

EXPERIMENT IN DELINQUENCY

by

Beau Fly Jones

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate
Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Department of Sociology and Anthropology,
McGill University,
Montreal.

April 1964

F O R E W O R D

Juvenile delinquency is a serious, complicated, and growing problem, which has received intensive theoretical and empirical investigation in most of the social sciences. But virtually none of the empirical investigation has been directed toward testing some of the more general, sociologically significant theories.

The purpose of this research is to compare the characteristics and social backgrounds of delinquent and non-delinquent adolescent males. Two groups, one delinquent and one non-delinquent, were chosen from a small, isolated community near a big city in the southeastern area of Canada. They were studied for three months, February through April, by intensive observation and interviewing. The general hypothesis of this research is that the social backgrounds and characteristics of the two groups will vary according to a number of specific hypotheses related to delinquency.

This thesis is divided into three parts. Part I contains a review of the literature in which each study or theory is placed in historical perspective with special attention given to the modern theories of primary concern to this project. Part II gives the design of the project along with a discussion of the methodological problems involved as well as a description of the pilot study and a brief presentation of the findings. Part III is directed to analysis of the major questionnaire schedule and other data.

I would like to thank Dr. William Westley, Chairman, Department of Sociology, for all the aid he has given as my advisor and Mr. Jack Dalton, Director, Catholic Boys Club, Montreal, for a financial contribution which made this project possible. Also I shall always be grateful to Mr. Herman Hirtle, Director of Youth Work, Y.M.C.A., Downtown Branch, Detroit, Illinois, for the enormous amount of time and historical information he contributed to this project and the boys of East End for their cooperation. I, of course, take full responsibility for the material presented in this thesis.

C O N T E N T S

	Background to Part I The Chicago Empiricists	1 - 20
	1924-1947 An Era of the Grand Study	
	Part I The Research Literature	
	1947-1961 A Period of Dialectical Growth	
Chapter I	The Sutherland School : Differential Association	21
Chapter II	Mertonian Thought : Social Structure and Anomie	41
Chapter III	Albert Cohen : Thesis	52
Chapter IV	Antithesis	61
Chapter V	A Synthesis?	92
	Part II Design and Defense	
Chapter VI	Methodological Questions	107
Chapter VII	Empirical Proceedings	118
	Background to Part III East End	
	The Community and Research Events	130
	Part III Project Analysis	
	The Troublemakers and the Junior Board	
Chapter VIII	Gang Lore and Police Law	176
	The Gang	176
	The Police	203
Chapter IX	Frustrations from Primary Relations	210
	The Family	218
	Girls	243
Chapter X	Pressures from Other Spheres	
	Education	252
	Religion	261

	The Agency	271
	Economic Position and Style of Life	283
Chapter XI	The Self and Individual Development	
	Self-concept	299
	Correlation	312
Chapter XII	Conclusions	334
	The Nature of Delinquency	335
	The Origins	342
	Evolution and Persistence	348
Appendix A	Preliminary Questionnaire Schedule	351
Appendix B	Questionnaire Schedule 1 - Pilot Study	353
Appendix C	Questionnaire Schedule 2 - Group History	357
Appendix D	Questionnaire Schedule 3 - Major	358
Appendix E	Census Data	375
	Bibliography	379

BACKGROUND TO PART I CHICAGO EMPIRICISTS

1924-1947 An Era of Grand Studies

Research between the two world wars on the causes of juvenile delinquency was dominated by scholars from Chicago. It was a period of exploration on a grand scale in which sociologists were aligned with each other in their search to uncover sociological factors in crime causation and in their desire to maintain an approach which was distinct from other approaches to the problem - namely that of psychologists. It was a period in which great contributions were made to theory and methodology. And it provided the foundations for the post war theories with which this research project is primarily concerned.

One of the earliest sociological theorists to study scientifically the causes of crime and delinquency was Edwin Sutherland whose Principles of Criminology (1924) represented a major break with previous approaches. The reformist character of early American sociology restricted most research in delinquency to problems of treatment and prevention, and, what was even more significant, impeded the growth of scientific methods. However, Sutherland's emphasis on close empirical validation and his concern for sociology as a science set his work apart from that of his predecessors. Moreover, great advances had been made in general sociological theory by Cooley, Dewey, Thomas, and others. Sutherland was the first to apply these new insights to the old problem of crime, to see the criminal as a "human being rather than a concept", to understand him in relation to the social organization and processes of society.

Crime, according to Sutherland, has no single cause, contrary to widespread belief but rather "is the joint product of an individual and a social value, or ... an attitude and a value".¹ For him, all human behaviour is motivated by four fundamental drives - fear, rage, love or joy, and curiosity.² Whether or not the individual will turn to delinquency or crime to satisfy any of these drives depends on the capacity of the home and community to fulfill his needs, and the degree of consensus behind legitimate social norms. A neighborhood without any moral standards

1. Edwin Sutherland, Principles of Criminology (New York: J.B. Lippencott Company, 1924) p. 111.

2. Ibid., pp. 118-122. Though the definition and illustration of these drives are mostly adapted from W.I. Thomas, The Unadjusted Girl (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1923), Sutherland carefully supported his argument by referring to case histories and empirical investigations.

cannot control conduct any more effectively than one which has a distinct tradition of crime and immorality. Mobility, immigration, compartmentalized sets of norms, the social consequences of poverty in a mobile society, bad companions - all produce diverse and conflicting patterns of social experience that weaken or destroy the force behind public sentiments, which in any case, are somewhat corrupted by a general disregard for the law.¹

Sutherland's treatment of causation goes beyond a synthesis and application of existing psychological and sociological theories. Looking back today, one can see in his work the seeds of future advances - particularly his own theory of differential association. And considering the materials he had to work with, it is certainly a tribute to Sutherland that his original approach was so overwhelmingly sociological in orientation. Not only were most of the sociological theories available to him unrelated to delinquency but apart from scattered sets of statistics and unstandardized case histories, most of the previous research on the causes of delinquency was highly psychological in orientation.² There were, however, a number of eclectic studies which did attempt to assess the significance of certain sociological factors, but being prior to the sudden growth in the twenties and thirties of sociological theory and methods specifically concerned with delinquency, their contribution to the field was somewhat limited.

1. This whole account was taken from Sutherland's chapters on causation. Edwin Sutherland, Op. cit., pp. 72-175.

2. For a complete bibliography of all research on delinquency prior to 1945 see P.S. de Q. Cabot, Juvenile Delinquency: A Critical Annotated Bibliography (New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1946).

Symptomatic of this problem are the works of William Healy, notably The Individual Delinquent, which Sutherland cites extensively. Healy had found the facts of even the best planned projects "too much for the theories", and therefore resolved to collect all possible data on the background and characteristics of 1,000 individual delinquents, classify it according to the results, and then diagnose the causes. But the traditional emphasis on and Healy's training in medicine and psychology¹ restricted his efforts primarily to those areas. Healy's firm belief that "all conduct is a direct expression of mental life"² is readily apparent in his impressive "Schedule of Data Concerning Delinquents".³ Using interviews, psychoanalysis, mental and psychological tests, as well as educational and other official records, Healy obtained a thorough coverage of the individual's physical, mental, and psychological development.

From the viewpoint of current sociology his material on sociological factors is certainly extensive: it contains complete demographic histories of each adolescent's family, religious and academic education, offences and institutional life along with personal interests, habits, associations, and the like. Unfortunately this data was overwhelmed by psychological rather than sociological analysis and the study lacks any kind of control group, sample method for selecting the individuals he examined, and precise

1. A certified M.D., Healy was then Director of the Psycopathic Institute, Juvenile Court (Chicago) as well as Associate Professor of Mental and Nervous Diseases (Chicago Polyclinic), and he was soon to publish Mental Conflicts and Misconduct (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1917).

2. William Healy, The Individual Delinquent (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1915) p. 30.

3. Ibid., pp. 53-69.

means of measuring and assessing the importance of variables - which were often inadequately defined and/or subsequently outdated in value.¹ In any case the very idea of being eclectic has long been open to question.

But then Healy was among the first to systematize and elaborate in great detail the methods he employed to organize a "grand" study utilizing diverse types of data for an extremely large number of subjects. A pioneer in the scientific study of delinquents in order to treat them scientifically, Healy's efforts were of great value.²

Before sociological variables could be weighed against psychological ones, it was necessary to establish what the social facts of delinquency were. Although some 30 years old the works of Thrasher and Shaw still survive as significant sociological studies and historical sources. Both were at Chicago with Sutherland during that city's fight against the biggest crime-wave the United States has ever known, and each had access

1.

In his summary for Case 24 Healy lists "Mother immoral" as an outstanding feature of the adolescent's heredity. (Ibid., p. 19) This kind of categorizing is typical and reveals clearly Healy's concern for reform as well as the confusion of the period regarding the concept of heredity.

2.

In fact he wrote an article on the matter some years later ("The Practical Value of Scientific Study of Juvenile Delinquents", United States Children's Bureau Publication 26 Washington D. C. 1922) and in 1926 with August Bronner published Delinquents and Criminals: Their Making and Unmaking (New York: Macmillan Company) - a comparative study of delinquents in two cities which is very similar in orientation and method to his previous work.

to and finances for fantastic research projects.¹

Thrasher's extensive survey of the formation and characteristics of over 1,000 gangs of all ages and sizes as well as both sexes, is rich with detailed accounts of gang life and its meaning. It was from this study that he derived the classic definition of the gang as an interstitial group originally formed spontaneously but integrated through conflict with adults or with other gangs. Gangs are interstitial groups in that they offer a substitute for what society fails to give; they fill a gap and offer interstitial activities for their members. Thrasher's description of the process by which a crowd of boys meeting on the street corner becomes a highly organized unit is most illuminating and one of the few accounts to discuss how easily this solidified unit may break down to become a violent mob.² Shaw's first report, Delinquency Areas (1929), contained a different kind of statistical evidence of entirely sociological factors. By studying delinquency rates and their distribution within the city from 1900 - 1926, he found that 9 out of 10 offenses were committed by two or more juveniles and that these rates varied inversely with the distance from the center of the city. Because the areas with disproportionately high rates were zones in transition from residence to business and industry - in effect slum districts characterized "by physical

1. Not to be confused with the "Chicago Area Project", organized by Shaw and his associates at the request of the Illinois State Department of Public Welfare to receive funds for needy areas on a self-help basis. Shaw's remark to a state employer who was reluctant to hire ex-convicts without academic background shows very well his approach to the problem; he said, "Those who teach delinquents are delinquents, not theorists, and those who combat it should operate on the same realistic level". See John B. Martin, "A New Attack on Delinquency: How the Chicago Area Project Works", Harpers Magazine, May 1944, p. 507.

2. Frederick Thrasher, The Gang (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926), pp.38-57. See also "Gangs", Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, pp. 564-567.

deterioration, decreasing population, and disintegration of the conventional neighborhood culture and organization"¹ - Shaw, like Sutherland, viewed delinquency as a product of social disorganization.

By social disorganization Shaw meant specifically the disintegration of the community as a unit of social control caused largely by the invasion of business and industry into residential neighborhoods and intensified by the influx of foreign national and racial groups whose cultural and social controls break down in the new cultural and racial situation of the city. In this context community resistance is low. "Delinquent and criminal patterns arise and are transmitted socially just as any other cultural and social pattern is transmitted". The section becomes a delinquency area over time as delinquent patterns become dominant and shape the attitudes and behavior of persons living there.² Shaw maintained this position throughout his subsequent studies and together with Sutherland established a trend which remained virtually unchallenged for over a decade.

What proved to be of lasting as well as immediate value to students of delinquency (besides Shaw's statistics) were his case histories and his interpretation of them. The Jack Roller (1930), the success story of a delinquent boy whom Shaw personally helped to rehabilitate, and its sequel written with Maurice Moore, The Natural History of a Delinquent Career (1931) survive as detailed accounts of how delinquents develop delinquent attitudes - told from their own point of view.

1. Clifford Shaw, Delinquency Areas (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929) p. 204.

2. Ibid., p. 205 - 206.

This process is further documented in a federal government report (1942) summarizing the major findings of all the Chicago Area Project studies. Based on another typical case history, the report's chapter on "The Development of Delinquent Careers"¹ depicts the successive stages by which early patterns of delinquency are acquired through association in play-groups and the community. Beginning with petty stealing in the neighborhood and truancy from school (which in Shaw's view is more a response to play-group situations rather than to any conflict or difficulty within the school), the first stage of developing a delinquent attitude is one of dependence on an older companion who acts as a teacher. With continued practise, the juvenile no longer considers his offenses simply as a form of play; rather he develops an attitude of pride and confidence in his ability to steal. Finally he begins to identify with delinquents and criminals and to incorporate criminal values. In sum, Shaw maintained that delinquency arises in areas which, because they are zones in transition, lack sufficient organization and control to prevent existing anti-social elements from converting relatively harmless games into distinctly delinquent action.

"New light" was indeed thrown on the problem by Healy in his last general study on the causes of delinquency.² In contrast to Sutherland and Shaw, Healy had been highly influenced by the emergence in this

1. Clifford Shaw and H.D. McKay, "Social Factors on Juvenile Delinquency", National Commission of Law Observance and Enforcement, No. 13, VII, (Washington D. C.: National Commission of Law Observance and Enforcement, 1931) pp. 347 - 383.

2. William Healy and August Bronner New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936).

country of psychoanalysis¹ and began to see delinquency as a reaction to frustrated desires for ego and affectional needs, of which there are many specific varieties. Although this view is within the framework of Sutherland's theory, Healy's focus is entirely different. As a sociologist, Sutherland concentrated almost completely on showing how social disorganization within the family and especially the community and wider society weakened or destroyed social control. That this state of affairs was inadequate in satisfying individual "wishes" was hypothesized but not systematically explored. Any purpose or meaning of the delinquent act to the individual is only implied in Sutherland's theory and in Shaw's account of the stages in a delinquent career. This was the central point of Healy's study.

In order to uncover the special experience and conditions which activate delinquency in a given individual, Healy again examined the backgrounds and personalities of 153 delinquents, in three different cities. This time, though, he also studied 145 non-delinquents and paired 105 of them with delinquents as controls. Since the project was initiated in response to accusations that the family was entirely responsible for delinquency, selection of recidivists was made wherever possible on the basis of whether or not there was a non-delinquent sibling in the family, which was taken as the unit of study. Apart from a few other minor limitations (such as the exclusion of the feeble-minded and the maintenance in the study of the average official ratio of delinquent boys to girls), the

1.

In 1930 Healy published The Structure and Meaning of Psychoanalysis as Related to Personality and Behavior (New York: Judge Baker Foundation Publication No. 6) and five years later co-authored with the prolific psychoanalyst Franz Alexander, Roots of Crime, Psychoanalytic Studies (New York: Alfred A. Knopf and Company, 1936).

cases were unselected - though Healy contends that they were undoubtedly representative of offenders that appeared before American courts in urban communities. During the three years of study, 1930 - 33, the delinquents underwent psychological testing, physical examinations, and psychiatric consultation relative to the "needs of the individual". Work with the total 133 families was done mainly by psychiatric social workers and contacts were made with schools and other social agencies within the community. Data on the control group including 5 pairs of twins was accumulated mostly through interviews.

One of the first projects in the field of delinquency to have such a large and close control-group, Healy's results opened the door to entirely new thoughts on delinquency. He discovered that 80 of the 105 delinquents studied with controls had normal rather than deviate personalities¹ (comparable to the 103 controls diagnosed as normal) and that 75 of them came from living conditions evaluated as "apparently inimical"² - compared to the total 75 controls who also came from this type of situation. Such evidence was a great step in dispelling the generally held beliefs that personality deviations and "inimical living conditions" were major causes of delinquency. Except with regard to treatment,³ Healy

1.

An individual with deep emotional dissatisfactions or mental conflicts was not classified as a personality deviate unless definite neurotic symptoms (like hysterical vomiting or obsessive ideas) were exhibited.

2.

Family life was rated according to home conditions, general family attitudes towards its members and the law, as well as distinct neighborhood influences.

3.

Actually Healy's treatment program was one of the most significant aspects of the study. Court records had shown clearly that institutionalization alone was largely a failure as a corrective measure. Healy reasoned that a delinquent could not be treated successfully in a vacuum,

did not emphasize further the meaning and implications of the distinction between delinquents with normal personalities and those with deviate ones, which was to become, albeit in different terms, so important in future research.

Instead, he turned his attention to the question of why one member of a family was a delinquent while the other was not. Having found no causally significant difference in physical, mental, personality, or general home factors,¹ Healy compared the emotional experiences of the delinquents and controls and was tremendously impressed by the prevalence of emotional disturbances among the delinquents. Ninety-one percent of the delinquents gave clear evidence of severe inner stress while only 13% of the controls were thus characterized and in every instance they were able to find counterbalancing satisfactions.²

that modification of the social environment was the key to rehabilitation. Treatment in Healy's program was divided in two parts. The individual received treatment varying from psychiatric aid to placement in a foster home or educational adjustments. Treatment for families consisted mainly of psychiatric services but also included giving economic aid and making educational contact.

Of 143 cases selected for treatment 72 ceased committing delinquent acts for a period of two years and were considered "cured". The number of successes included five of the 26 cases judged as "abnormal"; 19 of 50 cases in which the social pathology appeared to overwhelm the possibility of successful treatment of the delinquent within his family environment; and 48 of 67 cases classified as hopeful. (See pp. 158 - 172 for details.) The fact that nearly half the 143 cases were completely rehabilitated underlined for Healy and all students in the field the great practical as well as theoretical gains to be made in viewing delinquency as a response to frustrated social relationships. William Healy, New Light on Delinquency and its Treatment, op. cit.

1. There were a number of marked differences in these areas (particularly the outstanding predomination of hyperactivity in delinquents) but they were not considered as major causes. Also of importance was the finding that 80 per cent of the delinquents strongly disliked their fathers; 52 per cent their mothers; and 60 per cent school. But this area was not covered in the control group and no comparison could be made. Ibid., p. 52.

2. Ibid., p. 122.

The data on the nature of these disturbances fell into seven established psychiatric categories. Intense feelings of rejection or insecurity (46 cases); inferiority or inadequacy (46 cases); discomfort about family disharmonies (34 cases); and jealousy towards one or more siblings (31 cases) were the most common variety. Twenty-eight felt thwarted in the expression of urges and desires other than affectional; seventeen suffered from internal mental conflict; and only nine experienced deep guilt feelings.¹

It was largely on the basis of these findings that Healy proposed his theory - that delinquency is a reaction to frustration. If this was true, then the act of being delinquent must hold special meaning or value to the delinquent. Healy was able to distinguish seven types of "solutions" represented by delinquency or being delinquent. Without paralleling the classification of emotional disturbances, these were: escape, compensatory satisfaction, ego bolstering through recognition and status within the delinquent crowd, expression of revenge attitude, the satisfaction of instinctual urges felt to be thwarted; the wish for punishment, and the attempt to gain maximum satisfaction by exhibiting definitely hostile attitudes toward authority.²

Why delinquency is selected as a mode of reactive behavior was only discussed in the most general of terms. According to Healy, this happens because ideas of delinquency have already been part of the thought content of the individual, whose acceptance of these ideas (as opposed to others) is dependent upon whether or not there are other sufficient satisfactions.

1. Ibid., pp. 128-129.

2. Ibid., pp. 133-137.

The essentially psychological orientation, the use of such outdated concepts as instincts or urges, the overlapping of categories, the relatively unscientific criteria employed in the selection of cases and rating for the various classifications would undoubtedly limit the usefulness of Healy's study for modern sociologists. But the treatment program, his comparative case histories, and his general interpretation of them stand as the foundation of a new approach for sociologists as well as psychologists. It was some time, however, before sociologists began to concentrate on identifying and accounting for sociological factors generating frustration. They were more immediately interested in the problems of how and why delinquent ideas are accepted above others - probably because these questions were so closely related to the tradition of research set by Shaw, namely to discover how patterns of lower class delinquency are integrated with adult criminality in slum areas.

Only two years after Healy's study had been on the market Frank Tannenbaum published Crime and the Community. Although undoubtedly influenced by the Chicago school of thought more than by Healy,¹ his account of the community's role in structuring delinquent action into patterns of organized crime shows indirectly one way in which the individual comes to accept delinquent ideas. The community first contributes to the formation of delinquent habits by dramatizing an evil pattern so that the juvenile is not only defined as a "bad" person but

1.

Throughout Tannenbaum's chapters on the community he continuously refers to the various works of Shaw, Sutherland, and Thrasher but seldom mentions those of Healy whose psychological orientation had prevented his association with the more sociological traditions at Chicago - even though his original studies had been made there.

also, being identified in this way, he becomes the thing he is described as being through identification with others like himself. Once gangs form, they compete for allegiance; and to the extent that the gang "wins", it represents a failure on the part of the community to compete successfully. Finally, delinquents could not develop criminal careers without the support of groups whose ethical codes accept these activities; obversely, these groups could not survive unless they were fostered by corrupted politicians and policemen allowing middlemen to sell stolen goods to organized markets supported by other elements of the community or by harmful punitive processes which stimulate and perpetuate criminal traditions.

In 1942 Shaw and McKay published Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas. This ecological survey covered over twenty American cities and established conclusively their original finding that the distribution of delinquency "follows the pattern of the physical structure and social organization of the American city".¹ That is, the higher degree of physical deterioration and social disorganization, the greater the incidence of delinquency. But in comparison to their previous interpretation of this exceptionally high correlation, there is a marked shift of focus. Shaw and McKay still considered delinquency a manifestation of social disorganization; but instead of stressing rapid social changes, influx of foreign ideas, and so on, they emphasized the conflict of value systems within any given delinquency area. In effect, there was a conventional value system which lacked sufficient organization to control a highly organized, well developed tradition of crime and delinquency so that within the limits of

1. Clifford Shaw and H. D. McKay, Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas (Chicago: University of Chicago Press) p. ix.

a delinquent's immediate social world and in terms of its norms and expectations, he may be a well-adjusted person.¹

Why should delinquency areas be characterized in this way while areas with low delinquency rates are not? In answering this question Shaw and McKay turned to the differences in economic status. Clearly delinquency areas are characterized by low income and status in contrast to residential areas whose social and economic advantages are decidedly higher; yet despite these differences, children and young people in all areas are exposed to luxury values and success patterns of our culture. Shaw and McKay argued tentatively that the key to understanding delinquency may be found in "the disparity of facilities available to people in different communities for achieving a satisfactory position of social security and prestige".² For an observation of such crucial importance today, it is surprising that so many years elapsed before its implications were explored systematically.

During that lapse William Foote Whyte's classic study of Street Corner Society (1943) revolutionized the other trend set by Shaw - to consider delinquency areas as socially disorganized. Living for four years in a slum area as a participant-observer (which in itself was an innovation to research in this field), Whyte made intimate contacts with the members of four groups - the corner boys, the college boys, the racketeers, and the politicians - each representing a different stratum

1. Ibid., p. 436. The direct connection between Shaw and Merton who made this idea the focal point of his theory of anomie is very doubtful. In fact, there is no reference to Shaw's works in the 1949 edition of Merton's Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press) or in his chapter "Social Structure and Anomie" in The Family: Its Function and Destiny, Ruth N. Anshen ed. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949) although Merton does refer to Shaw's "Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas" op. cit., in the 1957 edition.

2. Ibid., p. 438.

or way of life within the social system (although the latter two groups did perform the same function of being intermediaries to the larger society).

By studying the interaction within each group Whyte was able to discern the lines of authority, the characteristics and function of the leader, the basis for membership and differentiation of status within the group, the aims and so on until he had a whole blueprint of their respective social structures. Significantly the corner boys functioned as a gang bound together by a network of mutual obligations whereas the college boys formed a democratic club for the social advancement of its members. The racketeers and politicians were run from the top.

By studying the interaction among the groups, Whyte discovered that Cornerville was (and the people who live there considered it to be) a closely-knit hierarchical organization in which people's positions and obligations to one another were defined and recognized. In order to get ahead, the Cornerville men must choose either the world of business and Republican politics, where he would be recognized as successful by society but as alien in Cornerville, or the world of rackets and Democratic politics in which case he would achieve acclaim in Cornerville but become an outcast to the larger society. Society, in short, placed a premium on disloyalty to Cornerville and penalized those who rose within it.

College boys, in contrast to corner boys, were more likely to succeed in getting out and in going ahead partly because as early as the ninth grade they were set apart from others and fitted into patterns of activity leading toward social mobility. College education and investing or saving instead of spending were only a part of that pattern. More

important - the college boy either did not become tied to a group or to close friends or he was willing to sacrifice his friendship with those who did not advance with him. The corner boy, though similar to the college boy in his desire to be socially mobile, lacked any kind of preparation to rise in anything but the world of Democratic politics and the rackets. And he was so tied to his group by this **system** of mutual obligations that he either could not or was unwilling to break away. "Corner-ville's problem was not lack of organization but failure of its own social organization to mesh with the structure of the society around it."¹

Although Whyte's research did not deal directly with the nature or causes of delinquency, his study contributed much to the field of knowledge about the social make-up of delinquency areas. In addition, he is known for his method of participant observation (especially since he included a discussion of the advantages and problems of it in the revised edition of his book) as well as his characterizations of the corner boy and the college boy which later theorists, particularly Albert Cohen, have found quite useful.

In sum, as early as the twenties Sutherland and Shaw had laid the foundations for a general sociological approach to the causes of delinquency. Both of them considered delinquency to be a product of social disorganization within the community which was, in their view, characterized by diverse and conflicting patterns of social experience and therefore lack of consensus behind legitimate social norms. Sutherland maintained that the individual turned to delinquency because his home and community

1. William Foote Whyte, Street Corner Society (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1943) p. 273.

failed to satisfy his basic needs.

The following decade was devoted, for the most part, to empirical research within this framework. Shaw documented many important social facts about rates of delinquency - its disproportionate concentration in lower class areas, the overwhelming prevalence of offenses among boys rather than girls, and the decidedly group nature of committing delinquent acts. Sutherland and Shaw established that there were distinct patterns of delinquent offenses, integrated with patterns of adult criminality, and that the process of becoming delinquent or possibly criminal had definite stages involving a gradual association and identification with delinquent juveniles and values. Thrasher, Tannenbaum, and Healy showed that the gang, the community, and the family played important roles in that process. The gang, having developed into a socially organized force of its own, provides the activity and social recognition or security that the community fails to provide through lack of understanding, adequate facilities, and social control. The family contributes to delinquency by its inability to satisfy the emotional needs of the individual who, according to Healy, turns to delinquency as a means of satisfying his frustrations. Also of great importance to future sociology was Healy's discovery that even though 9 out of 10 delinquents suffered from severe emotional disturbances, they were normal - not psychotic or neurotic.

Such were the advances of the thirties. But for every question answered new ones were raised and the theory of social disorganization was growing painfully inadequate. How could social disorganization regularly produce patterns of delinquent behavior which are transmitted from generation to generation? How could social disorganization

predictably lead to the formation of highly organized gangs in almost any given urban area throughout the country?

Even Shaw, its greatest proponent in this field, began to search for new explanations when in the early forties his survey of delinquency areas showed conclusively the consistency of delinquent offense distribution. He came close to seeing that delinquency could be a response to a structural defect within the social organization of American society when he observed that out of all the children exposed to success patterns, only some could afford to realize them. Unfortunately, though, Shaw did not explore or extend this point. So much had been discovered about the relationship of various sociological elements to delinquency but so little was known about their relationship to each other, that Shaw did not connect this observation to the idea of social organization. No one did, until Whyte had shown how organized delinquency areas were. Then it was only a matter of time before the two ideas were put together and answers could be provided to many of the questions arising from twenty years of study. But the second world war and its aftermath distracted further research for several years.

In the interim a number of studies were conducted which attested to the great need for general and middle range sociological theories. One of these was Eleanor and Sheldon Glueck's Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency.¹

1. The Glueck's Delinquency in the Making (New York: Harper Brothers, 1952) is a popularized summary of the material from Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency (New York: Commonwealth Fund, 1950). Nearly all of their research prior to this was devoted to studying the effectiveness of various forms of peno-correctional treatment; a summary of all these findings may be found in After-Conduct of Discharged Offenders (London: Macmillan Company, 1945).

Few empirical investigations have received such a violent and lacerating attack on methodology.¹ The Gluecks' review of existing research disclosed a tendency to emphasize one approach only. This trend, in their view, was inadequate so they resolved to make an eclectic study.

Five-hundred institutionalized delinquents were matched with 500 non-delinquents according to age, general intelligence, national origin, and residence. Each pair was compared at four levels of inquiry - the socio-cultural, somatic, intellectual, and emotional. Unfortunately they relied on Rorschach tests, psychiatric interviews, and capability tests in achievement and intelligence as adequate measures of delinquent characteristics and social conditions associated with delinquency. This orientation led them to minimize some of their most significant findings - namely sociological factors. By re-arranging the variables in their study, Walter Reckless has shown that their own data provided evidence of the overwhelmingly greater importance of sociological factors.² But whatever deficiencies the project has, the raw data from it has been used by sociologists ever since to document their own theories.

Another project which failed to achieve its goals was the Cambridge-

1. Frederick Thrasher's derogatory comments on it in the 1951 issue of the American Sociological Review, (v.16) were mild compared to the devastating two-part attack on it in the American Journal of Sociology: (v.57), by Sol Rubin and Albert J. Reiss - titled (respectively) "Illusions in a Project Using Matched Pairs" and "An Appraisal of the Research Methods". Michael Hakeem's "A Critique of the Psychiatric Approach to the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency" (Social Problems, 1957, 5 : 194-206) criticizes the Gluecks specifically (on p. 200) but the whole article is a scathing blow to most psychiatric techniques - especially the Rorschach tests which the Gluecks rely on almost entirely for their substantive conclusions.

2. Walter Reckless, The Crime Problem (New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1955) second edition, pp. 74-78.

Somerville study conducted by Dr. Richard Clark Cabot between 1935 and 1944.¹ By means of interviews and various psychological and physical tests 325 pre-delinquent lower class boys were matched with non-delinquents from the same socio-economic status. Vast quantities of material concerning the background, social relationships, and characteristics of the individuals in each group were collected before and during a five year treatment period for over half of the total 650 sampled randomly. Although the experiment in treatment was not successful, the original records were re-examined in 1958 by William and Joan McCord² whose findings will be discussed later.

1. The results of this project are reported by Helen Witmer and Edwin Powers in An Experiment in the Prevention of Delinquency (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951).

2. William and Joan McCord, "The Effects of Parental Role Models on Criminality", Journal of Social Issues, V. XIV, 1958, pp. 66-75.

A more detailed analysis of the Cambridge-Somerville project is contained in Origins of Crime (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959) which the McCords wrote with Irving Zola.

PART I THE RESEARCH LITERATURE

1947-1961 A Period of Dialectical Growth

Research on delinquency since World War II is characterized by theoretical controversy. Throughout this period sociologists aligned themselves into schools of thought or in groups of opposition against each other in a sometimes bitter conflict over the significance of certain factors. Most of the controversy centered around the theories of Edwin Sutherland, Robert K. Merton, and Albert Cohen, and has been intensified by the absence of conclusive empirical evidence.

The review of each theory will be followed by a presentation of the evidence in support of it and the evidence against it, any criticism implied or stated by other theorists, and an attempt to put the theory in perspective - from which questions and hypotheses relevant to this research will be derived. After a brief summary of the material, the general research design will be considered.

CHAPTER I

THE SUTHERLAND SCHOOL

DIFFERENTIAL ASSOCIATION

The first major theoretical issue after the war revolved around Edwin Sutherland's theory of differential association. Although the original formulation of Sutherland's theory appeared in 1937, it was developed during the forties and restated in the 1947 edition of his textbook. As the final account it is this latter version which stimulated so much controversy and research during the fifties.

Several years prior to the original formulation of his theory, Sutherland had worked with a professional thief and had been greatly impressed by the delinquent's statement that a person cannot become a professional thief merely by wanting to be one; he must be trained in personal association with those who are already professional thieves.¹ This led Sutherland to conceive of the delinquent and criminal as participants in a cultural tradition which conflicts specifically with anti-criminal codes of behavior.² Delinquent and criminal behavior, according to him, is learned like any other behavior - through inter-

1.

Sutherland said this in an address to the Ohio Valley Sociological Society in April 1942. This address was published in The Sutherland Papers collected and edited by Albert Cohen, Alfred Lindesmith, and Earl Schuessler (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1956). A full account of that delinquent's career was published by Sutherland in 1937, The Professional Thief (Chicago: Chicago University Press). It contains Sutherland's first explicit reference to differential association. Thus, in 1937 he wrote: "The differential element in the association of thieves is primarily functional rather than ecological". (p. 206)

2.

Originally, Sutherland had thought that any kind of culture conflict caused crime but later he restricted the concept to the area of law and crime which he called the "principle of specificity in culture conflict". Albert Cohen, Alfred Lindesmith, and Karl Schuessler, The Sutherland Papers, op. cit., p. 20.

action and communication with others.¹ It just happens to be delinquent because of a greater association with criminal patterns than anti-criminal ones. Slum conditions, where the law is not respected and where physical proximity accelerates learning processes, facilitate individual acceptance of delinquent traditions through differential association² with them. The crime rate at any given time is determined by differential group organization, the interaction between criminal organization, and organization against criminal activities.

Sutherland felt that his hypothesis of differential association was consistent with the principal gross findings in criminology. It explained why the crime rate is higher in urban areas than in rural districts, why the crime rate remains consistently high in deteriorated parts of the city, why the delinquency rate for a given group drops when it moves out of deteriorated areas, why males are more often delinquent than females, why crimes do not increase greatly during a depression, and so on.

But Sutherland was his own greatest critic.³ Until 1944 he had felt

1. The most important things which delinquents learn through association with other delinquents were not techniques of crime (since many criminal techniques are also techniques of non-criminal behavior) but rather the evaluation of behavior and the definition of the situation in which criminal behavior is appropriate. Ibid.

2. Differential associations may vary in frequency, duration, priority (in the sense that patterns of behavior developed in early childhood may persist throughout later stages without continued frequency of association); and intensity (regarding the prestige of the source of a criminal or anti-criminal patterns and with emotional reactions related to those associations). Ibid., pp. 10-11.

3. Sutherland's critique of his own work was originally titled "The Swan Song of Differential Association" written in 1944 but not published until 1956 as part of The Sutherland Papers, Ibid., pp. 30-41. Although Sutherland's final statement of the theory in 1947 was slightly modified in the light of his own criticism, it remained basically unchanged in substance. His 1944 criticisms are presented here because they still seem to apply.

that his theory was the necessary and the sufficient explanation for a person's entrance into a closed system of delinquent and criminal behavior. Differential association was the necessary explanation because, he thought, no person could enter the system of criminal behavior unless he had associated with criminal patterns. He regarded differential associations as the sufficient cause in the sense that all persons who associate with criminal patterns participate in criminal behavior unless inhibited by associations with anti-criminal patterns. According to this hypothesis then, whether or not a person engages in crime depends entirely on the ratio between associations with criminal patterns and those with anti-criminal patterns.

The doubts he had had about the necessity of association with criminal codes of behavior, he more or less dismissed.¹ It was the sufficiency of differential association as a cause of crime which occupied his attention. He found three factors which were at least partially extraneous to his theory. First, whether or not a person has the opportunity to commit crimes, such as embezzlement, has little to do with his association with criminal or anti-criminal goals and values. Secondly, criminal behavior may vary with the intensity of

1.

This assumes that delinquent and criminal behavior cannot be invented. Sutherland discussed this point and concluded that although it was possible for a non-criminal to invent simple crimes, it was most improbable that the individual could do this without some kind of previous association with criminal goals and values. (Ibid., pp. 23-24.) At best this position seems theoretically debatable, not only because it denies instances of possibly genuine invention (such as in the case of Leopold and Loeb) but also because indirectly it rejects the possibility of crimes committed purely through passion which Jean Paul Sartre has immortalized in his play Crime Passionnel. Finally, it cannot account in any way for the origin of criminal patterns.

need - independently of variations in differential associations.¹ Thirdly, criminal behavior in some instances is "not absolutely determined but only in relation to other behaviors, against which it may be balanced in the process of making choices".² To explain this statement he cited the case history of an isolated and unattractive girl who finally chose to participate in a homosexual relationship over the prospect of remaining lonely. Unfortunately, the distinction and relationship between committing a crime through need and committing one through lack of a better alternative is not clear in Sutherland's critique.

A fourth factor which Sutherland may have found extraneous to his theory was personal traits. In 1937 he proposed that personal traits cause criminal behavior only as they affect a person's association. Apparently this postulate received extensive criticism from several sources, and he discussed the issue in an address in 1942.³ On the one hand, he felt the objections were justified; but at the same time he believed the principle to be sound and preferred modification over abandonment. His subsequent analysis in the same address of the evidence presented by Healy and Bronner in New Light on Delinquency suggests that he neither modified nor abandoned his position. He argued that emotional

1. Principle nine of Sutherland's 1947 formulation states that "Though criminal behavior is an expression of needs and values, it is not explained by those general needs and values since non-criminal behavior is an expression of those same needs and values". Albert Cohen, Alfred Lindesmith, and Karl Schuessler, op. cit. p. 10. Although variations in needs and values may not by themselves account for delinquency, the development of those needs and values manifested in delinquency must be at least partially independent of differential associations with criminal and anti-criminal codes of behavior.

2. Ibid., pp. 33-34.

3. To the Ohio Valley Sociological Society, Ibid.

disturbance was significant in the genesis of delinquency only as it resulted in increasing the frequency and intensity of associations with delinquent patterns or in isolating the individual from anti-criminal patterns. Since Sutherland never defined personal traits or mentioned them specifically in his critique of 1944 or the last statement of his theory in 1947, it is not clear whether he finally considered personal traits to be an additional extraneous factor or whether he subsumed the concept under the category of need. However, the fact that his discussion of this area was entirely in terms of economic and sexual deprivation leaves this possibility rather doubtful and also indicates that the concept of personal traits could be treated in the same way.

Because Sutherland could find no place in his theory for these three or four factors, he concluded that differential association was an insufficient explanation for all criminal behavior. Nevertheless he felt that it was still the best available to explain delinquency in terms of the individual.¹ Or at least a valid account of a crucial factor in the genesis of deviant behavior.

How did others react to Sutherland's theory? Some accepted it without question. But Sutherland had deliberately encouraged criticism from all sides and most of his critics were those who had the greatest faith in his theory, people who were deeply committed to it. Apart from the criticisms made by Sutherland himself, the few major objections prior to 1955 were condensed and built upon by Daniel Glaser.² First and most

1. Sutherland was never really concerned with the origin of criminal traditions; he more or less assumed their existence and proceeded from there - a tactic which cost him much criticism.

2. Daniel Glaser, "Criminality Theories and Behavioral Images", American Journal of Sociology, 1955, 61: 433-442.

important, some critics interpreted Sutherland's conception of association to be synonymous with contact and therefore argued that the differential learning of crime is much more complex than intimated by Sutherland's theory. But, as Glaser pointed out, Sutherland included identification as well as contact in his concept.¹ Moreover, proponents of this argument often ignored Sutherland's reference to personality and other factors which determine differential association. A second type of criticism was that Sutherland's theory only accounts for one of several distinct types of crime. Both issues, in Glaser's view, stem from Sutherland's failure to evoke a clearly recognizable and integrated behavioral image of the criminal.

Using this point as a base, Glaser proposed to reconceptualize Sutherland's theory in terms of differential identification and role-taking. In essence, his theory is this: a person pursues crime to the extent that he identifies himself with real or imaginary persons from whose perspective his criminal behavior seems acceptable.² The focal point of such a theory is the interaction which leads the individual to chose a model; this includes the person's rationalization of his conduct to himself. The theory of differential identification cannot account for accidental crimes or unpremeditated crimes of passion because it treats criminality as a form of voluntary behavior structured by prior identification and present circumstances. But it does provide a criterion of relevance for elements in the background of each in-

1. In fact, Sutherland stated that "identification with a group of boys who stole was as important in differential association as actual contact." Edwin Sutherland, Principles of Criminology *op. cit.*, p. 138, 4th ed. And in his posthumous revision of Sutherland, Donald Cressey, added to the above statement: "Differential identification is a clearly implied and congruous aspect of the differential association theory". Quoted in Daniel Glaser, *op. cit.*, p. 439.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 440.

dividual case - such as economic conditions, previous frustrations, group participations, and the like - which may be seen in terms of how they affect the choice of the other from whose perspective the individual views his own behavior. Thus, the life situation can be related to criminal behavior by specifying the intervening identification. Without this specification, the relationship between the two evokes a disconnected image. With it, one can look for and explain the effects of imaginary or highly generalized others, remote reference groups, and so on as well as to evoke an integrated image of the criminal.

Despite the essential validity of Glaser's proposal to revise Sutherland's theory, the idea of differential identification has not gained wide acceptance. Ironically, however, his misgiving regarding the inadequacy of Sutherland's language were immediately borne out. It proved to be one of the major stumbling blocks to operationalizing the hypotheses.

James Short, who has attempted to test Sutherland's theory in several ways, found his language a handicap in two ways.¹ First, Sutherland was too general and abstract. How could one test an equation involving associations with definitions of the law or criminal patterns? Then, too, there was the problem of determining the distribution of opportunities and avenues of access to criminal and conventional values. Second, the apparent simplicity of Sutherland's language stood in the way of testing. It was obvious, as Short points out, that people develop through a process of communicative interaction particularly with

1. James Short, "Differential Association as a Hypothesis: Problems of Empirical Testing", Social Problems, 1960, 8: 14-25.

primary relationships. Yet Short and other students of Sutherland knew that he meant much more than that.

A start could be made, he found, by testing the four main variations of differential association - priority, frequency, duration, and intensity. But before Short and Nye who worked with him on most of the tests could do this, they needed a means of rating delinquency. After conducting numerous exploratory tests from large samples, they devised a delinquency scale based on a self-report system. The scale consisted of eleven items ranging from such minor offenses as driving without a license and disregard of parental authority to major felonies and narcotics violations.¹

The self-report system has many merits.² It allows the investigator to examine the extent and variety of delinquent conduct instead of assuming that institutionalized youths are categorically delinquent and that non-institutionalized juveniles are completely non-delinquent. Furthermore, it does not restrict the researcher to the use of institutionalized populations which may be biased by socioeconomic status, race, and other factors of discrimination. This is not to say, however, that the system is useless for study of institutionalized offenders.

In fact, one of Short's first studies used the male and female inmates of a state training school as his subjects.³ Measures of differ-

1. A full report of preliminary tests, a complete listing of the items, and a description of the method used for rating them may be found in their article, "Scaling Delinquent Behavior". While the advantages of the self-report system are clear and have been accepted, the delinquency scale itself has not met with equal success; for example, scholars feel that the items do not fully represent the range of delinquent offenses. James Short, Jr. and Ivan Nye, American Sociological Review, 1956, 22: 326 - 331.

2. James Short, Jr., and Ivan Nye, "Reported Behavior as a Criterion of Deviant Behavior", Social Problems, 1957-58, 5: 207-214.

3. James Short, Jr., "Differential Association and Delinquency", Social Problems, 1957, 4: 233-240.

ential association were obtained from answers to questions concerning the friends which subjects saw most often, for the longest time; whom they knew first and considered closest; and whether or not they were delinquent or criminal.¹ Specific, general, and total differential scores were obtained from the responses. The most notable finding, according to Short, was the consistently positive relationship between delinquent behavior and delinquent association. Although the coefficients were of such magnitude as to give confidence in the theory,² Short warns that the findings must be regarded as characteristic only of the population studied, since the delinquents concerned were necessarily considered more seriously delinquent³ than non-institutionalized delinquents and since there were no measures of any anti-delinquent and non-delinquent associations which may have been made by the respondents.

At the request of Donald Cressey the first 1960 issue of Social Problems was devoted to a symposium on Sutherland's theory. After an

1. The idea of asking institutionalized juveniles to discuss directly the extent and nature of their association with other delinquents seems somewhat spurious. To begin with, it was not clear from the questions whether their judgments should be based on personal opinion (which means that the bases of their evaluations will not be uniform) or official records (in which case non-institutionalized offenders are excluded).

2. Sutherland's theory was concerned with causes yet Short's findings make no distinction between differential association as a cause of delinquency and differential association as a result of delinquency.

3. In view of this, it is surprising that the original schedule was used as many of the offenses indicated or represented by each item hardly warrant institutionalization.

introduction by Cressey, Glaser¹ assessed the use of Sutherland's theory as a basis of predicting crime. From a review of previous prediction studies, he rated individual predictors according to their success or failure. Next, he showed that, in contrast to other theories, a majority of the most accurate ones could be deduced from differential association theory, while the least accurate could not. The only two efficient predictors which Glaser could not deduce from Sutherland's theory were type of offense and non-criminal employment opportunities post release. All of this, stated Glaser, points to the need suggested by Cloward² for subsuming differential association theory in a broader theory of differential access to criminal and non-criminal opportunities. Glaser concludes that so far Sutherland's theory is superior to alternative ones in terms of prediction and proposes that a differential anticipation³ theory might meet these standards even more adequately.

A second article is presented by Short.⁴ After reviewing several investigations, such as the Gluecks' Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency, which support but do not validate differential association, he reported another study which he conducted regarding the variable of intensity. He proposed that those boys and girls who are most involved in delinquent

1. Daniel Glaser, "Differential Association and Criminological Prediction", Social Problems, 1960, 8: 6-14.

2. Richard Cloward and Lloyd E. Ohlin, "Types of Delinquent Sub-Cultures", unpublished manuscript, December 1958.

3. That is, an interest in an actor's anticipation from criminal and non-criminal activity would lead one to study his self-conception as well as his membership and non-membership reference group.

4. James Short, Jr., "Differential Association as a Hypothesis: Problems of Empirical Testing", op. cit.

behavior will characterize their best friends in terms hypothesized to be delinquency producing; obversely, those least involved will describe their best friends in terms hypothesized as delinquency inhibiting. The findings from the delinquency scale and questionnaires given to high school juniors¹ tended to confirm the general theory, although not all the evidence supported their predictions in terms of their "somewhat arbitrary designation of items as delinquency producing, inhibiting or neutral".² In view of the difficulties in testing only part³ of Sutherland's theory, Short more or less concluded that it cannot be operationalized⁴ but suggested employing it as a general organizing principle to account for variations in crime rates.

Henry McKay in a third article for the symposium showed the utility of this approach. Much research was conducted to evaluate Sutherland's theory as an explanation of why and how individuals become delinquents while comparatively little attention has been paid to it as an explana-

1. The use of a non-institutionalized population certainly adds importance to the results yet the use of high school juniors who happen to be in school the day of the test excludes truants who may be more than truant as well as delinquents who have officially or unofficially dropped out of school permanently.

2. Ibid., p. 23.

3. Short came very close to operationalizing propositions which dealt with variations of differential association; he felt that those relating to the process by which delinquency occurs were entirely untestable.

4. Cressey who attempted to apply the theory to explain trust violations came to the same conclusion. He said, "It is doubtful that it can be shown empirically that the theory of differential association applies or does not apply to crimes of financial trust violation or even other kinds of criminal behavior". See Donald Cressey, "The Application and Verification of the theory of Differential Association", Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1952, 43: 43-52, p. 52. quoted by Cressey in "The Theory of Differential Association: An Introduction", Social Problems 1960, 8: 2-5, p. 4.

tion of the existence of both delinquency and non-delinquency in high delinquency areas. Sutherland had stated, almost in passing, that the crime rate at any given time and place is determined by the interaction between organization promoting crime and organization against criminal activities. He never elaborated upon this proposition nor provided any evidence that it was true.

Henry McKay showed how his statement, used as a broad principle, includes the whole range of participation in community life. His analysis focused on programs for treatment and prevention and natural or unplanned processes as they affect the delinquency rate. He argued that these programs and processes affect the delinquency rate because they alter either the ratio of conventional and non-conventional values¹ or the range of opportunities for participation in conventional groups. McKay ended his dissertation on a note of dismay. "At the present time the combined influences of those programs and natural processes furnish

1. There is more empirical evidence which indicates that values are not as directly responsible for variations in delinquency rates as proponents of the theory would suggest. Eleanor Maccoby, J. P. Johnson, and Russell M. Church found in a study of "Community Integration and the Social Control of Juvenile Delinquency", (Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 14: 38-52.) what they expected to find - that people in high delinquency areas tend to ignore children's pre-delinquent activities somewhat more often than those in low delinquency areas and that this tendency provides an atmosphere in which delinquency can grow more easily. They had originally thought any difference they found in the social contacts might at least be partially explained by differences in the values held by inhabitants of each area. This was not so; residents in high delinquency areas felt just as strongly about the wrongfulness of delinquent activities as did those in low delinquency areas. The authors concluded that causes for delinquency may be closely related to parent-child and community-child interaction but they must be centered in other processes than the direct transmission of values.

Martin Haskell made a similar discovery while director of the Berkshire Farm for Boys, a residential treatment school. He found that in therapy sessions boys frequently identified views of their parents as opposed to their acts. Martin Haskell, "Toward a Reference Group Theory of Juvenile Delinquency", Social Problems, 1961, 8: 220-230. See also Joan and William McCord, "The Effects of Parental Role Model on Criminality", Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 14: 66-75. (The findings of this study are discussed on p. 62.)

only fair prospects for the control of delinquency in the inner areas of large cities.¹

McKay's analysis was a general one and did not refer to specific organizations or experiments. Yet one of the most revolutionary and promising programs for treatment was derived solely from Sutherland's theory. In 1955 Donald Cressey proposed that if criminals are to be changed, they must be assimilated into groups which emphasize values conducive to law abiding behavior and concurrently alienated from groups emphasizing values conducive to criminality. Both reformers and those to be reformed must achieve status within the group by exhibition of "pro-reform" or anti-criminal values and behavior patterns. The most effective mechanism for exerting group pressure on members is to induce criminals to join with non-criminals for the purpose of changing other criminals.²

In 1956 these principles were put into action as basic tenets of the Provo Program designed to aid habitual delinquents. Because it was experimental, no reports were made public until a trial period of five years was completed. An apparently successful program thus far, the Provo experiment has two phases: intensive treatment and post treatment attention which involves an attempt to maintain some reference group support and aid in securing employment. The treatment system attempts to provide a social structure which will permit delinquents to examine the role and legitimacy of authorities in the treatment program; give them the opportunity to examine the ultimate utility of conventional and

1. H. D. McKay, "Differential Association and Crime Prevention: Problems of Utilization", Social Problems, 1960, 8: 25-37, p. 37.

2. Donald Cressey, "Changing Criminals: The Application of the Theory of Differential Association", American Journal of Sociology, 1955, 61: 116-120.

delinquent alternatives; provide the opportunity to declare publicly a belief or disbelief that they can benefit from a change in values; and make peer group interaction the principle rehabilitative tool because it permits peer group decision-making and grants status and recognition, not only for participation in treatment interaction, but for willingness to help others.¹ The real success of this program cannot be judged until full studies of the control group activities have been completed and compared to those of the treatment group. Whatever the final judgment of these and the following studies, those connected with it feel that it is one of the most effective methods of rehabilitation yet devised. And its debt to Sutherland for its theoretical orientation is an outstanding one.

In conclusion, Sutherland's theory was an important innovation in the study of delinquency and crime. It was perhaps the first systematic attempt to explain the causes of delinquency in terms of culture conflict from the point of view of the individual. Shaw and his associates had explained delinquency rates in terms of culture conflict but until 1937 the individual delinquent was generally held to be abnormal physically, mentally, and/or psychologically - despite the empirical evidence provided in 1936 by Healy and Bronner which indicated that this was not so. Sutherland changed that conception of the individual delinquent to one which views behavior as being determined primarily by cultural factors. Moreover, the settlement of issues involved in the theoretical debate stimulated by Sutherland, and the attempts to validate

1. LaMar Empey and Jerome Rabow, "The Provo Experiment in Delinquency Rehabilitation", American Sociological Review, 1961, 26: 679-695.

empirically at least part of his theory have led to significant refinements in theory such as the realization of the significance of opportunity structures and in method such as the invention of delinquency scales and the use of a self report system - to say nothing of the insights which may be gained from using the theory as a broad principle of organization and the potentially great practical value of the theory as a basis of treatment and prevention programs.

Unfortunately, the theory as a whole cannot be operationalized. As Glueck has pointed out, no one so far has "actually counted the number of definitions favorable to violation of the law and definitions unfavorable... and demonstrated that in the pre-delinquency experience of the vast majority of delinquents and criminals, the former exceeds the latter".¹ Even those most deeply committed to Sutherland's theory doubt that conclusive tests can ever be conducted primarily because of the difficulties presented by Sutherland's language and imagery. Yet it is equally improbable that Cressey's idea of differential identification or Glaser's concept of differential anticipation will prove any more testable - however theoretically fruitful these revisions might be - for the same reasons.

Perhaps the greatest barrier to operationalization is not a linguistic one but rather exists because the theory of differential association attempts to prove that what constitutes a major portion of becoming and being delinquent, causes delinquency. Ralph Turner said of prediction: "In any situation in which variable 'A' is said to cause variable 'B', 'A' is of no value as a predictor of 'B' unless we establish the existence of 'A'

¹. Sheldon Glueck, "Theory and Fact in Criminology", British Journal of Sociology, 1956, 7: 92-109.

apart from the observation of 'B'.¹ The same argument could be applied to Sutherland's theory for the very reason that he believed his theory to be the necessary explanation of delinquency. If "no person can enter the system of criminal behavior unless he has associated (or identified) with criminal pattern", then is differential association or identification not a fact or even a result of being delinquent? All the empirical evidence from direct tests by Cressey, Short, and Nye as well as the findings from other studies which also support but do not demonstrate the theory indicate that it is - in which case, the theory becomes tautological and therefore cannot be used to explain that of which it is a part. The relevant causal question, then, is why do delinquents differentially associate or identify with criminal activities and values or in other words, what factors cause individuals to chose delinquent friends and accept delinquent codes of conduct over conventional ones?

In answer to those questions as they relate ^{to} Sutherland's theory, there are two points of departure. First, there are the three factors - intensity of need, lack of alternative solutions, and opportunity by which he contended could be at least partial causes of criminal behavior outside the framework of his theory. Yet as far as Sutherland was concerned these three factors were of causal significance only under extraordinary circumstances. That is, need could be only a causal factor apart from differential association when it was extremely intense such as that found in acute poverty or sexual deprivation. Similarly, resorting to crime through lack of a conventional alternative was a causal

1. Ralph Turner, "The Quest for Universals", American Sociological Review, 1953, 18: 604-611, p. 606.

factor only if the individual had exhausted every other conceivable legitimate means to accomplish his goal. And opportunity was a causal factor apart from differential association in the sense that it limited the range of crimes possible for an individual to commit; few people, if any, are in a position to engage in the full range of criminal activities, should they desire to do so.

In view of these considerations, it would seem that these factors, even if they could somehow be operationalized, are largely irrelevant to a situation in which the individuals involved are neither poverty stricken, sexually deprived, nor (presumably) lacking in alternatives to accomplish their ends. The question of opportunity, however, is an important one - although not necessarily in terms of causation because it does at least structure the range of possible delinquent offenses.

With regard to this research project, then, several questions may be asked at this point: 1) What is the range of delinquent offenses committed by the members of both the delinquent group and the non-delinquent group?¹ Answers to this question may be obtained by simply asking the members of both groups to describe the extent and frequency of any delinquent offenses they may have committed. 2) What is the range of delinquent offenses which the members of both groups could commit if they had a desire to do so? This may be established by an examination of any delinquent offenses proposed but rejected by the members of both groups and an investigation

1. Since the members of both groups live in a working class area where the delinquency rate has been high, it is very unlikely that the members of the non-delinquent group have systematically refrained from engaging in any kind of delinquent activities. An investigation of the extent, seriousness, and frequency of those activities must be made for comparative and analytical purposes.

of the actual range of offenses committed by youths throughout the community. 3) If there is a significant difference between the actual range and the possible one, what factors may account for this discrepancy? Establishing an answer to this question involves two procedures. On the one hand, there has to be some general criteria for discerning whether or not the difference, if any, is a significant one. This could be accomplished quantitatively by comparing the number of offenses committed to those which could have been committed and qualitatively by typing the actual and possible offenses according to their objects and degree of seriousness and then comparing them. On the other hand, there must be an investigation of any factors arising from the physical and socio-economic status of the members of both groups as well as factors generated by the social structure which might serve as barriers to the commission of particular delinquent activities.

A second point of departure may be found in the factors which Sutherland contended could be causally significant inside the framework of his theory - factors which are important insofar as they affect the differential association. Because Sutherland believed his theory to be the necessary cause of delinquency, he felt there was no need to explain why a person has the associations which he has. Consequently his final statement in 1949 contains only the most abstract answer to this question. "A person's associations are determined in a general context of social organization...including many personal group relationships."¹ However, in his 1942 address, Sutherland did mention that emotional disturbances

1.

Albert Cohen, Alfred Lindesmith, and Karl Schuessler, op. cit., p. 11

arising from dissatisfied social relationships within the family might "have something to do" with the genesis of delinquency. Such cases, he argued with reference (stated earlier in this chapter) to the findings of Healy and Bronner, were in lower economic groups where the delinquency rate is high; "consequently there is a probability that they will come into contact with boys who are delinquent with greater frequency and intimacy than they would if they were not frustrated at home and that they will on that account become delinquent".¹ While this statement may be greatly oversimplified, the role which dissatisfied relationships at home might play in delinquency should at least be explored. Relevant questions which may be asked in terms of this research project are:

- 1) Are the members of either groups dissatisfied in any way with the social relationships within their family? If so, in what way and for how long?
- 2) Did the members of either group have any frustrations at home prior to the time of the research project? If so, in what way and for how long? Answers to this and the preceding question may be obtained by asking them directly to the members of both groups.
- 3) What is the relationship between frustrations at home, if any exist, and any association or identification with non-delinquent and known delinquent or criminal goals, values, or persons?
- 4) What is the relationship between frustrations at home, if any exist, and the commission of delinquent offenses? Partial answers to these two questions may be obtained by putting frustrations at home,

1.

Ibid., p. 28

associations or identifications, and delinquent offenses in chronological order and correlating them to each other. Of course, more complete answers to these questions cannot be obtained without assessing the importance of frustrations and pressures arising from other sources but this is the final problem of this research and will be considered at a later point.

On the basis of Sutherland's theory - assuming that the delinquents associate differentially with other delinquents as part of the course of their being delinquent - what are the probable outcomes?

- 1) The range of offenses committed by delinquents will overwhelmingly exceed the range of offenses committed by non-delinquents.
- 2) The range of offenses committed by the members of the delinquent group will encompass the range of offenses which they could commit had they a desire to do so.
- 3) The difference, if any, between the range of offenses actually committed and those which could possibly be committed, given the desire to do so, can be accounted for either by elements of the physical and socio-economic status of the individual or elements within the social structure.
- 4) The members of the delinquent group, in contrast to those in the other group, will have at the time of the research or at some time in the past, acute frustrations arising from dissatisfied social relationships within the family.
- 5) These frustrations, should they exist, will correlate historically with association or identification with delinquent or criminal patterns and the commission of delinquent activities.

CHAPTER II

MERTONIAN THOUGHT

SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND ANOMIE

The publication of Robert K. Merton's Social Theory and Social Structure in 1949 marks the beginning of a new trend in the study of deviant behavior. Merton argues¹ that some social and cultural structures exert a definite pressure upon certain persons to deviate rather than conform so that some forms of deviance constitute a normal response - normal in the sense of psychological predictability. Within a given cultural structure, the pressure which society exerts upon its members to achieve socially acceptable goals may vary independently of the pressure exerted on institutional means of achieving them.² If a society continuously emphasizes the value of a particular goal without a corresponding concern for the prescribed means of attaining it then the technically most effective procedure, whether culturally legitimate or not, becomes preferred to institutionally prescribed conduct. Anomie or normlessness develops when this process becomes widespread. Anomie, then, is the social situation which gives rise to high rates of deviant behavior. This general argument is the foundation not only for Merton's general theory of deviance but also for others specifically concerned with delinquency.

1. This discussion of Merton's theory is based on his revised edition of Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955) Chapters IV and V, pp. 131 - 195.

2. Actually, Merton seems to equate the concrete means to achieve goals with the cultural emphasis on the acceptability of means. At one point he states that "aberrant behavior may be regarded sociologically as a symptom of dissociation between culturally prescribed aspirations and socially structured avenues for realizing these aspirations". Ibid., p. 134, (emphasis added).

What are the sources of anomie? Although Merton maintains that there may be many different sources of anomie,¹ he discusses only one in his book² - the American success theme which is distinguished by its stress on economic affluence and social assent for all its members.³ That is, striving for success is a socially defined expectation. When the pressure to be successful is greater than the pressure on legitimate avenues available to the individuals to achieve it the individual may be frustrated to the point where only questions of technical efficiency limit his behavior. Were this condition widespread, the social in-

1. Merton believes that any cultural goal which receives an extreme emphasis without qualification as to the way in which it is achieved will lead to anomie. He mentions in a footnote, for example, that this situation may be brought on or encouraged by certain family constellations whereby the parents place so much value on achievement for their children that considerations of approved methods are vitiated. This is the only other source of anomie to which Merton refers, specifically but Meier and Bell conducted a study based on Merton's general proposition and found that the lack of opportunity to achieve any life goal, economic or otherwise, was significantly related to anomie. See Dorothy Meier and W. Bell, "Anomie and Differential Access to the Achievement of Life Goals", American Sociological Review, 1959, 24: 189-202.

2. During a Conference on Delinquency in 1956, Merton discussed the possibility that anomie might arise from a great diversity of cultural norms (as opposed to anomie arising from a conflict between a cultural norm and the means of achieving it). However, there is no specific mention of this type of anomie in the revised 1957 edition of his book. For Merton's discussion of this type of anomie see Helen Witmer and Ruth Kotinsky, editors, New Perspective for Research in Juvenile Delinquency (Washington D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Children's Bureau, 1956) pp. 63-65.

3. Later Merton carries this point to the extreme. Apparently, mere lack of opportunity is not enough to account for high rates of deviance. "It is only when a system of cultural values extols virtually above all else certain common success goals for the population at large while the social structure rigorously restricts or completely closes access to approved modes of reaching these goals for a considerable part of the same population, that deviant behavior ensues on a large scale." Robert Merton, op. cit., p. 146. This statement was made with reference to a particular response (innovation) to anomie, and it is not clear whether Merton meant for it to be applied to all types of response to anomie.

stability caused by it would lead to anomie, a breakdown in the culture occurring when there is an acute dissociation between culturally prescribed ends and socially structured means of attaining them.

While anomie gives rise to deviant behavior the obverse may also be true; according to Merton, deviance may in turn generate anomie in a vicious-circle process. The higher the rate of "successful" deviance,¹ the less faith in or stress upon the legitimacy of institutionally prescribed norms² (unless the situation is counteracted by the use of social controls). Thus, deviant behavior itself may engender anomic conditions.

Assuming that deviance is not random but restricted to a number of identifiable responses, Merton derives a typology of the various ways in which individuals may adapt their roles to the situation. How a person reacts depends on whether he accepts or rejects the cultural goal(s) and whether he accepts or rejects institutionalized means to achieve it or them. Of the five "modes of adaptation" - conformity, ritualism, retreatism, innovation, and rebellion - both innovation and rebellion may characterize different forms of delinquency. (Since the other two types of deviance are passive, they are irrelevant and will not be discussed.)

Rebellion is a transitional deviant adaptation striving to change the existing order, goals, and norms by institutionalizing new ones to

1. Merton does not elaborate upon this notion of "successful" deviance but nearly all the empirical studies on delinquency have noted the impact on boys when they continuously see living proof of achievement without effort. Conversely, the fact that "successful" deviance may be widespread raises the question: To what extent does law enforcement, or the lack of it, affect the relationship between anomie and deviant behavior?

2. It is conceivable that this formulation could apply also to foreign behavior, to high rates of emigration from and immigration to a community from assorted ethnic, national, and racial groups.

be shared by other members of society. Like resentment, rebellion is characterized by diffuse feelings of hostility, hate, and envy; a sense of powerlessness to express those feelings; and a continual re-experiencing of this impotent hostility. Rebellion is distinctive in that it involves a genuine change of values. This does not mean that value conflict may be equated with anomie. If rebellion is not widespread and powerful, it may lead to the formation of sub-groups alienated from others but unified among themselves. Alienated adolescent gangs or youth movements exemplifying this pattern may form subcultures of their own but these groups tend to be unstable unless they are sufficiently insulated from those who reject them.

Innovation, in contrast to rebellion, represents an acceptance of cultural goals but a rejection of institutionalized means. It is in this context that Merton cites class controls and educational requirements as primary barriers to the attainment of material wealth - the symbol of success. "Numerous studies have found that the educational pyramid operates to keep a large portion of unquestionably able but economically disadvantaged youths from obtaining higher formal education."¹ Crime and delinquency are mentioned specifically as examples of this pattern.

Cohen said of Merton's reference to delinquency that the theory of anomie does not account for all forms of deviance, that it cannot explain the non-utilitarian, destructive, zestful, and negative qualities which characterize it.² To the first charge Merton admits. To the second he

¹. Ibid., footnote 19, p. 145.

². Albert Cohen, Delinquent Boys, (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955) pp. 35-36.

reiterates that the deviant behavior resulting from a discrepancy between ends and means is not rationally calculated and utilitarian. Rather, response to these pressures may involve considerable frustration and non-rational behavior. Destructiveness and negativism may be similarly understood as responses to frustration.¹ On the other hand, the theory does not account for the properties of zestfulness and versatility. Their source, according to Merton, may be found in "the social interaction among like-minded deviants who mutually reinforce their deviant attitudes and behavior..."² No mention is made of the role that inadequate social controls, boredom, and the element of play might have.

Another objection to Merton's theory came from Ralph Turner. In an article about value conflict and social disorganization, Turner argued that anomie was a special case of "value conflict" - which he defined broadly as an imbalance between ends and means. "Socially approved means constitute limitations on socially approved ends and vice versa, but value conflict in a meaningful sense exists only when the balance between the two is lost."³ Merton later denied emphatically that value conflict may be equated with normlessness. Conflicts between norms held by distinct subgroups often create an increased adherence to the norms prevailing in each sub-group. "It is conflict between culturally

1. Dubin maintains that an extension of Merton's categories may explain the destructiveness exhibited by certain gangs. If solidary relations and internal competition for status institutionalized norms within the group, then destructiveness becomes an operating invention - a type of behavioral innovation. See Robert Dubin, "Deviant Behavior and Social Structure" American Sociological Review, 1959, 24: 147-163.

2. Robert Merton, op. cit., p. 179.

3. Ralph Turner, "Value-Conflict in Social Disorganization", Sociology and Sociological Research, 1954, 38: 301-308, p. 305.

accepted values and socially structured difficulties in living up to these values, which exerts pressure toward deviant behavior and disruption of the normative system."¹

Having considered what anomie is, some of its sources, and the relevant types of response to it, the important question is: how to examine it in an empirical situation? There have been several efforts, namely on the basis of Srole's anomie scales,² to measure anomie as subjectively experienced by the individual; but none of these deals directly with delinquency - possibly because it is taken for granted that juvenile delinquents by definition are characterized by a sense of social isolation, futility, and powerlessness, and are, in short, alienated from society.

Indices of anomie as an objective condition of group life have been developed by Lander³ who identified the delinquency rate, percentage of home ownership, and percentage of non-white residents as measures of social stability and relative anomie. But as both Lander and Merton

1. Robert Merton, op. cit., pp. 190-191.

2. Meier and Bell, op. cit., used this scale in their study and A.H. Roberts with M. Rokeach attempted to replicate Srole's study, "Anomie, Authoritarianism, and Prejudice: A Replication", American Journal of Sociology, 1956, 61: 355-358, but Srole questions whether it has in fact been replicated. (Ibid., 1956, 62: 63-67.) The five items in Srole's scale seek to measure the individual's perception of his social environment and his place in it. Questions in the scale rate degree of interest in the achievement of life goals as well as the individual's ability to accomplish those goals.

A third study using Srole's Anomie Scale has been conducted by Mizruchi who tested for anomie in a small city. On the basis of his study he hypothesized that lower classes have a greater tendency to feel anomie due to socially structural differential access to supportive subsystems and the inaccessibility of means for the achievement of socially desired ends. See Ephraim H. Mizruchi, "Social Structure and Anomie in a Small City", American Sociological Review, 1960, 25: 645-655.

3. Bernard Lander, Towards an Understanding of Juvenile Delinquency, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954) and partially replicated by David Bordua, "Juvenile Delinquency and Anomie: An Attempt at Replication", Social Problems, 1958-59, 6: 230-237.

recognize, these variables at best only serve as a very indirect index of the rate of disrupted social relationships.

Assuming that social instability is an indication of an anomic situation, perhaps an examination of the ethnic and national backgrounds of the subjects; the histories of their geographical, educational, and occupational mobility; and the nature and extent of participation in formal as well as informal groups outside their own peer groups will provide more direct yet objective measures of disrupted social relationships. More pertinent to Merton's emphasis on the dominant source of anomie, though, would be to establish the extent that individuals in both groups internalized the cultural success goals of social assent and economic affluence.

Both concepts, however, present a difficult problem. What, precisely, are they and how can they be measured from the viewpoint of the individual? If a working class boy actually¹ sets his goal at being president of a corporation or at reaching any of the very top income brackets, there is no doubt that he desires to be economically affluent. But what if the same boy simply wants to move from a blue collar job to a white collar position; has he internalized the goal of economic affluence? Success is such a relative concept; not only does each class have its own definition of success but also there is an absolute level of success which everyone or at least a majority considers to be successful. Thus, each individual has two definitions of success - one based on his own class or profession and one based on the absolute or majority standard. More important, it is possible that an over emphasis by a given class to achieve success within that class may be as conducive to anomie as a widespread desire by the majority to achieve real affluence.

¹. This is distinct from dreaming about a goal which there is no likelihood of achieving.

Merton recognizes this but he is not clear on whether he is referring to either phenomenon separately or both in combination; when he speaks of an "over emphasis on success", he does not specify which definition of success or the exact source of the pressure - a given class or the majority? In his analysis he tends to equate the two. Noting that in terms of income, Americans always want 25 per cent more than they have,¹ he defined monetary success as "the point which is always 'just ahead'". By this definition, then, anyone who has the slightest ambition to improve himself financially may be said to have internalized the goal of monetary success. Not only does this seem extravagant but it belies the general tenor of his whole thesis and obscures the most important point. Throughout his discussion of "the success theme" as portrayed by the mass media - the basis of his central hypothesis - he refers to success almost entirely in terms of "reaching the top", "rising to the estate of economic royalty", "going from rags to riches", and so on. Only in passing does he state that any standard of achievement may become "differently accepted" among the several social strata as successful. Thus, it is impossible to determine from Merton's discussion exactly what he means by success.

But even if success cannot be measured on the basis of Merton's thesis, is not the key phrase "over emphasis" rather than "success"? However one defines success, the important point is not measuring the extent of internalization of the goal but rather the extent of internalization of the means to achieve whatever one accepts as successful. The essential issue, then, is not whether or how far an individual desires

1. Robert Merton, op. cit., p. 136 from a study by H. F. Clark for which there is no specific reference.

to improve his financial status but rather how much he wants to do it and how frustrated he is in his efforts. Is his desire to rise economically so strong that he is willing to use illegal means? Or is he so frustrated in his efforts that he would resort to illicit methods? Or is it possible that he could be so frustrated that he rebels against society by violating the law but not in such a way that he gains financially from it? These are the main operational questions to be asked from Merton's theory.

A conclusive test for the significance of this source of anomie with regard to delinquency would of course involve demonstrating that a substantial number of the working class (the class to which members of both groups belong) were exposed to an intense pressure to rise financially, without a corresponding pressure to do it legally, and accepted the goal without accepting the legitimate means. Such an enormous and complicated task would not be necessary, however, merely to explore the possible relationship between this source of anomie and a given delinquent group. Thus, on the basis of Merton's theory one could hypothesize that:

- 1) The members of the delinquent group will have experienced a greater amount of socially disrupted relationships than the members of the non-delinquent group.¹
- 2) The members of the delinquent group, in contrast to the members of the non-delinquent group, will feel or will have felt prior to this research a definite pressure, particularly from their parents, to improve themselves economically without a corresponding pressure to attain their ends legally.

¹. This hypothesis will be explored by establishing and comparing the background, mobility, and participation factors mentioned on p. 47.

- 3) The members of the delinquent group will have less educational and vocational training than the members of the non-delinquent group.
- 4) In contrast to the members of the non-delinquent group, they will feel that the qualifications they have or can acquire are inadequate to achieve their goals.
- 5) If the members of the delinquent group reject the cultural goals of economic progress and social assent, then they will substitute culturally unacceptable goals and will consider their deviant behavior either as a rebellion against society or as useful in the attainment of their own goals.
- 6) If, on the other hand, the members of the delinquent group do desire to rise socially and economically, if that desire is intense, if they feel they lack the qualifications necessary to the achievement of their goals, and if they have not felt a pressure to achieve their ends legally, then the members of the delinquent group will have invented illicit methods for the expressed purpose of financial gain.¹

In order to explore these hypotheses, the following will be established and compared:

- 1) Whether or not the subjects have felt any pressure from their parents or others to rise socially and/or economically;
- 2) Whether or not they felt a corresponding pressure to rise financially by legal means or to break the law;
- 3) What educational and other qualifications they actually have to attain their economic and social goals, what credentials they perceive

1. It is clear from the wording of these and other hypotheses, that much weight is placed on the accuracy of individual perception. This problem will be discussed in Chapter VI.

to be necessary for such attainment, and what qualifications they think would be necessary for the achievement of their ideal economic and social goals;

4) Their present positions, their job goals (what type of job they hope realistically to attain in the future), and their ideal job choice;

5) What the subjects earn, what they hope realistically to earn in the future, and what they would like to earn ideally;

6) Their current styles of life (living conditions, class, and spending habits), that style of life which they hope realistically to achieve in the future, and that which they would consider ideal;

7) If their present qualifications, jobs, earnings, and styles of life are different from those they hope realistically to achieve, what they feel can be done to eliminate this discrepancy and what they are in fact doing;

8) If their actual goals are different from their ideal goals, why they are different and whether a change would be possible realistically;

9) If such a change would be possible, why they do not or will not attempt to change;

10) Whether or not they consider material wealth so important that they would be willing to use any method, legitimate or illegitimate, to attain it;

11) How the delinquents view their own deviant behavior.

CHAPTER III

ALBERT COHEN

THESIS

The third major theoretical controversy during the late forties and fifties was created by the publication of Albert Cohen's Delinquent Boys in 1955. Subtitled "The Culture of the Gang", this provocative theory seeks to explain the peculiar content and origin of what, in Cohen's view, is the typical delinquent subculture. Although Cohen's theory is based largely on those of Sutherland and Merton, he rejects them as adequate explanations of delinquency on the grounds that neither theory accounts for the properties which characterize most delinquent gang activity. In short, they do not fit the facts.

What are the facts a theory must fit? According to Cohen, most delinquent behavior is non-utilitarian in the sense that it is not motivated by profit or gain but rather "for the hell of it" - for the malicious enjoyment of others' discomfort and the delight in defying taboos, for the deliberately negative purpose of doing exactly the reverse of what is prescribed by middle class norms. Other traits of gang activity and the structure of the gang include hostility to non-member peers and adults, versatility rather than specialization of their activities; strong group autonomy or intolerance of restraint except from within the group itself; and shortrun hedonism, the lack of interest in planning long-term goals or organized recreation.

Like Merton, Cohen assumes that the American emphasis on economic success is basically a middle class ideal but one which is shared to some extent by all classes. Since education and certain values are prerequisites to competition in an essentially middle class system, those who lack them are extremely handicapped. The educational system, as stated in Cohen's general hypothesis, is structured so that lower class

boys are alienated from school and lower class cultures do not prescribe the kinds of discipline necessary to achieve middle class goals.

Middle class ethics, in contrast to working class norms, place great value on ambition to achieve difficult goals; rational planning and allocation of resources as well as budgeting of time; self-control with regard to physical aggression and violence; the cultivation of manners and personability; constructive recreation involving study, practice, and the development of skills; individual responsibility or a reluctance to turn to others for help; and respect for property. All of these are norms and values which Cohen believes the middle classes try to instill in their children, who are taught to evaluate themselves and others by the possession of these "virtuous" qualities before they ever begin their formal education.

Perhaps the most systematic introduction working class boys have to competition for status by middle class criteria is in school. Cohen maintains that the "democratic conception" of education implies that a major function of the schools is to reward middle class ambition and conformity to middle class expectations. This happens, in brief, because middle class boards of education representing middle class parents hire middle class teachers to foster the development of middle class behavior. Apparently welfare agencies, youth groups, and religious organizations (generally sponsored and maintained by middle class people) tend to follow a similar pattern.

Anyone who does not measure up to these standards is considered a problem and a failure as a person. Lacking the necessary preschool

training and discipline, it is most likely that working class children will be unprepared and in many cases unable to meet these criteria. Whether or not middle class standards of worth are applied to individuals directly, they cannot be indifferent to these standards because they are the norms of people who control their lives in school and in organized play, perhaps even in religion, and certainly in job choice when the time comes. To the extent that the working class boy without the essential prerequisites values middle class status, he is faced with the problem of having his sense of worth destroyed, developing feelings of insecurity along with a sense of frustration, and losing confidence in learning that which he is capable of learning.

According to Cohen, lower class boys may react to this problem in one of three ways. A few decide to conform regardless of their limitations; they manage somehow to overcome their status handicap, acquire middle class "virtues", finish school, and go on to college. Others, probably the vast majority, solve the problem by retreating from it. These corner boys, as they are named after William Foote Whyte's description in Street Corner Society, may or may not complete their high school training for it is not necessary for the kind of acceptable but "dead-end" jobs they will eventually attain. They prefer not to take the risks and sacrifices of the "college boy response" (also named after Whyte's account); that might mean giving up a way of life which is familiar and possible failure should they try something else. Both college boys and corner boys, Cohen asserts, inhibit their overt aggression "and even their conscious recognition of their own hostile impulses" against middle class morality "for (they) acknowledge the

legitimacy of the rules by which they are stigmatized".¹

Despite its obvious costs, the delinquent response has some advantages over that of the corner boy. Delinquent subcultures are distinguished by the overt and wholesale repudiation of middle class standards. Should corner boys engage in behavior which is defined as delinquent, such as truancy, "it is not because non-conformity to middle class norms defines conformity to corner boy norms".² Rather it is because conformity to middle class norms interferes with his own; the fact that truancy is a delinquent offense is incidental to his desire to escape a dull and possibly humiliating situation. In contrast, members of delinquent subcultures which are formed through a process of mutual conversion, engage in delinquent activity precisely because it is delinquent, because it is the very antithesis of middle class norms. The corner boy's recognition of the acceptability of middle class values prevents him from being overtly hostile but membership in a delinquent gang legitimizes aggression and eliminates any ambiguity of status that the corner boy might have.

Just how much delinquents are capable of legitimizing aggression - to what extent delinquents actually reject middle class society - is not clear from Cohen's statement. He argues on the one hand that the child who breaks clean with middle class morality has no moral inhibitions about expressing his aggression freely against the source of his frustration. This connection between status frustration and the aggressiveness of delinquent subcultures, he submits, is more plausible

1. Albert Cohen, Delinquent Boys (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955) p. 132.

2. Ibid., p. 129.

than many frustration-aggression hypotheses because there is no doubt about the target of the aggression which, in this instance, is the manifest cause of their status problem. Yet in the immediately proceeding discussion, Cohen applies Parson's insight regarding deviant behavior¹ and asserts that these norms do not "really undergo total extinction, that instead they press for recognition. In order to cope with this threat to their stability, delinquents 'over-react', probably in the form of an 'irrational', 'malicious', 'unaccountable' hostility to the enemy within as well as the enemy without: the norms of the respectable middle society".² If the mechanism of reaction-formation is an element of delinquent behavior, is it a completely effective one? In other words, does it enable the delinquent to make a completely clean break without any moral inhibitions regarding aggression, or does it merely force any inhibitions into the background to remain a kind of underlying ambivalence? Perhaps delinquents cannot fully reject these norms at all once they are internalized but rather fluctuate continually between rejection, over-reaction, and acceptance. In any case, the idea that a clean break can be made is doubtful.

In summarizing Cohen's theory, delinquency is one cost of a democracy in which the middle class, being overwhelmingly dominant in number and power, sets the standards of success and provides its young with the disciplines, values, and other equipment necessary to achieve it. Lower classes are either unable or unwilling to furnish their

1. Talcot Parsons, The Social System (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1951) discussion of "Role Conflict and the Genesis of Deviance", pp. 280-283.

2. Ibid., p. 133.

young with these prerequisites, and consequently the majority of them are not prepared to compete. For those who wish to compete this presents a problem. Participation in delinquent subcultures, which have been formed through a process of mutual conversion offers a solution to that problem.

Cohen himself is the first to attest to the need for research on his thesis. In fact, he is currently engaged in an intensive study which will be published some time in the near future.¹ Until this and other supporting research can verify the theory with empirical evidence, Cohen can only continue to answer his critics on theoretical grounds.

Gresham Sykes and David Matza were perhaps one of the first to criticize him. In 1957, a year after Delinquent Boys was published, they argued² that many delinquents seem to be at least partially committed to the dominant social norms because they frequently exhibit guilt or shame when they violate its prescriptions. Other evidence of their commitment may be seen in their accord or approval of certain conforming figures and their tendency to distinguish between appropriate and inappropriate targets for their deviance. Delinquents do this, Sykes and Matza maintain, because they develop mechanisms which neutralize the

1. A more detailed description of this project is given below (see p. 88).

2. Gresham Sykes and David Matza, "Techniques of Neutralization", American Sociological Review, 1957, 22: 664-670.

disapproval flowing from internalized norms.¹

These techniques, mainly in the form of rationalizations and justifications, precede delinquency and perhaps make it possible for it to occur at all. By denying responsibility for his actions, by learning to view himself as acted upon rather than acting, the delinquent can deviate without necessarily attacking directly the dominant norms themselves. Second, the delinquent can deny to himself that his action is injurious. Third, should the delinquent be forced to admit that there has been an injury, he can view it as a form of rightful retaliation or punishment. The delinquent can push this technique to an extreme and condemn the condemnors; by attacking or discrediting others, the wrongfulness of his own behavior towards them can more easily be repressed. Finally, he can think of himself as sacrificing the demands of the larger society for the demands of his own social group. "These 'definitions of the situation'", according to Sykes and Matza, "represent tangential or glancing blows at the dominant norm system rather than the creation of an opposing ideology".²

1. Although not directly critical of Cohen, the argument put forward by Sykes and Matza is supported by others. Solomon Krobin in his article, "Conflict of Values in Delinquency Areas", (American Sociological Review, 1951, 16: 653-662) contends that in any community where there is a conflict of norm systems, both delinquents and non-delinquents will internalize aspects of each - in fact, Krobin suggests that it is the very existence of this dual orientation which accounts for the delinquent's aggressive destructiveness. Cloward and Ohlin, also note the significance of various types of rationalizations. Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin, Delinquency and Opportunity (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960) pp. 130-139.

2. Gresham Sykes and David Matza, op. cit., p. 669.

Cohen discussed this analysis in 1958. In an article written with Short,¹ he stated that although identification of these particular techniques of neutralization was a significant omission, his book did emphasize the importance of reaction-formation, one of the most elementary forms of neutralization, not only because it is a way of coming to terms with one's delinquent impulses but also because it helps account for the specific content of the deviant behavior in question. In fact, they assert that the very formation of a delinquent subculture is probably one of the most universal and powerful of neutralizing techniques.

In reviewing Cohen's comments regarding the Sykes and Matza article, it would seem that he does not actually repudiate the essence of their criticism: that delinquent norms are not the antithesis of middle class norms and that the placement and extent of delinquents' blows against the larger society are highly structured rather than being a wholesale attack on the middle class. Sykes and Matza clarify and extend this point in a later article in 1961² which integrates this and additional criticisms of Cohen's theory into a general statement. But before going into the substance of that article, it will be useful to review the recent empirical findings and criticisms upon which it is based as well as the findings of research on the family and the gang which have significant implications for Cohen's theory. In effect, this review will cover all the major research of the fifties.

Sutherland wrote about crime and culture conflict in general; and

1. Albert Cohen and James Short, Jr., "Research in Delinquent Subculture", Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 14: 20-38.

2. Gresham Sykes and David Matza, "Juvenile Delinquency and Subterranean Values", American Sociological Review, 1961, 26: 712-719.

although there were many implications in his theory regarding class, he actually said very little about it. Merton was primarily interested in deviance as a form of behavior distinct from conforming behavior; consequently his remarks on delinquency in particular are quite sketchy. His theory is clearly in terms of class, but it is essentially a theory about the social structure. Cohen was the first among the major post World War II theorists to be concerned solely with lower class delinquency and until Cloward and Ohlin published Delinquency and Opportunity in 1961, was the only one to make a systematic statement about its nature (apart from statistics). Because of this, all observations during the fifties about the characteristics of delinquents and their delinquency have specific implications for Cohen's definition of the problem.

Moreover, Cohen was the first to adapt Sutherland and Merton and to emphasize both class and conflict. While Cohen's application is in no way a synthesis of the two, it represented for subsequent researchers and theorists the general statement for all those who viewed class structure and class relationships as perhaps the major cause for delinquency. Consequently, any attack against this general position was directed against Cohen's thesis rather than those of Sutherland and Merton. Thus, the research of the fifties is not simply an antithesis to Cohen's theory; in many cases, it is also a criticism of the school of thought he represents. But because most of it was an attack against Cohen, evaluation of his thesis will proceed the review of literature for this period.

CHAPTER IV

ANTITHESIS

The year after Cohen published Delinquent Boys, there was a series of research projects on the role of the family. The first of these was conducted by Nye¹ whose data concerning adolescent adjustment in broken and in unhappy, unbroken homes was secured from a 25% sample of all boys and girls in grades nine through twelve in three medium sized towns in Washington State. Data on the parent-child relationship was obtained from a 50% sample of the same population. In both parts of the study delinquency scales were included in the questionnaire schedules. Altogether 2,323 questionnaires were used. Nye found that there were no significant differences in the distribution of delinquent behavior by socio-economic levels; that children from homes broken by divorce did not have poorer adjustment than those from homes broken in other ways; that in certain areas, such as school and church life, adjustment of adolescents in unhappy unbroken and in broken homes does not differ significantly.² From the second part of the project he found that there

1. The preliminary findings of this part of the project are reported by Nye in "Parent Adolescent Relationships and Delinquent Behavior", Research Studies of the State College of Washington, 1956, 24: 160-170. The complete results are found in "Child Adjustment in Broken and Unhappy-Unbroken Homes", Marriage and Family Living, 1957, 19: 356-361. In this study homes were considered broken if the adolescent did not ordinarily live with his original parents. The unhappy but unbroken families were those which fell in the bottom tercile of a parental interaction score computed from the amount of quarrelling, mutual interests, and so on. In addition each child rated his relationship with his parents in terms of happiness.

2. These findings are substantially supported by the results of a study conducted by Charles Browning who found a significant correlation between delinquency and family integration. More important, the findings were essentially the same when unbroken and broken homes were analyzed separately. Broken homes, then, do not appear to be a valid indicator of family disorganization, he suggests that the term should be redefined or abandoned. See Charles Browning, "Differential Impact of Family Disorganization on Male Adolescents," Social Problems 1961, 8: 37-45. A similar analysis was made by Jackson Toby, "Differential Impact of Family Disorganization", American Sociological Review, 1957, 22: 505-512.

was a significant correlation between rejection of one or both parents and delinquent behavior. Rejection of this type, he suggested, hinders the adoption of the parent as a conforming adult model and therefore weakens the parents' ability to be agents of social control.¹

Although Nye found little differences in the correlation between delinquency and paternal rejection as compared to the correlation between delinquency and maternal rejection, there is some evidence that the paternal relationship is more important - at least for boys. In a controlled study of "aggressive" and "non-aggressive" boys, Albert Bandura and Richard Walters found little difference in the amount of warmth and esteem that the subjects in each group showed their mothers; in contrast, the aggressive boys showed much evidence of having experienced a severe break in the father-son relationship.² And from a re-examination of the old Cambridge-Somerville study,³ William and Joan McCord found that criminal rates were highest among paternally rejected boys whose fathers were criminal. However, consistent discipline coupled with love from at least one parent seemed to offset any criminogenic influence. If the mother was also deviant, the chances of criminality were greatly increased even when both parents were loving.⁴

1. Ivan Nye, "The Rejected Parent and Delinquency", Marriage and Family Living, 1956, 18: 291-297. Albert J. Reiss, Jr., observed that parental authority may also be diminished if economic deprivation leads to subjective feelings of insecurity. See Albert Reiss, Jr., "Delinquency as the Failure of Personal and Social Controls", American Sociological Review, 1951, 16: 196-208.

2. Albert Bandura and Richard Walters, "Dependency Conflicts in Aggressive Delinquents", Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 19: 52-66.

3. See p. 20 (Background to Part I) above.

4. William and Joan McCord, "The Effect of Parental Role Models on Criminality", op. cit.

Closely related to this question of parents being effective role models is the question of parents being effective transmitters of values. Through analysis of the case histories and therapy programs for boys enrolled in Berkshire Training School, Martin Haskell found that lower class parents exerted a definite pressure on their children to conform to the law.¹ Similarly, the McCords found that the conscious values even among criminals seemed to support the non-criminal norms of society.²

These studies, taken together, show that the nature of the relationships within the family is of crucial importance, perhaps even more significant than the ability of the family to prepare the child for the achievement of its goals. Moreover, they bring into focus the fact, somewhat denied by implication in Cohen's theory, that lower classes may value law abiding behavior as much as other groups of higher socioeconomic standing.

Throughout the fifties (especially the latter half) there was a growing trend in social work and in the mass media to recognize the importance of sociological factors in delinquency. Consequently, observations from these sources have increasingly been stated in sociological terms or at least with reference to them. The result is that theorists have begun to exploit these newly-found resources and cite them as valid empirical evidence of certain patterns of lower class delinquent behavior as well as the physical and social conditions associated with them. More important, these reports attest to a new variety of gang activity.

1. Martin Haskell, op. cit., p. 223.

2. William and Joan McCord, "The Effect of Parental Role Model on Criminality", op. cit. See also Eleanor Maccoby, J. P. Johnson, and Russell M. Church, op. cit. (The relevant findings of this study were discussed above in regard to Sutherland's theory. See p. 32, Chapter I.)

The wealth of data provided by Sutherland, Shaw, Thrasher, and other prominent pre-World War II sociologists was limited primarily to descriptions of professional thieves, organized criminal gangs developed and maintained for the expressed purpose of promoting criminal careers, and gangs organized on a temporary basis to fill in the gap between childhood and adult status. Delinquent activity in the latter case, noted mainly by Thrasher, is the non-utilitarian, "malicious" form of adolescent play which Cohen described in his Delinquent Boys. Criminal gangs and semi-professional thieves, however, are decidedly utilitarian and definitely orientated toward criminal careers. Conflict in either non-utilitarian or criminal patterns is more or less restricted to evading the law or anyone attempting to stop them and to minor fist fights with individuals in other gangs.¹

In contrast to these types of gang activity, those described by social workers and reporters during the fifties, were mainly oriented to drug addiction or warlike conflict with other gangs. Virtually without exception the accounts of observers such as Harison Salisbury,²

1. In fact as late as 1936, Healy stated that "In Finland, fighting with knives, which is never seen here, belongs to the traditional ideas of the people..." William Healy and Augusta Bronner, New Light on Delinquency, op. cit. (emphasis added).

2. Harison Salisbury, The Shook-up Generation (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958). Salisbury is one of the first to note, contrary to widespread opinion, that race is not the basis of gang warfare but rather it is based on geographical location. Not only are many gangs integrated but also there were several instances of battle among gangs of the same race or ethnic origin.

Paul Crawford,¹ and Walter Bernstein,² to name but a few,³ emphasized these distinctive features of gang life; the desperate need for individual members to make a reputation for themselves and their gangs; the underlying desire to avoid the violence of their special kind of warfare for settling disputes accompanied by a lack of experience and faith in other methods of terminating quarrels; the rigidity of ideology and social stratification within each gang (the substance of which is always well-known to other gangs); and a universal acceptance of rules defining the procedure of declaring and making war amongst themselves - this includes special war officers, "summit" conferences held on tenement rooftops, and arsenals for assorted weapons ranging from chains and clubs to guns and knives.⁴ The grotesque similarity between gang warfare and conventional war among nations has been noted by most of these writers who, committed to social reform, tend to emphasize the delinquent

1. Paul Crawford, Working with Teenage Gangs (New York: The Welfare Council of New York, 1950).

2. Walter Bernstein, "The Cherubs Are Rumbling", The New Yorker, September 21, 1957.

3. Other accounts may be found in Reaching the Unreached (New York: New York City Youth Board, 1950) Sylvan Furman ed.; Stacey Jones, "The Cougars - Life with a Delinquent Gang", Harpers Magazine, 1957 November; and Will Chasan, "Teenage Gangs from the Inside", New York Times Magazine, 1957, March 21.

4. Nearly all of these reports have come from New York City. Why they have not been observed before is debatable. Whether it is because of New York's increased interest in the problem or whether these gangs have only just emerged is not known for certain. Furthermore, the fact that so far, these gangs have been peculiar to New York would indicate that their emergence is dependent upon certain factors not common in other cities. Most of the empirical evidence in the past has come from observers in the Chicago and Boston areas.

nature of the adult world which they feel is largely responsible for these social problems.¹

In reading the accounts of those who have had extensive and intimate contact with delinquency - including scholars of the thirties and forties - it is interesting to note their constant references also to the acute boredom and strong leadership apparently common to all types of lower class gangs.² Yet both of these characteristics have been virtually ignored by theorists as factors that might at least structure the particular form of delinquency in any given area.

Second, these reports make the idea that delinquents are rebelling against the middle class alone seem highly questionable. To begin with observers and social workers alike noted that one of the gravest problems among delinquents in lower class urban areas was to introduce them to the world beyond their street block. Pre-school children in these high delinquency areas tended to be almost completely insulated from experiences outside their homes or neighborhoods and any evaluation of another person's behavior that they may have made was much more likely to be made on the basis of conformity or non-conformity to the law rather than

1.

Social reformers are not alone in this view. Among the many sociologists and other scientists who subscribe to this position, Milton Barron's The Juvenile in a Delinquent Society (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1954) and Paul Goodman's Growing Up Absurd (New York: Random House, 1956) stand out as classic statements.

2. Except probably in the case of semi-professional thieves and drug addicts who generally associate in very small, relatively unstructured groups rather than large, organized gangs.

on one of class differences since they were all from the same class.¹ Public school, welfare agency, and church populations, based largely on geographic location tended to follow the same pattern.² Life within these districts was generally characterized by disorganized family relationships; inadequate educational, recreational, and religious facilities or programs; possibly discriminating or other forms of illicit police treatment. And, to quote from Tannenbaum, "Once the gang has been developed, it becomes a serious competitor with other institutions as a controlling factor in the boy's life. The importance of the gang lies in its being the only social world of the boy's own age".³ In view of these circumstances the likelihood that delinquents have any concept of class seems very small.

Third, this deluge of reports and observations during the fifties establishes beyond doubt the existence of entirely different patterns. Among other things, it raised the crucial question of how many types of delinquent patterns there were. Cohen and others immediately re-examined the literature and came up with a variety of answers. The pattern described in his book Cohen calls the "parent male subculture"

1. One social worker in downtown Detroit estimates that his agency deals with over 300 delinquents who have "no comprehension of the middle class system". Additional proof that delinquency there is not primarily a response to middle class control may be seen in the fact that "there have been no measurable changes in delinquency patterns occasioned by the tremendous change in middle class composition (in that city) during the last two decades". Herman Hirtle, Director of the Y.M.C.A., Downtown Branch, Detroit, in a personal communication.

2. Salisbury, Barron, and Crawford, are particularly adamant in their denunciation of educational, welfare, and religious leaders for allowing this situation to occur and persist.

3. Frank Tannenbaum, Crime and the Community, op. cit., p. 10.

because it is probably the most common variety in this country. "Semi-professional theft", the second in Cohen's typology, does not correspond with Sutherland's concept of a criminal elite of the same name but rather signifies a stage in the history of a delinquent career proceeding from trivial to serious, occasional to frequent, adventitious to systematic, crimes by individuals who become isolated into highly organized groups. Then, in addition, there are the drug addict subcultures, middle class delinquent patterns, and conflict-oriented subcultures which consist of large gangs founded on and maintained by warfare among themselves.¹ The typology subsequently developed by Cloward and Ohlin is similar to Cohen's but they excluded middle class delinquency (since they were only concerned with lower class cultures) and incorporated drug addiction and semi-professional theft into more general types which they called respectively, the "retreatist" pattern and the "criminal" pattern.²

The recognition that there were distinct varieties of delinquent behavior led to another important question: does each type of delinquent behavior require an entirely different explanation? Cohen argued that at least middle class delinquency may be distinguished from the others on theoretical grounds since it probably arises in response to problems of adjustment which are ~~characteristically~~ products of middle class social-

1. Albert Cohen and James Short, Jr., "Research in Delinquent Subcultures", op. cit.

2. Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin, Delinquency and Opportunity, op. cit.

ization and life situations.¹ He admitted in the end, however, that there is not sufficient evidence to determine conclusively whether all patterns are variants of a common subculture with qualitatively distinct etiologies or quantitative extremes of a common subculture with the same variables accounting for their existence and their extremity.² Subsequent theorists have had little to add to this statement.

What has been questioned is whether or not the structure of delinquent groups is typically that described by Thrasher, which virtually all students of delinquency have accepted. The review of empirical literature suggests that although there may be a variety of delinquent

1. Most theorists tend to agree with this argument but one of the greatest difficulties they have encountered in formulating any explanations is that no one seems to know exactly what it is. One of the few attempts made in this direction was by William Wattenburg and James Balistreri ("Automobile Theft: A 'Favored Group' Delinquency", American Journal of Sociology, 1952, 57: 575-579) who tried to uncover some of the sociological variables related to middle class delinquency by comparing the social characteristics of boys committing the offense of automobile theft with boys committing what they assumed were more typical lower class offenses. This assumption was highly criticized by Herbert Bloch and Arthur Neiderhoffer who wrote: "Perhaps it might be advisable for sociologists ... Wattenburg and ... Balistreri ... to change the emphasis and quotation marks to 'Automobile Theft: A Favored "Group Delinquency;" ... because automobiles are stolen in every class". See Herbert Bloch and Arthur Neiderhoffer, The Gang (New York: The Philosophical Library, 1958). For an up-to-date summary of all the different theories purporting to explain middle class delinquency see Robert Bohlke, "Social Mobility, Stratification, Inconsistency, and Middle Class Delinquency" (Social Problems, 1961, 8: 351-364), which seeks to account for the alleged increase in this kind of delinquency.

2. It is this problem which Cohen is working on now.

patterns, the structure is essentially a highly organized one. In 1959 Lewis Yablonsky¹ argued that much of what appears to be rigid and cohesive applies only to a very small inner core of the group, which leads or coerces the vast majority of membership into group action in a rather disorganized, haphazard way. Yablonsky came to this conclusion after four years of research into and direct contact with 30 delinquent gangs in New York City slum areas. Viewing human collectivities on a continuum of organizational characteristics there are mobs at one extreme and cohesive, highly organized groups at the other. Gangs such as the Cherubs, Black Knights, and Cougars are neither mobs nor true groups, argued Yablonsky, but rather what he calls "near-groups" which, apart from the inner core, are characterized by a minimal consensus of norms, shifting membership, individualized and diffuse role definitions, limited cohesion, impermanence, disturbed leadership, and limited definitions of membership expectations. These near-groups are midway on the continuum, according to Yablonsky. True groups may manifest near-group structure under stress, in transition, or when temporarily disorganized but in any case group activity tends to take on the features of mob or crowd behavior when large numbers are gathered; consequently they can become extremely violent at the slightest provocation within or outside the group.

Throughout his analysis Yablonsky emphasized the emotional basis of leadership and individual participation in group activity; he main-

1. Lewis Yablonsky, "The Delinquent Gang as a Near Group", Social Problems, 1959, 7: 108-117.

tained that the primary function of the gang is to provide a channel for acting out hostility and aggression and thereby to satisfy the continuing and momentary emotional needs of its members. The supreme example of this is the function of violence which is a highly valued means for individuals and groups to achieve a reputation.

Unfortunately, Yablonsky did not define clearly what he meant by emotional disturbance or the causes of violence. Mainly because of this his argument has been criticized by Harold Pfautz¹ who submitted that the characteristics of near-groups can be more productively organized in terms of what Herbert Blumer called expressive social movements. Expressive movements, according to Blumer² do not seek to change the institutions of the social order; the tensions and unrest out of which they emerge are not focused on some objective social change which the movement seeks collectively to achieve. Instead they are released

1.

Harold Pfautz, "Near Group Theory and Collective Behavior", Social Problems, 1961, 9: 167-174. Actually, Pfautz misinterprets a great deal of what Yablonsky said. For example, he argues that Yablonsky does not base his analysis of the group-mob continuum on organizational characteristics and that he fails to appreciate that gang and gang warfare constitute collective attempts to solve the problems faced by a particular segment of adolescents in a particular social situation. These criticisms seem to be gross misjudgments. Moreover, Pfautz actually accepts the substance of Yablonsky's argument and merely places it in a different, possibly more productive, context.

2.

Herbert Blumer, "The Field of Collective Behavior", Principles of Sociology, Alfred M. Lee, ed. (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1951) pp. 170-216.

in some kind of expressive behavior.¹ By incorporating the concept of near-group into a theory of collective behavior, it is possible to account for violence as an expression of social protest. Rather than rely on the idea that it flows mainly from emotional disturbances or that it is merely the "badge of guts", violence, according to Pfautz, is the only and most elementary way in which these youths can act together in the face of the social unrest which is indigenous to their social environment. Since expressive movements can have careers, are subject to routinization, and can become institutionalized, it is entirely conceivable that Yablonsky's observations refer to an early stage of the conflict subculture which Cohen, Cloward, Ohlin, and others maintain is highly organized.² Pfautz does not analyze this idea any further except to say that this formulation may be relevant for a theory of the origin of conflict-oriented delinquent gangs. But it is also possible to reconcile the two theories at yet another point - the source of violence. Could violence not be the manifestation of emotional disturbances (not in the clinical sense) arising from continued exposure to conditions of

1. In his study of drug addiction, Harold Finestone found Blumer's classification of social movements to be a useful framework for analysis of the social type of the "cat" or drug user who, because he is typically Negro, has been denied by a discriminating society the opportunity to achieve or identify with status position in the larger society. The cat, according to Finestone, is an expression of one possible adaptation to such blocking and frustration in a segment of the population which turns upon itself and attempts to define within itself criteria for the achievement of social status. Within his own isolated social world the cat attempts to give form and purpose to dispositions derived from but denied an outlet within the dominant social order. See Harold Finestone, "Cats, Kicks, and Color", Social Problems, 1957, 5: 3-14.

2. This way of resolving two contradictory sets of observations was suggested to Pfautz by James Short in a personal communication. See Harold Pfautz, op. cit., p. 173, footnote 1.

extreme social unrest and economic deprivation, intensified by crowd mechanisms such as "circular-reaction" and "contagion"?

Although the observations of Yablonsky and Pfautz regarding the structure of gangs were based on empirical evidence, the extent of this type of structure (as opposed to that described by Thrasher) has not been established statistically. But it certainly challenges the view that gangs are typically well-organized and cohesive. Moreover, the interpretations of these men throw a new light on the causes of conflict-oriented delinquency and bring into focus the importance of crowd mechanisms which may stimulate or structure much of delinquent behavior in group situations.

Perhaps the most significant issue which evidence found during the fifties brought into focus was the relationship between delinquency, social values, and the class structure. It was not long before theorists began to utilize these new sources of evidence and attack the idea that delinquency is a response to the pressures exerted by a predominantly middle class society. Since Cohen was the leading proponent of this argument, his theory was the main object of criticism.

In 1958 Walter B. Miller published the preliminary findings of a six year service-research project covering some seventy areas of behavior for twenty-one adolescent corner groups in the slums of an eastern city.¹ Miller's whole argument is based on the premise that motivation in this situation can be approached most productively by

¹. Walter B. Miller, "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency", Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 14: 5-20.

attempting to understand the nature of the cultural forces impinging on the acting individual as they are perceived by the actor himself - rather than as they are perceived and evaluated from the reference position of another cultural system. In the case of gang delinquency, the cultural system which exerts the most direct influence is that of the lower class community itself - not the so-called delinquent subculture which has arisen through conflict with the middle class and is oriented to the deliberate violation of middle class norms.

By way of describing lower class culture as he found it, Miller discusses six focal concerns or values among lower class people - concerns which commanded widespread and persistent attention along with a high degree of emotional involvement. In order of their importance to lower class people, these concerns or values are: trouble, toughness, smartness or cunning, excitement, fate, and autonomy.¹ Each of these is conceived as a dimension within which a variety of alternatives may be followed according to the particular situation and person. Thus, for example, within the dimension of excitement, one individual may desire thrills and the threat of danger over safety and what he perceives as boredom.

Street corner groups, in Miller's view, represent the adolescent variant of this culture. The delinquent gang is only one sub-type which happens to be defined on the basis of participation in law violating activity and it should not be considered separately from

1. Cf. The values or concerns of the middle class as described by Cohen, p.53.

lower class culture but rather as a variant of lower class adolescent groups. If conformity to the norms of one reference group constitutes violation of norms upheld by other reference groups, the immediate reference group norms will be much more compelling since deviance within the group may be controlled by expulsion, its most powerful sanction. Status within conforming and non-conforming groups is achieved and maintained by demonstrated possession of the valued qualities in lower class society. It involves, for both types of adolescent group, an intense desire to be viewed by others as adult which they do not define in terms of responsibility but rather acquisition of certain symbols of adult status, such as a car, ready cash, perceived "freedom" to drink, and so on.

As to why one street corner group becomes delinquent while another does not, Miller answers only in extremely general terms: "the commission of crime ... is motivated by the attempt to achieve ends, status, or conditions which are valued and to avoid those which are disvalued ..."¹ In the final analysis this hypothesis seems little more than a rather primitive variation of the pleasure-pain principle but Miller's emphasis on the necessity of understanding delinquent behavior in terms of the culture from which it stems and the importance of that culture on motivation does much to discredit the thesis which sees delinquency as negative and rebellious, a view which evaluates only ethnocentrically.

More directly critical of Cohen's theory are Herbert Bloch and

¹. Ibid., p. 17.

Arthur Niederhoffer whose book, The Gang (1958), has received widespread attention and support. Like Miller, the authors believe that delinquent gangs are just one variation of youth group cultures developed spontaneously among adolescents to fill the gap between childhood and adult status. All social systems recognize that adolescence is a distinct and trying period for the young. Many societies aid its youth by defining clearly what is expected of them, when the transition should be made, any necessary conditions or prerequisites, and the particular position or status which candidates may have. American society makes little, if any, formal preparation for the induction of its adolescents to adult status and consequently it frustrates "the need to be a man ... (which) cuts across class lines and can be considered a cultural imperative of gang behavior".¹ The gang furnishes the same psychological content and function as the more formalized rituals found in other societies; it provides a "custom-built" answer to strivings for adult fulfillment. How a gang develops and becomes delinquent is based entirely on Tannenbaum's description of the vicious circle.²

This analysis accounts for the existence of several gang characteristics which other theorists cannot explain or do not even mention. One of these is gang philosophy, its definition of manliness and its view of others. Again like Miller, Block, and Niederhoffer argued that gang members define adulthood according to symbolic evidences of manhood which lack the sense of responsibility normally associated with adult status; participation in sexual experiences is a desired goal but not

1. Herbert Bloch and Arthur Niederhoffer, op. cit., p. 144.

2. See above, p. 12ff (Background to Part I).

marriage or "pulling" a job is considered a worthy achievement but not getting one. On the other hand, gang members take on the responsibilities of a soldier - fighting to the death if necessary, enduring all pressures exerted to reveal information, and so on. Driving cars, getting drunk, "serving time", smoking, and gambling are all gang activities which carry the "magical aura of manhood". And singling out, for example, the school as a special target for aggression is not a protest against the middle class in general, so much as it is a reflection of hatred directed against the one institution which defines them as boys rather than men.

On the question of gang values and their origin, Bloch and Niederhoffer agreed with the Criminologist, Donald Taft, who argued that such gang values as loyalty, materialism, competition among groups, and so on are hardly new values but rather conflict with values of the larger society because of the form and direction in which they are expressed by gang members.¹ Gang members view life as a battle and because the gang boy wants the same security, recognition, and happiness as the rest of society; gang life is as much a defense against life's blows as it is an attack on authority. If, in this battle, he violates middle class norms, this is only incidental and not directed specifically at them.

The authors' specific disagreements with Cohen's theory are many. They point out, first of all, that Cohen erroneously cites Thrasher as a supporting authority. Quotes from Thrasher show that he did not sup-

1. Donald Taft, Criminology (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950), p. 181 quoted in Herbert Bloch and Arthur Niederhoffer, op. cit., p. 171.

port the thesis that delinquent offenses are deliberate attacks against middle class society.¹ Moreover, if lower class delinquency is war against the middle class, it would follow, they argue, that overall class warfare would be affected; yet there is less class antagonism now than at any time in American history. Finally, the authors provide much evidence from personal experience² as well as other sources that the delinquent gang is not particularly versatile, that offenses are largely utilitarian, that long range plans are frequently made and meticulously carried out, and that reasons for truancy are extremely varied.

In fairness to Cohen it must be mentioned that while Thrasher's observations on gang motivation do not support the theory of delinquent subcultures, Cohen's description of gang activity and structure were closely based on empirical data provided by Thrasher. Discrepancies like this attest strongly to the need for an adequate sociological definition and classification of delinquency. Another extraneous source of conflict between Cohen's theory and that of Bloch and Niederhoffer, which may also be accounted for by differences in empirical data, is the question of age. Thrasher's data and other material used by Cohen included much evidence of truly juvenile delinquency (as opposed to adolescent delinquency) and Cohen's theory at least attempts to give an explanation for it. Yet Bloch and Niederhoffer are entirely concerned with adolescent gangs and do not provide any reasons for the allegedly considerable extent of delinquency among pre-adolescents.

Another attack against Cohen's theory came from Cloward and Ohlin.

1. Ibid., p. 175-176.

2. Niederhoffer has been a Lieutenant on the New York City Police force for quite a number of years.

Like Cohen they contend that delinquency is a product of marked discrepancies between culturally induced aspirations among lower class youth and the possibilities of achieving them by legitimate means. They criticize Cohen for his emphasis on the idea that lower class youths are not only induced to strive for middle class goals but also desire a middle class way of life. In their view, the lower class youths who are most likely to become involved in delinquent subculture do not seek a change of group membership as a solution to their problems, for they do not wish to disrupt their present associations. Rather, they seek the achievement of higher status in terms of lower class criteria - which, in contrast to the upper and middle class emphasis on money and respectability, consists of money alone.¹ Acquiring the "big score", then, gives lower class youth the status they desire without having to disrupt their current relationships or obversely to abide by restricting middle class morals. While this distinction between lower class boys who define success in middle class terms and those who define it according to lower class standards is an important one, the idea that lower class youths in general tend to evaluate each other solely on the basis of material wealth, and that they have no value for "respectability" seems completely unwarranted on theoretical grounds (the distinction would hold without being defined in this particular way), and conflicts with much of what is known about delinquency areas.

Cloward and Ohlin also criticize Cohen's account of how delinquent

¹. Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin, Delinquency and Opportunity, op. cit., p. 113.

subcultures are formed. They agree with Cohen that the evolution of them involves the process of mutual conversion among likeminded deviants and that there must be some means of handling the problems of guilt and fear attendant to the commission of deviant acts. But they disagree with Sykes and Matza as well as Cohen that reaction-formation or other techniques of neutralization must be used toward this end. Delinquents solve the guilt problem in advance by withdrawing sentiments supporting the legitimacy of conventional norms, in short by attributing the cause of failure to the social order rather than to themselves. Since the rules and values of the dominant society are no longer considered binding, the individual can legitimately (from his own point of view) criticize, offend, retreat from, rebel against, or attempt to reform that social system. This would also explain why delinquency is generally a collective phenomenon. Should the individual tend to blame himself for his problem, then his solution would require changing himself; and he would be unlikely to join with others to develop a solution. If, on the other hand, the individual blames the prevailing social order, then his consequent alienation from it generates a certain amount of tension which can be relieved by gaining support from others in a similar position.

Cloward and Ohlin believe that there are at least two factors within the framework of their theory that would account for the tendency on the part of delinquents to hold society responsible for their problems: (1) "the relative discrepancy between institutionally induced expectations (as opposed to aspirations) and possibilities of achievement, which produces a sense of unjust deprivation; and (2) highly visible barriers to the achievement of aspirations, which give rise to feelings of discrimination".

Finally, Cloward and Ohlin criticize Cohen for his failure to account for differentiation of delinquent subcultures and their relative stability. Cohen, they assert, considers only variations in the availability of legitimate means to achieve socially acceptable goals; his explanation ignores the existence of differential access to illegitimate means to achieve illegitimate goals. These differentials in addition to other social conditions, structure the type of subculture that develops among dissatisfied youths who blame society for their problems. Since criminal subcultures require support from other elements of the community, that kind of subculture is likely to arise in a neighborhood milieu characterized by close bonds between criminal and conventional values. Consequently a new opportunity structure emerges which provides alternate avenues to success-goals and generates a relatively stable subculture. In contrast, conflict subcultures arise where severe limitations on both conventional and criminal opportunities intensify frustration, where discontent is heightened further by a corresponding lack of social control from criminal and conventional institutions - a highly unstable situation in which violence is virtually the only means available of achieving status. Retreatist subcultures arise where adolescents are double-failures, those who not only fail to achieve legitimate goals but also fail to achieve status through membership in a criminal subculture or through being violent in a conflict subculture.

This theory has been presented in detail here for several reasons. By pointing out that delinquency may arise out of a frustrated desire to achieve economic improvement in terms of lower class standards, Cloward and Ohlin undermine an unwarranted assumption prevailing in

perhaps most post war theories of delinquency, including that of Cohen. Second, the idea that delinquents form delinquent subcultures because they blame society rather than themselves is an extremely plausible and provocative view though, like the first criticism, only further research can determine whether delinquents are typically guiltless or typically ambivalent and it is entirely possible that neither is more common than the other. Third, in viewing the individual as having socially structured access to both conventional and illegitimate opportunity structures, Cloward and Ohlin further unite, at least in part, the theories of Sutherland and Merton, and consequently their theory explains more about delinquency than either previous one taken separately.

This review of numerous, different descriptions regarding various aspects of delinquent behavior, raises the question: are there any common denominators of delinquency throughout a historical unit of time (post World War I) irrespective of location? Based on documents dating back to the early thirties and up to the late fifties, Sykes and Matza found empirical evidence of three major themes which occur with marked regularity.¹

First, nearly all observers note that delinquents are deeply immersed in a restless search for excitement, "thrills", or "kicks"; that an activity involves breaking the law is precisely the reason why it is exciting. The significance of this pattern, according to Sykes and Matza, lies in the fact that the delinquent is not simply enduring the hazards of provoking the authorities, courting physical danger,

1. Gresham Sykes and David Matza, "Delinquency and Subterranean Values", op. cit.

and experimenting with the forbidden; he is also creating hazards in a deliberate attempt to manufacture excitement.

Second, observers agree that delinquents commonly exhibit a disdain for work with a desire for money; that is, the delinquent disavows the material aspirations of the larger society and thus protects himself against inevitable frustration. Sykes and Matza concur with Cohen in his interpretation that delinquent attacks against property are often a form of play rather than means to a material end. However, they argue, this does not mean that delinquents do not want money. Quite the contrary, delinquents are constantly and deeply concerned with the problem of money; what they disdain is a slow accumulation of it. Since legal means are rarely effective avenues for the sudden acquisition of large sums of money, the delinquent will employ illegal means to achieve his goals. In view of this, it is hardly an accident that "smartness" is such an important feature of the delinquent's outlook on life.

A third theme running through accounts of delinquency centers on aggression, usually interpreted as a manifestation of the delinquent's alienation from society. Sykes and Matza argue that aggression is more likely an attempt to express toughness and therefore masculinity, since manhood is commonly defined by delinquents to be an ability "to take it and hand it out".

Thus, delinquency appears to be permeated by a cluster of values that can be characterized as the search for excitement, the disdain for work and a desire for the "big score", and the acceptance of aggression as proof of masculinity. Whatever disagreement among theorists exists

concerning the ultimate explanation of these values, they are almost invariably taken as indicative of the delinquent's deviation from the dominant society. Sykes and Matza ask: are not these values strikingly similar to the code of the leisure class as described by Thorstein Veblen?¹ What is not familiar is the mode of expression of these values - namely, delinquency. "In our haste to create a standard from which deviance can be measured, we have reduced the value system of our whole society to that of the middle class. We have ignored both the fact that society is not composed exclusively of the middle class and that the middle class is far from homogeneous."²

A closer look at society will reveal the existence of subterranean values - values which are in conflict or competition with other deeply held values but which are still recognized and accepted by others; values which are accepted privately but opposed publicly; or values which are held at certain times but not others. Adventure, for example, is sought legitimately in sports, travel, and other leisure activities. And the idea that all the members of our society are fully attached to the virtue of work is as questionable as the notion that delinquents are deviant in their attachment to conspicuous consumption or that they monopolize the taste for violence. Even a cursory look at the fiction in mass media, not to mention news accounts of aggression in race riots,

1. This view is strongly supported by Ralph Turner who argued that "while there are some values held by subgroups in a society which are not recognized as legitimate by others, most disorganization consists of conflicting interpretations of the application of certain values". See Ralph Turner's "Value Conflicts in Social Disorganization", op. cit., p. 306.

It is also supported by Donald B. Taft when he said that the basic values in our culture are accepted by both the delinquent and the larger society of which he is a part. See Donald Taft, Criminology (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950).

2. Ibid., p. 715.

war, industrial conflict, and so on, shows America's widespread fascination for violence and its readiness to resort to its use. Thus, with regard to at least one cluster of values, delinquent norms are not essentially deviant - only their attitudes toward the norms and their behavior.

In sum, the major criticisms against Cohen's theory are directed at several specific parts:¹ his definition of the problem; his claim that it was the typical or most common response and the consequent implication that an explanation of it would account for delinquency in the lower classes; his tendency to view the middle class as a group which is sufficiently organized and powerful to define for the rest of society what should be strived for, which controls the avenues for achievement of these goals, and which has a monopoly on the value for law-abiding behavior as well as other values and disciplines "unanimously" required for social and economic advancement.

Even though the empirical evidence supporting these criticisms is far from conclusive, it is clear that Cohen's theory conflicts with much of what is currently known about the conditions of delinquency areas and the nature of delinquency itself. Regarding the causes of delinquency, research on the family suggests that the nature of social relationships within the family may be considerably more significant in the genesis of delinquency than its ability or inability to prepare its youth for the achievement of middle class goals and that lower class families in all probability support law abiding norms as much as families in other

1. For a detailed analysis of the theoretical soundness of Cohen's theory see John Kitsuse and David Dietrick, "Delinquent Boys: A Critique", American Sociological Review, 1959, 24: 208-215.

socioeconomic levels. Second, this and other research indicates strongly that delinquents may not be specifically class conscious at all and that they may not secretly want to join the ranks of the middle class, which from most accounts is anything but a homogeneous and wholly law abiding group and which may or may not have a specific impact on or distinct clash of values with the lower classes. Moreover, there is some basis for believing that delinquents may be suffering from frustrated attempts to rise within their own class.

Regarding the nature of delinquency itself, observations throughout the fifties by reporters, social workers, and social scientists alike have established beyond doubt the existence of a variety of delinquent orientations (conflict, criminal, drug addiction, etc.) and characteristics which are not necessarily malicious and negative (depending on the point of view of the viewer), which are indicative of a capacity for long term planning, and which are hostile to the adult world or law abiding society in general rather than to the middle class specifically. In fact, delinquent values may be conversions of subterranean values held by the larger society and delinquents may uphold many law abiding values and goals - in which case, techniques of neutralization may be involved. Or there may be a complete withdrawal of sentiments supporting the legitimacy of conventional values so that the delinquent blames society for his ills and thereby solves the problem of guilt in advance. Finally, very recent research indicates that much of what is taken for highly organized gang behavior maintaining a high degree of intolerance to deviations from specific group norms, may be near-groups

whose targets of attack are more a product of crowd mechanisms and generalized social protest than discriminating selection based on class conflict.

All this is not to say that Cohen's theory has been "disproved", and has no support or that the other theories are more adequate. Quite the contrary. Cohen was perhaps the first to discuss delinquency in terms of subcultures, emphasize the necessity of understanding the psychological as well as sociological basis for them, and present a systematic explanation for their origin. For this he has been widely appreciated.¹ Moreover, most contemporary theorists agree with his central thesis that delinquency is a product of the same values and social structure which support a democracy based on private enterprise. The disagreement revolves mainly around the question of class relationships and their effect on the genesis of delinquency. Then, of course, there is that large area of disagreement over what delinquency is. The basis of these disagreements and why they exist will be discussed in the next chapter.

What this review of the literature does mean is that the evidence on either side of each issue - what role class membership and the family play in causing delinquency; which characteristics of delinquent behavior and group structure are most universal; what **these** characteristics represent; what social, psychological, and physical conditions are associated with a given cluster of characteristics as opposed to those conditions associated with all forms of delinquency - is sufficiently strong to admit a case for it but insufficient to accept as a basis for deriving

1.

And there are several theorists, such as Martin Haskell (op. cit.), who accept the theory as a whole.

specific hypotheses. In effect, there are no clear grounds for accepting Cohen's theory over the arguments against it and vice versa. No doubt the work in which Cohen is currently engaged will clarify many of these issues since his project is apparently an extensive one aimed at uncovering the overt characteristics of delinquent offenses, collective activity, and group structure; how these characteristics or clusters of them are distributed throughout the social system; and, at a very general level, their origins. But there is still a great need for much intensive research centering on the mental and social dispositions of delinquents.

Thus, rather than submitting hypotheses derived from Cohen's theory or any of the criticisms against it, this research will attempt to explore and compare the two groups' thoughts, attitudes, behavior, and values, concerning the various institutions and classes, primary relationships, themselves,¹ and in the case of the delinquents, their delinquency. This will involve not only questioning and observing the members of each group with regard to these areas of social and mental life; it also involves documenting their social and material conditions as well as the overt characteristics of their offenses, collective activity, and group structure since this kind of documentation is essential to understanding the particular group in question and for comparing it with others. In short, the aim at this point in the research is to explore and compare systematically the style of life and its meaning for the members of each

1. The importance of a delinquent's self-concept is widely recognized and discussed by virtually everyone concerned with the problem yet apart from one or two studies this area has hardly been investigated. Reckless, for example, has examined known non-delinquents and argues that a non-delinquent self-concept acts as an insulator against delinquency and Finestone has discussed the self-concept of colored drug addicts, but both of these studies are quite limited in coverage. See Walter Reckless, "Self Concept as an Insulator against Delinquency", American Sociological Review, 1955, 21: 744-746 and Harold Finestone, op. cit.

group in a relatively controlled situation.

A second step is to determine the extent to which the members of the delinquent group are committed to the values of a generally law-abiding society. The main research questions, therefore, are as follows:

- 1) Exactly what values, norms, and goals held by the members of the delinquent group differ from those held by the members of the non-delinquent group, those defined by Cohen as being typically middle class,¹ and those maintained by any generally law-abiding community.
- 2) Do the members of the delinquent group employ techniques of neutralization as defined by Sykes and Matza?²
- 3) Are the offenses committed by the members of the delinquent group primarily against persons, property, or norms? Are the offenses directed more against persons, property or norms relating to a particular class status or social standing or are they more directed against those relating to adult status in general.
- 4) Do the members of the delinquent group view their delinquency as a temporary phase or do they intend to become criminals as a primary means of livelihood? Do the members of the delinquent group view their delinquency as an attack on society or a particular aspect of society which they ultimately wish to join (having had their revenge as it were) or as an attack against a social world which they completely reject and into which they do not wish to become integrated?
- 5) On the basis of answers to these questions and relevant answers obtained regarding the theories of Sutherland and Merton, the final

¹. See above, p. 53, Chapter III.

². See above, p. 57, Chapter III.

questions are: Are the members of the delinquent group so closely committed to the values of the larger society that they may be said to be temporary mischief-makers who have converted some subterranean values or could they be more accurately characterized as members of a subculture whose values are distinctly in conflict with accepted values?

The third step in this phase of the research is to investigate the basis of any frustrations. Although virtually all theorists agree that delinquency is a response to a problem or set of problems, this review of the literature shows clearly the dissension of opinion. Therefore, the research question at this point is aimed simply at uncovering the problems of the members of each group. Undoubtedly, this will be one of the most difficult aspects of the research since even the most co-operative adolescents may be quite unaware of their problems (especially the most abstract and distant ones), or unable to communicate (and/or evaluate) those problems of which they are aware. On the other hand, any evaluation a person may have regarding the problems he perceives cannot be discounted completely. In fact, many theorists believe that the delinquent's evaluation of his delinquency and his problem is too often ignored.¹ In view of these considerations several efforts will

¹. One of the earliest theorists to argue that the delinquent's explanation of his delinquency be taken as valid was Burgess in The Natural History of a Delinquent Career. (Clifford Shaw and Maurice Moore, "Discussion", pp. 235-254.) op. cit.; indeed, the works of Shaw, Thrasher, and Sutherland relied heavily on the delinquent's own evaluation of the situation. When interest shifted to studying the effect of pressures generated by a rather abstract social structure, the immediately prevailing assumption was that adolescents, and above all disturbed adolescents, were generally incapable of evaluating or even discussing such abstract phenomenon. Recently, however, social commentators and theorists alike have returned to the old position. In fact, a central thesis in Paul Goodman's Growing Up Absurd (which has been referred to by most students of delinquency since its publication) is that delinquents' comments on themselves and society are probably more perceptive than those of social scientists who tend to be so committed to the system which produces high delinquency rates that their perceptions are distorted.

be made to avoid a heavy reliance on the testimony of the delinquents, although the fact that there is a control group should prove more useful here than perhaps for any other aspect of the research. That is, it is absolutely essential to compare the problems of the members of each group - as they are perceived by the members themselves and as they are observed by the researcher. This means that observation at this point will be of particular importance. In addition, the general socio-economic conditions of the neighborhood will be investigated through interviews with prominent civic leaders in every field and through an examination of any historical documents which might be available.

CHAPTER V

A SYNTHESIS?

This project is primarily concerned with three post World War II theories and their reaction to them. Each theory has been described and evaluated according to the evidence and comments of other theorists relevant to it. According to Cloward and Ohlin, a theory must account for the precise nature of the pattern to be explained, its distribution within the social structure, the problems of adjustment to which the pattern might be a response, why the adaptation has evolved in the direction it has, and why it persists or changes.¹ Each of the major theories will be "tested" briefly for its ability to meet these requirements. These tests will constitute a summary of each statement and the differences in emphasis among them. Following that, there will be a discussion of the similarities between these and the criticisms against them. Finally, a discussion of why these theories have been so controversial will form the defense for the general aims of this project.

Writing long before it was apparent from statistics and empirical literature that there was a great variety of delinquent problems, Sutherland defined delinquency strictly as a violation of the law. His theory of differential access to favorable and unfavorable definitions of the law explains in a general way why delinquents are primarily lower class, adolescent males. His emphasis on criminal traditions and the process by which those traditions are accepted accounts for the persistence of delinquent patterns but not why they are accepted above others in a conflict of cultural norms or how they originated and why they changed. Numerous attempts to test Sutherland's theory have led

1. Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin, Delinquency and Opportunity, op. cit., pp. 31-46.

to the conclusion that is essentially an organizing principle, an accurate description of part of the process of becoming delinquent.

In contrast, Merton's view that deviance results from a dislocation between the emphasis on cultural goals and the means (emphasized and actual) of achieving them provides a possible explanation of the origin of delinquency. Since he was primarily concerned with deviant behavior in general, he did not consider its evolution, persistence, and so on, except to classify it as being either rebellious or innovating. Although the theory has been strongly criticized, it has nonetheless been widely accepted.

Cohen's theory is essentially an adaptation of Merton's, but the emphasis is quite different. Both Cohen and Merton agree that the cultural stress on the attainment of material wealth creates a problem for those who desire it but lack the means to achieve it. They also agree that this problem is not randomly distributed throughout the social structure but rather is concentrated among the lower classes who, out of all the social groupings in society, are least equipped to meet the challenge. However, Merton maintains that this is primarily a structural defect caused by an inherent lack of legitimate avenues to attain monetary success, whereas Cohen contends that the problem arises mainly from imperfect socialization, that the defect lies in the way the lower classes prepare their young to achieve their life goals. Thus, Merton "blames", as it were, the structure of society while Cohen holds the lower classes themselves responsible for the problem.¹ And by emphasizing that it is

1. This largely accounts for why Cohen has received the brunt of the criticism while Merton has received relatively little.

the middle classes who set the goals and provide adequate preparation for its young to achieve them, Cohen accounted for what he thought was the peculiar content of the typical, lower class, deviant response, which when widespread evolves into a delinquent group response through a process of mutual conversion. Because the deviance not only conflicts with the norms of the larger society but also represents a rejection of goals originally desired, the group over-reacts, becomes isolated, and forms a delinquent subculture. Cohen more or less assumes that once the subculture is formed, it is a stable one and consequently he does not discuss why it persists or changes.

Unlike Cohen, Cloward and Ohlin maintain the original emphasis in Merton's theory and therefore have a solid foundation for uniting his theory with that of Sutherland. By accepting Merton's emphasis on differential access to legitimate means of achieving socially approved goals, they could not only adapt the theory to explain the origin and evolution of delinquent subcultures but also link it to Sutherland's theory of differential association - which implies the concept of differential access to illegitimate means - without substantially changing the value of the variables. By viewing delinquency as a product of differences in opportunity structures, they could then explain the differentiation and persistence or change of delinquent subculture.

Apart from some notable differences in emphasis and, in a few instances, specific conflict, these theories are essentially harmonious. Cohen's theory containing adaptations of both Sutherland and Merton could not be very different from that of Cloward and Ohlin who, after

all, successfully united the same theories. Yet there has been a great deal of controversy surrounding all of these theories, Cohen receiving the brunt of the attack. Through this conflict of views a number of important distinctions have emerged - distinctions which have greatly refined and broadened understanding. At the same time, though, they have usually been made with the idea that the differences between or within particular patterns are substantial ones and require some kind of separate or additional explanation. Yet most of these differences revolve around the question of delinquent values¹ and could be subsumed or incorporated into one broad distinction based on the extent to which delinquents are committed to the cultural systems of law abiding society.

Clearly delinquent values are somehow different from those of other groups. But which ones, in what way, to what extent, and why? Answers to these questions are of the utmost importance not only because values are considered to be a major determinant of behavior but also because it is through them that the meaning of behavior for the individual himself may be understood by others. In general, there seem to be two distinct schools of thought. The classists which consist of Sutherland, Merton, Cohen, Cloward, and Ohlin; and the anti-classists.

The classists, whatever their differences, argue that delinquency is essentially a product of class differences and conflict. On the whole, they agree with what was implicit in Sutherland's theory, namely, that lower class cultures have little regard for respectability or con-

¹. In the broadest sense of the word, i.e., encompassing attitudes and thoughts.

formity to the law. These and other differences (particularly educational and economic) combined with a widespread cultural emphasis on material wealth generate class conflict. Because delinquents are primarily of lower class background and because conflict with the upper classes is held to be such an outstanding feature of lower class life, it is argued that the values of delinquents must be in direct conflict with those of the upper classes. Due to the amount of frustration caused by the situation, the conflict is a violent one; but it is also an ambivalent one, since there is some acceptance of at least the goals of the upper classes. In fact, most of the theorists within this tradition believe that lower class youth must want to change their class membership¹ and that inability to do so is perhaps the major cause of delinquency.

Judging from the general tenor of statements, and evidence presented by the classists, members of delinquent subcultures (criminal, retreatist, conflict oriented, and the alleged parent male) owe their existence to conflict either with the law or with the norms of the middle class; consequently have no guilt problem and need no techniques

1.

Although Cohen does adapt Whyte's classification of corner boys and college boys, he identifies the very small minority of college boys with the middle class and suggests that corner boys secretly uphold delinquent or middle class values but refuse to take the risks involved in either response. Thus, in Cohen's scheme and all the others for that matter, there is no place for the working class boy who appreciates his own culture and genuinely does not wish to rise above it though he may want to rise within it.

of neutralization;¹ select targets on the basis of access and opportunities; are more or less unlimited in their range of offenses;² and tend to support delinquent values permanently - usually by becoming integrated into patterns of organized crime.

Against this school of thought are the anti-classists, including Miller, Bloch and Niederhoffer, Yablonsky, and Sykes and Matza. Miller is actually somewhere in between the two traditions. Although he does not compare one class to another and rejects the view of the classists, he does believe that delinquency is a product of values which are distinctly lower class. He distinguishes between law abiding, lower class value systems which, if accepted, tend to generate law abiding behavior and value systems which are themselves legitimate but in the extreme form tend to generate law-violating behavior. And he implies that life fashioned according to the former would be so dull, bland, and uninviting that discontented youth must choose the latter.

The other theorists are more distinctly anti-classist. Bloch and Niederhoffer differentiate delinquents' values from others by con-

1. As defined by Sykes and Matza. It may be argued that this generalization does not apply to Cohen since, as stated earlier (p. 59), he agreed with Sykes and Matza that techniques of neutralization are needed and in fact pointed out that "over reacting" or reaction-formation was an elementary one. Yet Cohen does not view the problem as one of guilt but one of "seduction". The delinquent, according to Cohen, over-reacts because he does not want to accept the validity of middle-class norms; reaction-formation is a defense against once internalized norms that have been rejected but are still pressing for recognition. In contrast, Sykes and Matza contend that techniques of neutralization are rationalizations to get around or neutralize the flow of disapproval from norms which are generally accepted by the delinquent.

2. While criminal gangs who maintain distinct contracultures restrict themselves primarily to various forms of stealing (which in itself has a great range of possibilities) and rarely engage in drug addiction or gang warfare, it is because these latter activities interfere with the accomplishment of criminal goals. In contrast, less seriously delinquent groups who are more committed to society tend to avoid certain types of offense because of that commitment.

trasting them with those of adults since, according to them, delinquents are not particularly class conscious and feel that it is the adult world in general, not specific class groups, who are to blame for their ills. Yablonsky, although primarily concerned with the structure of delinquent groups, is quite clear in his view that most delinquents uphold law abiding values most of the time and that it is only when they succumb to the mechanisms of a crowd led by confirmed delinquents that they engage in delinquent behavior. Sykes and Matza maintain that the values upheld by delinquents are in most cases extensions or conversions of subterranean values existing in law abiding society.

Whether individuals within this school of thought contrast the values of delinquent to those of certain lower class cultures, to those of adults, or simply to law abiding values, they all agree that delinquency cannot be explained by class conflict since it cannot account for middle and upper class delinquency which usually occurs within law-abiding communities. Apart from Miller, they tend to argue that delinquency of all classes can and should be explained by a single theory.¹ And they all agree that delinquents are generally committed to the goals and many, if not most, of the values of law-abiding society. Finally, the overall picture of delinquency which emerges from the data and statements of theorists within this tradition is quite different from that of the classists. In this view as summed up or implied in the Sykes and Matza thesis, members of delinquent subcultures, being committed to many law-abiding values, are quite limited in their range of

1.

Though of those who have a causal theory, none of them has produced one which is as theoretically sound and well supported as that of the classists.

offense, select specific targets of attack (which may or may not involve members of the middle class), and need techniques to neutralize the flow of disapproval from the internalized norms of law-abiding society which they will eventually join (barring complications) before reaching adult status.

In consideration of these distinct sets of differences it would seem that sociologists have only apparently been discussing the same phenomenon; that, in fact, the two schools of thought have been referring to two quite different patterns of delinquency - the classists to what Milton Yinger calls contracultures,¹ and the anti-classists to what Sykes and Matza might have called subterranean cultures. Members of contracultures, according to Yinger, uphold counter values which are founded on and maintained by a definite conflict with the larger society. Although Yinger introduced this concept in 1960 before Sykes and Matza published their article on subterranean values, he was aware of the substance of that article; the growing tendency to view delinquent values as extensions or conversions of values held by the larger society; and the need to distinguish deviant cultures from temporary collective movements (fads and fashions), adolescent peer cultures which simply involve playing the roles prescribed by the dominant culture, and subcultures which are variations of the dominant culture but still within the limits of acceptability of that culture. Yinger suggests that the term contraculture be used wherever the normative system contains, as a primary element, a theme of conflict with the rest of society.

¹. Milton Yinger, "Contracultures and Subcultures", American Sociological Review, 1960, 25: 625-635.

Judging from his argument against the Sykes and Matza thesis, he believed that this concept would sufficiently distinguish delinquent from other subcultural systems and movements since subterranean values converted may become counter values by virtue of the conversion. Moreover, it can be argued that whatever the nature of subterranean values converted, the paramount fact is that when used as a basis for action, they do offend the values of others and in this sense are in conflict with law abiding society. Yet the distinction between contracultures and subterranean cultures is an extremely significant one because it directs attention to a number of theoretical and empirical differences. Theoretically, the distinction represents two separate schools of thought while at the same time, it brings together and encompasses the many specific and otherwise separate differences within each one. And, although the exact nature and extent is a vital question for future research, there is a difference in reality between a subculture which is entirely delinquent, upholds counter values, and is founded on conflict with the values of the larger society and one which is certainly deviant but in a quite limited way and which is not in direct conflict with the majority of law-abiding values. Furthermore, the distinction is not altogether a new one either in theory or in reality; for the difference between contracultures and subterranean cultures is quite similar to the difference between the early Shaw-Sutherland descriptions of semi-professional thieves bound for criminal careers and Thrasher's concept of the gang as an interstitial group, filling the gap between childhood and adult status. Finally, that there is a difference in theory and in reality between the two types of cultures, goes a long way toward explaining why there has

been so much controversy.

That the controversy has been such a long and involved one is perhaps better accounted for by the status of research on the subject. In the first place, none of the major theories nor the criticisms against them have been tested directly in the sense that empirical projects have been designed to test specific hypotheses. Because they are causal statements, conclusive proof would demand that investigation of the problem began before it happens and that a number of highly abstract and complicated variables be measured and controlled for. This would involve devising numerous means to measure the extent that certain "elements" in the "social structure" exert "pressures" toward nonconformity. And because many of these statements deal with such highly psychological phenomena as reaction-formation, status-frustration, guilt problems, and the like, sociologists would have much difficulty in establishing conclusively their existence and effects.

Meeting all of these requirements would be extremely difficult but possible if it were not for a second major problem; there is virtually no agreement on the definition of crucial variables. How can sociologists test for the causes of delinquency when they do not agree on what it is? How can they consider and investigate the effects of class membership and relationships when there is no consensus about the structure of each class, their value systems, socialization practices, extent of mobility between them, and so on. Underlying these definitional disputes and, at the same time, because of them, there simply is not enough quantitative or qualitative evidence to provide a basis for agreement or resolution. To be sure, there have been some

instances where the evidence has been sufficient to accept one view over another, if only in very broad terms. No doubt even Cohen would recognize the heterogeneity of all classes as he and others have discovered and accepted the existence of a variety of delinquent orientations. And even though the available data has made these discoveries possible, it is on the whole inadequate to settle most of the current conflict.

Before World War II, research, when it was systematic and comparative, dealt primarily with ecological, demographic, and physiological variables, while those who were concerned with the social relationships of the delinquent generally made no attempt to be comparative and their coverage of material was quite limited, at least by modern sociological standards. Thus, there is much information from Thrasher and Shaw, about social relationships within the gang and from Healy about social relationships within the family; but virtually no knowledge of the relationship between gang life and family life nor any material on class relationships. Data after the war, provided largely by social workers, reporters, and reformers consists almost entirely of observations and does not constitute scientific research. While it has been extensive, it has hardly been systematic or standardized in coverage of variables and in their definition; nor is any of it controlled by comparative research. Finally, very little of the research has been historical.

Despite these inadequacies, available data both before and after the war has provided great quantities of material on numerous aspects of delinquency and enabled the sociologist to make many important

distinctions regarding types of delinquent orientation, gang structure, values, target selection, range of offense, and so on. On the whole, these distinctions have more or less emerged from conflicting sets of material from a variety of sources; what is needed desperately is knowledge of how they are related to each other - composite accounts of the different types of delinquent subcultures. But before causal statements can be made, it would be necessary to have composite and historical accounts of the background and social life of these same delinquent subcultures compared to those of non-delinquent subcultures. Without at least attempting to do this, it is not possible to evaluate which variables apply to which types of delinquency; what the time-sequence of causal variables is, nor to what extent these variable are relevant to both delinquency and non-delinquency.

In sum, there exists a vicious circle with regard to the study of delinquency. Conflicting and inadequate knowledge of the nature of crucial, independent as well as dependent variables creates (and is created by) conflicting definitions of them and consequently prevents conclusive testing which, in turn, intensifies the conflict of theories. In view of this status of research, the general aims of this project are twofold: to test, wherever possible, the hypotheses derived from the theories of Sutherland and Merton and more important, to provide a portrait of one delinquent group in its social setting and compare it to that of a non-delinquent group. By investigating a large variety of the social characteristics and background factors of the members of each group, it is hoped that the portraits will be fairly composite ones. And by attempting to uncover those same characteristics and background elements with regard to certain periods in the past of each individual,

it is hoped that the portraits will be historical as well.

Clearly this project has outstanding limitations - namely, trying to cover a large quantity of material in a relatively short period of time, attempting to find differences between groups which are too small to achieve statistical significance, and aiming to be historical without being a longitudinal study.¹ On the other hand, it has considerable potentials. The smallness of the groups somewhat obviates the difficulties presented by a limited amount of time and allows a greater depth of study than one dealing with a much larger number of individuals. With so few subjects involved, it is possible to establish rapport on a personal basis and to observe each one in numerous contexts. Moreover, the community in which they live is extremely small and well-defined geographically, politically, religiously, and economically. This unusual situation minimizes the usual difficulties of becoming familiar with it as a whole, making generalizations about it, and checking the accuracy of statements made by the subjects regarding their living conditions and histories.

Even if these potentials are not fully realized, it is hoped that the combined methods will yield a slightly different kind of picture from that produced by studies conducted prior to it. Its historical emphasis is certainly similar to the biographies presented by Shaw and Sutherland though it lacks the depth and attention to detail achieved by studying one person at a time. Yet being concerned systematically with the pasts of a number of delinquents and non-delinquents gives it a different dimension, one somewhat comparable to that obtained

1.

These and other problems will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

by Healy and Brommer when they contrasted the backgrounds of several hundred adolescents of both types. This project, however, is primarily sociological in orientation rather than psychological and physiological. That the individuals involved form highly organized groups and may be observed in a variety of social situations are key premises of the research plan. In addition, the smallness of the total number of individuals offers an opportunity for more intimate contact which, in any case, is not biased on either side by reformist objectives.

Actually, the whole orientation of this project is more like Whyte's study of street corner society than any of the others dealing specifically with delinquency. Naturally, its scope is quite narrow in comparison but like that of Whyte, this project is concerned with all facets of life and tries to see each group in its relation to the social setting of which it is a part. Secondly, the groups are similar in size to those with which Whyte lived, and require much the same role of participant observation though in this project a somewhat more formal relationship was created by interviewing and the use of questionnaires. Obviously, these methods combined with the historical emphasis give it a quality unlike Whyte's study. Although it took Whyte some two years to accomplish his goals, he was working with several groups and much of that time was spent establishing rapport, especially with the politicians and racketeers, owing to the secretive character of their professions. But the detailed account of his methodological problems and their solution furnishes an excellent guide to any subsequent research project attempting to provide a composite picture of small groups.

Finally, researchers in the past have made many great contributions

to knowledge but numerous gaps remain. There are many factors which have been discussed in theory but have never been investigated empirically at all. Others are known to exist in fact but in many instances their relationship, as it is proposed in theory, has yet to be substantiated. This project cannot begin to fill any one of these gaps for above all it is a pilot study exploring several of them in a very limited way. But it does represent a start.

CHAPTER VI

METHODOLOGICAL QUESTIONS

The various lines of enquiry within this project were presented throughout Part I. In brief, the specific hypotheses to be tested and the proposed means of testing them were stated at the end of the chapters on Sutherland and Merton. These hypotheses center mainly on three factors: the range of offenses committed by the delinquents; frustrations created by social relationships within the family; and emphasis on and barriers to the achievement of economic goals. Although Cohen's theory dealt with these factors, his thesis as a whole is so controversial that no other hypotheses were made. Instead, general topical areas were chosen for study; namely, the specific character of delinquency, the individual's concept of himself, and pressures toward nonconformity generated by institutions and class relations. All lines of inquiry were to be investigated by several months of observing and interviewing intensively two small adolescent groups, one delinquent and the other non-delinquent.

Before giving an account of the research situation and analyzing the results of the inquiry, it is necessary to consider a number of methodological and empirical questions. Several of these questions refer to problems which are inherent in the design of the project and cannot be solved entirely. Hopefully, though, the suggested precautionary measures will reduce them substantially in importance. Also there is the question of defining delinquency. Finally, there was the problem of finding a suitable empirical situation. Toward this end a pilot study was conducted. This chapter will deal with the methodological questions. Chapter VII discusses the pilot study and major questionnaire schedule.

Regarding the design of the project, there is one question which encompasses all the others. What kind of generalizations may be made? Most of the observation and interviewing are directed at documenting how individuals behave in different contexts, what their values are, and what they think about particular people, external conditions, and themselves. Given the length, diversity, and intensity of involvement in the project,¹ certainly it is possible to make relatively sound generalizations about these aspects of delinquency in the community chosen for investigation.² But any study of the causes of a given type of human behavior necessarily requires examination of the conditions which are external to the individual(s) committing that behavior. No doubt a complete and longitudinal community study would be the best means. While such an approach is unquestionably outside the scope of this pilot project, it does aim at least to explore these external conditions by several methods but mainly through interviews with the members of each group.

This assumes that the perceptions of the individuals involved will bear a fairly close relationship to reality. If anomie, for example, is perceived to exist by all or most of the individuals in both groups, then presumably it exists objectively also. It is possible, although highly improbable, that anomie does not exist but is perceived

1. While it is true that adolescents especially might attempt deliberately to project certain images of themselves, the nature of the involvement with them (described in Chapter VII) and the checks for accuracy (discussed below) should provide a very firm basis for separating calculated images from those which are not.

2. Naturally, the extent to which these generalizations may be applied to delinquency elsewhere depends on whether the empirical situation is judged typical or atypical.

or that it does exist but is not perceived. Such a case of collective distortion in the first instance, or collective insensitivity perhaps even repression in the second, would be extremely unlikely to occur. What is much more likely is that the members of one group being different in character from the other group, may have a different perspective of external conditions. Moreover, lack of experience and education may limit perceptiveness on the part of both groups a great deal.

Additional difficulties arise when the perception concerns a specific social relationship. In this case the perspective will probably be biased by the needs and past experience of the viewer; and because it is a view of something which involves two people only, verification, wherever possible at all, lacks the weight of numbers. Much the same may be said for perceptions concerning some point of personal history - except that any bias would be more the product of present rather than past experience.

In order to combat these problems and others caused by the age and orientation of the subjects, several methods will be employed. First, the material nature of the community will be observed intensively, including visits to the homes of each subject. Second, at least one parent of each subject and various leaders of the community will be interviewed informally and/or observed. Third, the history of the community (particularly social and economical) will be investigated. Fourth, there are various other checks for accuracy within the interview schedules. It is hoped that these extra precautions combined with the length and intensity of general observation will check factually as well as supplement in a large way the statements made by the subjects

so that undue distortion is prevented and sound generalizations may be made about the situations as well as the perceptions.

Apart from the question of accuracy another difficulty in making generalizations is measurement. If the statements made in the interviews are accurate and the behavior observed is normal,¹ how is it possible to measure and generalize about either one when the total number in each group is so small? Moreover, the major questionnaire schedule, although standardized, is open - end on many questions and has built-in means for the individual to stress what is important or problematic to him. Certain behaviors, backgrounds, factors, and characteristics of the members of one group may be so widespread and distinct from those of the other group that definite patterns emerge and may be compared. The difficulty arises if any given pattern is not clear cut or if several patterns are distinct but not widespread. In the first instance, if additional, sufficient data cannot be obtained little else can be done except document and discuss it. The latter case will require separate or cross analysis.²

This raises the question of significance. Clearly no statistical tests for significance can be made. On the other hand, if all or most of the members of one group are definitely different in some way from

1. That is, if images calculated to impress the researcher in a certain way can be separated from behavior without such deliberation.

2. In other words, if the individuals in one group vary in religious and ethnic backgrounds for example, then these factors will have to be cross analyzed to see if there is any significant causal connection.

the members of the other group, it would seem then that the difference is hardly one of chance alone. While the causal importance of such a difference cannot be determined conclusively (only suggested tentatively), it is hoped that there is at least some value in the identification and comparison of the differences between the two groups.

The other major methodological question, defining delinquency, raises problems of a different kind. All delinquent activity is a special category of deviant behavior which is generally defined as any offense against the basic norms of society.¹ Some forms of deviance, such as over conformity, are tolerated. Delinquency is not, according to Cloward and Ohlin. They reason that "a deviant act (which) is frowned upon but otherwise ignored by officials will not mean the same thing either to the community or to the offender as an act that would ordinarily result in delinquency proceedings".² The community may not tolerate a deviant act by showing its disapproval or even taking action, but deviant acts become delinquent offenses only when "they result or are likely to result, in the initiation of official proceedings by agents of criminal justice".³

1. At least this is the central idea of most definitions of deviance. Some theorists, such as Cohen, stress that it is institutionalized expectations which are violated. Others, namely Lemert, refer to deviation in terms of the limits of toleration for variation from any given norm. See Chapter I especially p. 57 for the "Tolerance Quotient," Edwin Lemert - Social Pathology (New York: McGraw Hill, 1951).

2. Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin, Delinquency and Opportunity, op. cit., page 6. In fact, they have argued that the value of studies attempting to measure hidden delinquency are limited because the likelihood of delinquency proceedings, had these acts been detected, is not known. Although it is true that in most cases delinquency proceedings (beyond occasional appearance at court) were not initiated, they were detected, which constitutes an official response.

3. Ibid., p. 4.

Paul Tappan¹ supports this position effectively by pointing out that definitions of crime or delinquency which are not based upon legal statistics can **only** be biased. For in order to classify what is "socially injurious", "conduct against norms", or "anti-social behavior" one must decide who has been damaged and what social interest has been offended. It is evident that any such attempt could not avoid making all kinds of ethical and political value-judgments. Until these notions are "structurally embodied with distinct criteria or norms - as is now the case in the legal system - they are useless for purposes of research".²

All of these arguments make it clear that the anticipated official response is essential to understanding the nature of delinquency and that legal indices are necessary for objective research standards. But is this enough?

Although legal criteria must be employed, their inadequacies cannot be ignored. State laws differ tremendously on what age limits are covered by the term "juvenile" as well as what offenses are considered "delinquent".³ Certainly the more serious violations, like robbery and

1. Paul Tappan, "Who is Criminal?", American Sociological Review, 1947, 12: 96-103.

2. Ibid., p. 97. Speaking as a lawyer Tappan emphasizes the practical danger of using arbitrary standards: they allow unqualified persons to label as criminal any individual or group which they conceive nefarious. In fact, "it has become common practice to adjudicate as delinquent any child deemed to be antisocial or a behavior problem... instead of requiring ... proof of specific reprehensible conduct..." (Fn 9. p. 99) Finally, he warns that to assume an unconvicted suspect a violator is to subvert the deepest of our political and ethical tenets.

3. Tappan himself reports that the laws in all the United States and Canadian provinces contain only one class of clearly defined delinquency: any act which, if committed by an adult, would be a crime. See Paul Tappan, Comparative Survey of Juvenile Delinquency (Part I North America), United Nations Division of Social Welfare 1952-53.

rape, constitute delinquent acts; but exactly what behavior is included in such spurious charges as incorrigibility, disturbance of the peace, and loitering is rarely (if at all) defined precisely.

In addition to these limitations within the law itself, official practices create even more variations. Nathan Goldman's study of "The Differential Selection of Juvenile Offenders for Court Appearance"¹ skillfully distinguishes the extra-legal factors which determine whether an offender of the law becomes officially classified as a Delinquent.² Apart from the actual infraction, Goldman found that arrests and convictions are structured by three major criteria. First, values and attitudes of the community which influence official referral to court include whether or not the juvenile violated conventional conduct norms, the way in which the offense was committed, and the ability of the parents to maintain discipline within the home. Secondly, the visibility of the offense and the offender are taken into account. It is in this category that minority groups and certain class groups may be "seen"

1. Nathan Goldman, unpublished dissertation, University of Chicago, cited as the basis for a subsequent paper "Defining the Delinquent Child", read at the Eastern Sociological Society (Philadelphia, 1958).

2. In this paper Goldman defines the genus and species of deviant children. All law breakers are members of the genus or class of Transgressor. Using the extent to which the community recognizes the juvenile as a Transgressor as an indices, he may be further classified as: 1) a Violator - if the offense remains unknown to the public, 2) an Offender - if the transgression is known to the police and public but no official action is taken, 3) or a Delinquent - if the transgression is known and exposed to official action by a court. Delinquents may be sub-divided into Unofficial Delinquents if no action is taken, Adjudicated Delinquents if any action short of institutionalization is taken; and Institutionalized Delinquents. This classification has been described at length because it makes clear important distinctions which are particularly relevant to this research, and will be used throughout. Ibid.

differently. And last, official decisions can be influenced by the tolerance level of the community¹ which, in turn, is affected by its social and class organization, its history and traditions, and its economic and political character. Another determinant of official action which could be added to Goldman's list is police corruption. Although no sociological study has been made, it is common knowledge that corrupt police practices do exist and consequently must affect official statistics.

If legal judgments are highly subject to extra-legal circumstances, then they represent only a selected population of convicts and exclude a whole class of violators and offenders who, but for those extra-legal circumstances, would have a different status. After all the professional thief is no less a thief because he is not apprehended or because of peculiar local conditions he does not anticipate an official response.² The salient point for the sociologist is the fact that he wilfully and habitually violates the law. He is in the same sociological category as the one who is apprehended and convicted, both are guilty of committing criminal offenses, both identify themselves with these crimes, and probably both are identified by at least others in the profession, perhaps even the public, as thieves.

1. These last two determinants of court action reflect strongly Lemert's theory of deviant behavior. Op. cit.

2. It may be true that an anticipated response to a serious crime such as murder may prevent him from committing it; however, this does not alter his status as that of a thief.

By the same token as Merton¹ and others have pointed out, the college youth who purloins a baseball is in a different sociological category from the undetected but professional thief. While both are violators, one views himself as a generally law-abiding citizen who has engaged in an illegal, easily forgivable prank; the other's self-concept is founded on conflict with the law. Rightly or wrongly both would be viewed accordingly by the public and the law who, given the opportunity to judge, would probably pronounce the college youth a non-delinquent and the other a delinquent. Hence, there are legal as well as social grounds for differentiating occasional petty violators who are not socially or legally considered delinquent from the habitual violator who identifies himself and is socially identified by his persistent infractions against the law and who should be defined legally as a delinquent. Whether he is depends largely on extra-legal conditions. And if guilt is established by self-admission,² sociologically he should be classed as a delinquent regardless of anticipated official action or legal pronouncements.

A similar principle may be applied to working class youths who reside in high delinquency areas. Solomon Krobin has argued that it is a mistake to dichotomize juveniles in these areas on the basis of delinquency and non-delinquency. Because he believes that such areas are characterized by a conflict of values, he maintains that individuals must participate "simultaneously in both criminal and conventional value

1. Robert Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, op. cit., p. 178.

2. Apart from use of official records, any other method of establishing guilt, as Tappan has argued, would be unethical.

systems".¹ It is true that all youths in high delinquency areas must be affected by the existence of a deviant value system and that many of them must become involved in acts of delinquency; in fact, it would be difficult to find a curious and adventuresome boy, especially in such an area, who has not violated the law or associated with delinquents at some time or other in his youth. Yet there is a difference, legally and sociologically, between delinquents and non-delinquents in these areas. In such areas one must look for predominance of criminal or conventional values, attitudes, behavior, and identification. Despite the probable violation of the law by most youths in these areas, peers and adults including the law do not look upon all of them as delinquents;² neither should the sociologist.

Thus, legal criteria are relative not only to variation in local laws but also to completely extra-legal circumstances. And consequently they do not include that class of persons who, except for those circumstances, would be classified sociologically as delinquent. To rely solely on legal criteria would be as unscientific as defining delinquency without any reference to them. Clearly, some additional means of measurement is needed, one which represents the social facts of delinquency as well as the legal ones, one which at least includes all habitual violators and not just those who have been judged and convicted. Is it not possible to use admission of guilt as that criterion? If a person defines himself, by virtue of admission to violating specific laws, as a habitual violator, the fact of his delinquency is no less a reality because he has not been

1. Solomon Krobin, "The Conflict of Values in Delinquency Areas", American Sociological Review, 1951, v. 16, p. 665.

2. This, of course, does not apply to delinquency areas where all youths are allegedly belonging to confirmed delinquent gangs for the entirety of their youth.

judged officially or because he does not anticipate official action. And if that definition is shared to the extent that it is the basis of his social status, then there is all the more reason to classify him sociologically as a delinquent.

In this research, then, delinquent behavior refers to behavior which is deviant, a violation of basic conduct norms, and illegal - an infraction which but for extra-legal circumstances would result in official proceedings. In terms of the individual, delinquency refers to juveniles who admit that they are guilty of habitually violating the law, regardless of whether they anticipate an official response. It also refers, of course, to those juveniles against whom official action has been taken. Obversely, non-delinquency refers to youths who are predominantly non-delinquent in their behavior, values, attitudes, and identification, to youths who may have violated the law, perhaps habitually for a short period of time, but who have not appeared before court or been officially adjudicated delinquent.

CHAPTER VII

EMPIRICAL PROCEEDINGS

In addition to the methodological questions and the problems of defining delinquency, there was the problem of finding two groups which would be suitable for the purposes of this project. Despite the inadequacy of available statistics it is generally accepted that the greatest number of offenders are characteristically from the lower income groups and are usually white,¹ Anglo-Saxon, Protestant males in the middle of their teens. It is also believed that a lack of formal education is typical. In order for the results of this project to be relevant to the more general theories² and for comparative purposes, it was desirable to find two groups which corresponded as closely as possible to this image. Second, it was necessary that the two groups should be comparable in group structure and that the members should reside mainly in the same community since substantial differences in any of these factors, including the demographic ones, are known to affect behavior significantly. Thus, if all these factors could be successfully controlled for, they would be eliminated as causal agents. And last, presuming that few teenagers are perfectly law-abiding, it was necessary to establish whether the non-delinquents were in fact not delinquent and similarly whether the so-called delinquents were habitual transgressors, violators, offenders, or delinquents.

To make certain that the groups finally selected would fulfill these requirements, a pilot study was conducted after a few weeks of preliminary observation. The members of both groups were administered

1. Because of widespread color discrimination in many areas, statistics showing the Negro as the greater offender than the white are suspected as being the most unreliable of all.

2. As opposed to those seeking to explain variations from this statistical stereotype.

a six-part questionnaire¹ covering: 1) demographic and some other information concerning residence, education, religion, family, and occupation; 2) the structure and pattern of social relationships within each group including sociometric charts; 3) outgroup relationships - what the two groups felt about each other and a third older one of confirmed delinquents;² 4) a listing of their regular activities and the amount of time devoted to each one (as an objective indication of its value); 5) a listing and account of their non-regular activities - what they did for pleasure or entertainment and excitement;³ 6) a statement of their attitude toward the project. Also comments made after the completion of the interviews were noted. Virtually all the data from the interviews was verified directly from observation or indirectly⁴ by the acting director of the social agency with whom there

1. For a listing of the questions and an account of its design see Appendix B.

2. Discovered during the course of preliminary observation.

3. This portion of the questionnaire was designed to elicit from the respondents an account of their infractions against the law. It was felt that establishing guilt in this way, rather than asking direct questions, would yield better results for two reasons. First, any indication that delinquency was the principal or even a subject of the study might seriously affect their attitudes and behavior. Throughout this investigation specific references to delinquency were avoided and questions in the major interview regarding violations of the law were minimal in number and balanced in importance by other questions. Second, confessions of guilt, which are offered without direct request are generally held as being more valuable or significant than data given in answer to pointed questions. For the same reasons direct references to class were avoided.

4. Indirect verification here and elsewhere means that at least one other person either offered spontaneously information which would verify a given statement or was asked to comment on a subject which would cover the statement in question. According to the working premise of the project, statements made in interviews and other private information were not disclosed to anyone else.

was continuous contact. He had known all of the subjects for a number of years and, having made an informal study of the community, he was thoroughly familiar with the area and the backgrounds of the subjects.

How similar were the two groups?¹ The members of both groups were male Caucasians with the exception of one Negro in the non-delinquent group. All subjects were from working class families of approximately equal size and composition. Only one in each group was broken by divorce or separation and one of the non-delinquents' mother was a widow who had not remarried. Most of them went to the same schools, had changed schools and neighborhoods approximately the same number of times, spoke English almost exclusively, began work at the same age, and had the same type of job.

The two groups differed in several respects. First, about two-thirds of the delinquents were approximately two years younger than those in the other group. At the time of the study the eight members of the delinquent group ranged in age from 17 (the age of five of them) to 19. The ages of the three oldest boys in that group (18, 18, and 19) corresponded to the ages of the three youngest in the non-delinquent group so that there was exact matching in three cases. The other four non-delinquents were aged 19, 20, 21, and 24. Second, there was considerable difference in the amount of vocational training. Although the members of both groups had received virtually the same amount of formal education before they left school to begin work, nearly all those in the non-delinquent group were actively engaged in trade school

¹. In order to preserve continuity, the detailed results of the questionnaire have been combined with material from other sources and are presented in Part III.

courses and one was going to night school. In contrast, only one of the delinquents who began a trade school course was still taking it at the time of the study, the others dropping out shortly after enrolment.

Third, four of the eight delinquents¹ were Catholic whereas only one of the non-delinquents was Catholic. He and one of the Catholics in the delinquent group were the only ones that were of French descent. The rest of the members of each group were Protestant. Fourth, the ethnic backgrounds were so different or mixed that they seemed similar. About half in each group had been born in the greater urban area of the city. Apart from two members of the non-delinquent group who were Norwegian and Ukranian, the rest were from England or the Commonwealth countries of Nova Scotia and Barbados.² Excluding these two non-Britishers, who did not come to Canada until the age of 12 and 11 respectively, the others had emigrated to the area by the time they were seven. At the time of the project all of the non-delinquents were residing in East End itself where they had spent an average of 12 years. Two of the delinquents did not reside in East End proper nor had they ever lived there and two brothers were born in East End but were then

1. Actually, only seven of the delinquents participated in the entire project. One of the rank and file dropped out completely shortly after the pilot interviews to go steady with a girl. Since he no longer identified himself or was identified by the group as being a member he was not observed or interviewed further.

2. The members of the non-delinquent group came from East End (2), the greater urban area (1), England (1), Barbados (1), Norway (1), and France (1). Of the delinquents 3 were born in East End, 2 in the greater urban area, 2 in England, and 1 in Nova Scotia. Thus matching occurred in four instances and all but two originated in English speaking countries so there was no substantial language problem.

living in a town nearby. These two brothers had, however, always lived fairly nearby and spent the greater portion of their lives in East End and all four spent virtually all of their spare time in East End since they became members of the group. The other members, who formed the core of the group, had lived in East End nearly all of their lives.

Of these differences, only the religious and the ethnic factors seem to be substantial and potentially significant as causal factors; therefore they will require cross-analysis. That the delinquents had made no attempt to educate themselves further seems to be a product of their differing orientations rather than a cause of them since they were delinquent long before they left school for the explicit purposes of earning their own living and becoming more "independent" gang members. The difference in residential history could only be significant in two of the four cases since the two brothers grew up in the East End area and associated themselves exclusively with it as opposed to their own neighborhood. And having observed briefly the respective communities of the other two, there seemed to be little difference in appearance or facilities. The difference in age acquires significance only in connection with other factors and will be discussed accordingly where it is relevant.

Group structure was compared according to several indices: age, size, length of friendship, basis for membership, frequency and duration of interaction, basis of leadership, decision-making policies, purpose, and function. While some differences were found, they were believed to be insignificant or controlled for in another way. One

difference was the surface formality of the non-delinquent group. Being members of the junior board of the social agency, their official meetings were conducted more or less according to parliamentary procedure and their relations at the social gatherings of which they were in charge were affected by their duties. This difference, however, was felt to be insignificant since underlying this occasional facade were all the elements of an informal group, similar in nature to that of the delinquent group.

Another small difference between the two groups was that the members of the junior board seemed to be slightly more independent in their activities; they spent a few more hours a week with their families, on double dates, or pursuing their studies. On the other hand, because all of them had the same outside interests, group bonds were probably stronger and, like the difference in education, these outside interests seemed to be a product of their age and different orientation.¹ In any case, group membership, if not group activities, was as important to them as it was for the delinquents. Finally, the main difference between the two groups was, of course, their manifest purposes. Junior board members were required by the agency to lead "respectable" law-abiding lives; any major deviation would result in expulsion from the whole program. And officially the junior board were pledged to maintain order at all agency functions. The delinquents, obversely, had resolved to create disorder and make trouble wherever possible.

This raises the all important question of how delinquent were the

1. Analysis of their responses to the questionnaire section on gang membership and history proved this to be true. See Chapter VIII.

delinquents and how law abiding were the junior board members? The delinquents admitted to a number of minor offenses which were committed fairly regularly at week-ends during the winter and more frequently during the summer. They also confessed to a variety of major offenses. All of them had been arrested but through alleged lack of evidence were usually released without further official action. Three had been institutionalized, of which two were still on probation (although one had broken it), and one had been detained by the court for six weeks.

The non-delinquents, since they had become board members, had not violated the law apart from such offenses as drinking under age. Although most of them had committed some delinquent offenses when they associated with the big gang, these offenses were extremely limited in range and frequency and lasted only for a very short, specific period of time. Moreover, only three of them had ever committed or were involved in serious offenses. Finally, most of them had been arrested one or two times but only one of them had appeared before court. For these reasons, the members of the non-delinquent group cannot be called true delinquents. It is true that they have violated and offended the law but some transgressions are not sufficient, however, to warrant labelling them delinquents.

The outstanding results of this pilot interview series and observation, then, are that in group size and structure the two groups were comparable. They were also similar in class, degree of formal education, occupation, and family composition. Considerable differences were found in their ages, religious denominations, and ethnic origins. And last, the two groups were different with respect to delinquency.

Is there any significant relationship among these differences? The fact that all the older group had violated the law might indicate that delinquency is simply a stage which many juveniles of similar backgrounds go through. On the other hand, the delinquents' delinquency began at a much earlier age, lasted longer, and was much more serious in frequency and range of offense as well as in identification. Furthermore, many older youths from this same community, and in two cases brothers of those board members who had engaged in minor delinquent activity, are confirmed delinquents. That they are older, still delinquent, and from the same environment functions as an added control for the age bias of the groups. The fact that two of the three board members who had committed some serious offenses were first generation immigrants is somewhat discounted since only half of the delinquents were immigrants and since the English speaking community was composed largely of immigrants.¹ What may be significant is that nearly all delinquents, including those offenders on the junior board, were either immigrants or Catholics and, therefore, were marginal figures - either for religious or ethnic reasons but, apart from one exception, not for both. The real significance of this finding can only be estimated after further research.

1. The social agency has three mimeographed reports on the community and all of them refer to the large number of immigrants in the community. These reports were written by past and present directors of the program in 1953, 1957 and 1960. As they have no title and have not been published, they will be referred to as "Agency Progress Report" with the year.

Unfortunately, there are no statistics on this. The 1961 Census simply states that 1080 are from the British Isles and lists the figures for about 13 other ethnic groups, totalling 275. Apart from the Italians who numbered 140, the other groups averaged from 12 to 20 each. (Catalogue 92-575, Series 1, 2, Bulletin 1.2-5: 30-11-1962, Table 39.) For a detailed breakdown of these figures see Appendix E.

Actually, the limited transgressions of the junior board members add perspective to the project, especially to the comparison of answers to questions dealing with change. In any case, the two groups seem similar enough to compare and sufficiently different to contrast. And the community, which is described in the next chapter, was ideal for a comparative study of small groups, both of which proved eager to co-operate. For these reasons it was decided that they would be suitable for further observation and interviewing.

Observation during and after the pilot interviews entailed meeting with the two groups informally in their own contexts. Each group was observed regularly at the movies and group meetings, on "excursions", at home, and at local hangouts. The Saturday night dances were attended also because this was the only time when the two groups interacted with each other and the only possible opportunity to view each group's interaction with the senior board of the agency. Individual as well as group relationships with each other, girls, families, the police, social agency representatives, past teachers, and strangers were noted with respect to the past and present and in terms of interaction, activity, and sentiments. Of particular importance was the notation of differences in individual behavior when the individual was alone, with one other peer, in a group, or with adults and whether there was any drinking.

The major questionnaire was administered to each individual privately and lasted from two and a half hours to four and a half hours. The questions were derived from theory, observation, and pilot study clues.¹ They were designed to obtain several sets of information. First, they

¹. The entire schedule is presented in Appendix D.

covered the individual's relationship to groups of primary relations: (his group, the other gangs, girls, and his family): to institutions within the community (the school, the church, the law, and the social agency): to the economic structure; and to himself. Second, the questions dealt with different aspects of each relationship: the actual relationship or behavior within that relationship, the respondent's conception of it, his expectations from it; whether he perceived any differential access to the achievement or maintenance of it, and his future plans with respect to it. Third, the questions were designed to assess historical changes in the relationship - when it happened, how, and why.¹ In addition the heads of both groups were interviewed to obtain a history of the gangs' leadership, membership, and memorable group events.

Most of the interview data was verified by observation and continuous contact with the current acting director of the social agency and, to a lesser extent, a school teacher who had taught nearly all the subjects and had known them intimately since they were children. Both contacts were most helpful in discussing the subjects and their home life as well as their relationship to the agency and the school. If there was any conflicting data regarding the time or details of an event, the respondents themselves would often check each other. Also comments made by parents were very valuable. Although never questioned specifically about their children or events, conversation with them

1.

It is hoped that this part of the interview would reveal the time sequences of certain events - whether, for example, rejection of parental advice comes before or after delinquency has been established, whether disrespect of the law is a generating factor or a resultant characteristic of delinquency.

revealed clearly their general attitude. Of particular importance was fairly regular contact with the mother of the head of the junior board (whose brother was a member of the older gang) and the mother of the delinquent gang's original leader who returned to the community on leave from the Navy. Although never actually interviewed, they played a large part in the project.

Historical and other supplementary information was obtained from informal interviews¹ with various community leaders. Information about the only Protestant, English speaking school in the community prior to 1960 was obtained from the man who was chairman of the school board from 1953 - 1960 and the current chairman as well as the current principal and his predecessor. Also interviewed were the Reverend who served from 1951 - 1960 as minister of the only Protestant church in the community, an executive of one of the oil companies who, although he was no longer a member of the community, was the financial director of the community's social agency; and the Town Clerk.

Finally, much historical information was obtained from two written sources. For the fiftieth anniversary of the town's existence, celebrated in 1960, the township published a large booklet² containing among other things, a full account of the town's growth in its economy and in its religious, social, and educational facilities. It also

1. See Appendix A.

2. Actually, it may only be presumed that the government published this booklet for apart from the title, "Town of 1910 - 1960", and the date of publication, June 4, 1960, there is no other information nor any page numbers. However, it begins with a signed statement from the Mayor, giving it at least some official authenticity.

contained some statistics regarding the general characteristics of the population. The other source was the series of progress reports written by agency directors in 1953, 1957, and 1961; they discuss in detail the social problems of the community and the role of the organization since it began after the war.

BACKGROUND TO PART III EAST END

The Community and the Project

In contrast to most research on delinquency, this project deals with a rural industrial community and a description of its setting and history are vital to understanding the subjects. Also some events occurred which affected the delinquents and their relationship to the project; consequently they must be documented in order to evaluate the results.

THE SETTING

About 15 miles from the center of a large urban complex in the eastern provinces, the township of East End is bounded on the east and west by two rivers, on the north by another small township, and on the south by a host of oil refineries. It is these refineries which were entirely responsible for the fact that "from the industrial point of view, (East End) is fourth among Canadian cities and towns".¹ While this statement is true, it is quite deceptive since the whole town covered an area of about four square miles and had a population of 5,630,² living in one-sixth of the total area. Of that population 1,195 were English speaking residents who were socially segregated from the remaining French speaking inhabitants. The Protestant population was 897 and was almost completely English speaking. Most of the 530 children attended the English Protestant school and about 150 went to the English Catholic school. The English speaking teenage population numbered about 225.

Although the town boasted of 40 secular and religious associations, numerous parks, a public swimming pool, and a stadium, provisions for organized social and recreational life for the community's English speaking teenage population was virtually non-existent. The Protestant church offered sports facilities and occasional social functions but

1. "The Town of, 1910-1960". The booklet also states that according to the 1957 Federal Statistics, the manufacturing production of the town amounts to \$1700,000,000. All figures presented in this description, unless stated otherwise, are taken from the booklet.

2. Actually the official census of 1961 states that the population totals 5,884. See Appendix E.

both were highly religious in character and few boys in this age group attended either program. All organized social life for these youths revolved around the social agency which only offered the Saturday night dances and a weekly sports night. There was no agency which dealt specifically with what the community considered problem youths. Unorganized social and recreational facilities were limited to one movie house and two bowling alleys.

Originally founded as a garden city in 1910, the town was inhabited almost exclusively by wealthy French businessmen most of whom were builders. The Great War proved devastating to the community's economy and the idea of an entirely residential township had to be abandoned with the coming of the oil companies which enabled the town to survive financially. This industrial expansion, beginning in about 1925, resulted in a migration of English speaking people into the community. The 1957 Agency Progress Report indicates that the majority of immigrants until the second war were executives, engineers, and managers. Apparently most of the workers commuted due to lack of housing facilities within their means.¹

Religious and educational facilities for these people were extremely limited in spite of the city's wealth. Sunday school classes were taught by lay persons and even youngsters who had just graduated from them. They were held in the Protestant school as was any social activity sponsored by the church. The Protestant school even now goes

1. Unfortunately census statistics for East End are minimal since the town is so small. The 1941 Census Report gives only a crude breakdown of occupations for East End: Agricultural, manufacturing, construction, and other. Most males over 14 years of age were involved in manufacturing. See Census of Canada 1941, "Population by Occupational Groups", Table 10.

only through the seventh grade. Anyone desiring further education had to go elsewhere, usually about 10 miles away. This situation remained unchanged until 1960 when a new school was added to the adjoining town for the use of both towns. Staffing the school was as problematic as finding religious teachers. There were only two English speaking male educators in the entire community; the rest were French, untrained females, or imports. Social life, such as it was, centered around these two institutions, such as they were, for there was little else the community had to offer.

During and after the war numerous events occurred which were to alter the character of the whole town. Apart from any disturbance the war itself may have caused, there was first a wave of delinquency. Although modest in scale, it involved the sons and daughters of many of the town's leading citizens. In 1945 a group of English speaking parents banded together to petition a national social agency to establish a branch in East End. The agency served for four years as an extension project of other branches and in 1949 moved to the Protestant school in East End.

In 1946-47 the government sponsored a subdivision of prefabricated houses at low cost to veterans. These houses were filled largely by workmen. Probably because of this and the delinquency scare, senior executives and upper personnel attached to the oil companies began very slowly to emigrate out of the community. As this process gradually accelerated, the community began to deteriorate. This was one of the main reasons why the agency decided to move to East End.

One of its first projects was to make a study of the community.

What they found there appalled them.¹ In addition to the lack of adequate housing; religious, educational, and social facilities; and trained personnel for these fields, they discovered an extreme apathy toward religion and education especially. About two-thirds of the congregation had never attended church and certainly did not support it financially. Only a handful of young people attended services regularly though adults numbered about forty a week. Failing interest, evening services were discontinued in 1956. The attitude toward education was similar. While attendance at school was compulsory, truancy was increasing. Moreover, the labor force, which was by the early fifties a growing majority,² had always received high wages, about the equivalent of a graduate engineer, and tended to view university training as a waste of time.

Faced with these conditions the agency set about its task with vigor organizing social, sports, and craft activities for all age groups, the outstanding feature of the program being the summer camp. "The entire program for twelve years (1945 - 1957) was on the basis of a negative goal - keeping youth out of trouble."³ And it had met with considerable success. In 1957 the agency report could boast of a sports program "beyond which neither facilities nor members would develop further".⁴ It also claimed to have solved the major disci-

1. Agency Progress Reports of 1953 and 1957.

2. By 1951 the total labor force 14 years of age and over was 1,236 for men and 289 for females. Of that total 396 were proprietors, administrators, clerics, or professionals. Laborers numbered only 174 but 113 were employed on construction and 492 on manufacturing. See Census of Canada 1951 V.IV Labor Force, "Occupations and Industries", Table 9. For complete breakdown see Appendix E.

3. "Agency Progress Report, 1957," p. 17.

4. Loc. cit.

plinary problems. Outside the agency, however, the town clerk¹ and others referred to another increase of delinquency beginning about 1955 just after a series of apartment blocks were completed and filled by unskilled workers casually employed.

In the fall of 1957 the peak of success in attendance reached by the agency declined sharply and was soon to collapse altogether. The 1960 agency report gives two main reasons for this. First, in the spring of '57 the parish priests suggested, and in the fall ordered at the threat of excommunication(!), that the French contingent (some 65 per cent of branch membership and program income) to cease participation in the program. At the same time, emigration of executives, professionals, and the like rapidly accelerated leaving a ~~solid~~ working class community,² with an insufficient number of families financially able to support the elaborate and expensive sports and crafts activities for each age group. And it was for these families that the program had been geared.

Actually this acceleration of emigration seemed to be as much a product as a cause of the events of '58. First, the older "anti-social" population rebelled against the agency; during the winter and spring they simply discontinued association. By autumn of that year the delinquency problem had become so widespread that the junior board was virtually the only remaining group of youth "representing socially

1. In a personal communication April 6th 1962.

2. In 1961 about 800 males were craftsmen, process production, related workers, and laborers as compared to 88 males in managerial occupations and 91 males in professional and technical occupations. Census Report of Canada 1961 V.IV, Labor Force, op. cit., Table 9. See Appendix E for details and comparison with 1941 and 1951 statistics.

acceptable behavior patterns". Of the 12 members of this board, only one resided in East End. This domination of the program was one of the major reasons why the older group had rebelled in the winter and why the intermediate group began to stop participation in the fall. Toward Christmas of '58 the percentage of English speaking supporters had declined about 80 per cent. Finally, there was a series of private parties which received considerable public notice. Boys would wait until their parents were going out and then invite a horde of their friends to the house. In the process of party making several homes were literally wrecked and each parent was told that there had been a small, quiet party which had been raided by "uninvited" guests. Because of all this, the agency decided that its only justification for existence was to devote its complete attention to the delinquency problem.

On January 10, 1959, the Agency Reclamation project was launched. The project began with an open house attended by half the English speaking teenage population. On the basis of questionnaires administered to the attendants, the whole agency program was reorganized. Space and other facilities were given for Saturday night dances provided that the teenagers supervised it themselves and abided by certain rules. The junior board which was to be entirely elected and representative was invested with considerable authority and was to be responsible for keeping order. Several older youths, who otherwise might have been excluded from the program because of the new age limit, were appointed junior staff members to aid the junior board. These two staff members and the junior board elected in the spring of 1959 and 1960 constituted the members of the non-delinquent group for this research.

Actually, the Protestant School Board still controlled the entire program through its ownership of agency facilities - namely the school. The board, thoroughly frightened by the violent events of '58, set down a stringent code of behavior covering everything from language and dress to drinking and sexual activity; and deviation from that code at agency functions was punishable by suspension or expulsion from the program. By the enforcement of age limits the board successfully excluded the older gang which was causing most of the trouble. In any case all were agreed that the big gang as it was called, was simply too dangerous to integrate with younger groups.

Conflict arose between the board and the agency over enforcement of this code. The agency knew that there was a younger group of delinquents attempting to imitate the big gang, expected that they would not assimilate easily to the code, and wanted the authority to make special provisions for their behavior since they were the ones who needed guidance the most. On the grounds that toleration of deviance would encourage further deviance the board rejected the request.

During the conflict a survey of community problems was conducted by the agency as part of the reclamation project. It included, among other things, interviewing and testing samples of the adolescent population. Unfortunately, the detailed results were destroyed but outstanding findings contained in the 1961 report were: 1) virtually none of the youths had been exposed to religious education and values; 2) none of the boys in the town had graduated from high school despite an average to high capacity for learning (as measured by an Army

Classification Test); 3) although there was only one boy involved in a service career, there was universal interest and capacity for mechanical problems;¹ 4) the major concern of the parents was to be "rid of a dependant" while the concern of the youths was to be independent financially; 5) although both parents and youths showed respect for law and authority,² neither group maintained "acceptable" moral standards; and 7) exposure to alcohol occurred frequently during pre- or early adolescence and in some cases was encouraged in the home. The report notes in addition that until late in 1955 most of the infractions of civil law were not accompanied by violence; after that offenses, committed mostly by the detached older gang, were more serious and in three cases extremely violent.

The findings indicated clearly that there was a great need for the program. And despite its dependence on the school board, it went extremely well for a time. Having been without a decent place to socialize or recreate for some time, everyone was on their best behavior. Even the delinquents stayed out of trouble at agency functions. Of course the installment of a policeman at the dances was a novel deterrent and monthly contact with potential troublemakers was quite effective. Within eight months of launching the number of local police calls was reduced from about thirty a month to a total of one for the entire period. And the program expanded to include all of the English

1. This was discovered through the Kuder and Strong Army Classification tests. None of them, though, had been referred to trade schools.

2. The example given of this respect for authority was "when ... tried to stab the executive secretary, he was violently dealt with by his peers and our position of authority had to be relied upon to prevent him from being severely beaten", "Agency Progress Report, 1960", p. 18.

speaking population.

But the success of the project was shortlived at least with regard to the delinquents. They had first begun to come to the agency during the spring of 1959 and became highly involved while they participated in the Softball League during the summer of that year. Actually, their most delinquent member was at reform school for this period and their leader had enlisted in the Navy. And while they were for the moment quite integrated in the agency programs, they were also in the process of reorganizing the group for the expressed purpose of causing more trouble. Their plans were soon realized for during autumn of '59 and the most of 1960, they created so much disturbance that they had to cease wearing their special jackets and insignia. Triumphant at having caused such a sensation, they decided to control their activities. Unfortunately their self-imposed (as they prefer to think of it) restrictions came too late to prevent their expulsion from the agency sports program. As many of them had never been fully interested in it, this hardly affected them. But late in the fall one of them was suspended from the dances. This and the fact that another winter was approaching had a sobering effect on all of them, so that their activities were somewhat subdued by the time this investigation started in early February of 1961.

The director of the agency introduced each group separately to the project at one of the Saturday night dances when they were all there. They were told that the investigation was a study of small groups involving observation and interviewing for a period of several months, that the purpose was to compare the behavior, thoughts, and

attitudes of the members toward various institutions and people, that above all they were to act naturally, and that all information was to be kept confidential apart from the final report in which all persons and places would be given fictitious names to provide complete anonymity. Both groups immediately agreed to participate. In fact all of them seemed delighted at being the subject of a research project particularly the delinquent group since their suspended member was given permission to return to the agency program in order to take part in the study. Also as the agency director pointed out, they felt that "no one took them seriously" and being subjects in a research project would certainly enhance their status.

It was decided at this meeting that the junior board would be observed on Tuesdays when they met at their leader's house informally and occasionally for formal meetings. The delinquents or Eagles as they had called themselves were to be observed on Fridays when they usually met to go to the movies. Both groups would be observed on Saturdays at the agency dances. The pilot study interviews, to be held in the school basement, were scheduled for the end of February and the beginning of March.

Being somewhat older and more reserved, it was several weeks before rapport was thoroughly established with the junior board. Once it was, they could not have been more co-operative. In meetings they were careful to explain the background of any new topics and after the first few meetings the leader exclaimed spontaneously that indeed they were behaving naturally. Events which occurred while they were not being observed were immediately reported without being asked for; and several times they even asked to be observed at important special sessions. In

interviews they made every effort to be thorough and accurate and in most cases were exceptionally frank about their personal problems including those of which they were ashamed. Throughout the study, they accepted the role of an interested but impartial observer; not once did they demand time, attention, or special favors such as transportation.

At first the Eagles were much the same, though instead of being unnaturally respectful in the beginning, they acted abnormally normal, as it were - making much effort to start the project off with no illusions about their capacity for making trouble. At the same time, they were quite protective when their actions might be dangerous and/or involve the police. Shortly before the pilot interviews the novelty wore off and the stage of "showing off" more or less ceased. During the pilot interviews they were as co-operative as the other group both inside the office and outside while they were being observed. After the series was completed, a number of events occurred which, combined with the exigencies of the given situation, affected the structure of the group and their behavior. Because of these events and through some unfortunate gaps in communication, errors in judgment, and particularly the quite accidental dissemination of misinformation about my activities with the other group, it was no longer possible for them to accept the role of an impartial observer; consequently my actions became inextricably involved with those events. In order to evaluate what effect these events and my role in them had on the major interview series they should be recorded. In any case, they reveal much about the community and the delinquent group. Before presenting this history, however, it will be useful to introduce the

characters and to sketch briefly their group status and their way of life. All of the information in the proceeding section was obtained from the pilot interviews and observation.

CHARACTERS : THE JUNIOR BOARD

- MITCH:** Aged 18. Born in England. Both parents English. Immigrated to East End at the age of five. Left school after 12 years; eight grades passed successfully. Grades average to failing - trade excellent. Currently engaged in second year of government correspondence course. Member of Church of England whose doctrine he accepted but had no contact with the church. Parents divorced during infancy. Mother remarried shortly afterwards; had two other children of her own and cares for four foster children. Stepfather was a skilled laborer. Had had a total of three jobs, working as a dyer for eight months before project; earned \$46 a week, \$15 of which was paid to parents for board. Member of junior board for two years; President one.
- RED:** Aged 20. Born in the City as were both parents. Moved to East End at the age of five. Left school after 14 years. Grades good until the ninth grade which was repeated. Currently in second year at night school. Has had office job in daytime for two years; received \$60 a week; gave a quarter to parents for rent. Prior to that was in the Navy for two months and worked in office during the summers. Member of United Church though does not practise or accept doctrine. Father was unskilled laborer; mother, a housewife. Had one sister. Member of junior board since return from the Navy about two years.
- T. J.:** Aged 24. Born in Norway as were parents. Came to Canada at the age of 11½, living in various other provinces for seven and a half years. Left Canadian schools after eight years having passed the fifth grade. Nearly completed second year of correspondence course in mechanics. Currently a construction worker receiving \$50 weekly; \$10 goes to parents for rent. Has had a total of nine jobs, this one for about two years. Originally a Lutheran, was then an Atheist. Father was a caretaker of the Protestant school but prior to that had been a construction worker. Had two sisters and a younger brother. Was paid junior staff member of board for a year after having won agency's annual trophy for the greatest improvement.
- ANDY:** Aged 18. Born in East End. Both parents Canadian. Left school after 10 years having passed the ninth grade. In second year of correspondence course in electrical engineering. Had been working as a sprayer for two years; paid \$15 rent to parents out of \$64 salary. Prior to that had worked for the city for two months. Attended United Church about one or twice a month though did not believe in doctrine. Both parents living; had four brothers and five sisters. Father was a dock supervisor. Had been part of agency leadership since age of 15.

SPORT: Aged 20. Born in Barbados as were parents and lived in East End since seven. Left school after eight years having passed all grades successfully. Originally had a part-time office job for a year; then was an upholsterer for three years. Currently unemployed, having recently resigned from three year \$90 a week job of line inspector found immediately after two year post in Navy. Was hoping to sign contract in the spring with professional athletic team. Accepted generally the doctrine at United Church though did not practice it. Was only Negro in either group. Father was a mechanic. Came to Canada at the age of five just after father remarried, having divorced first wife three years prior. Had five sisters and one older brother. Had been living next door with leader of Eagles since his unemployment. Was paid junior staff member of the agency. Had been a member of non-delinquent group for several years.

REX: Aged 19. Born in France as were both parents. Came to East End at the age of 12, seven years after the death of his father. Left Canadian schools after 10 years, having passed nine grades successfully. Worked week-ends for one year as a packager then worked two summers as a machinist. Was earning \$65 a week in a semi-skilled job; also paid rent to mother. Was the only Catholic in the group. Accepted but did not practice his religion. Had three older sisters and one older brother, who had remained in France when family immigrated. Had rejoined junior board after three years' membership in other groups. Just before beginning of project had a mild form of nervous breakdown and was somewhat withdrawn from the group. By the end of the project, having apparently recovered fully, he was again reintegrated into the group.

CREW: Aged 19. Born in East End. Left school after nine years of school having succeeded in passing eight grades. Currently in second year of part-time auto school. Earned \$75 a week as a printer of which \$15 went to parents for rent. Had had the job for 1½ years. Prior to that had had four assorted jobs lasting two, six, two, and four months respectively. More or less accepted doctrine of United Church though had little contact with the church. Both parents living. Father from Italy, worked as an oil company mechanical operator. Mother was English. Had two brothers; oldest one was member of the big gang. Had never fully belonged to any one group having part-time membership in several groups at the same time. Had been quite close to junior board since his expulsion from the dance a year before the study and was made an official member of the board in the early part of the project.

Apart from their official bonds, board members were held together by mutual obligation, common background, and similar interests. The group as a whole seemed fairly cohesive in spite of the fact that there were two distinct cliques within it. On the basis of interaction patterns and ranking of members according to degree of trust, loyalty, and closeness, Mitch, Red, and T.J. formed the dominant clique while Sport, Andy, and Rex formed the other. Crew, through his friendship with Mitch was more or less attached to the former clique. Although they had elected Mitch their President, there was an explicit denial of there being any one leader; at the same time, they considered Mitch the most responsible, if not the most popular, and looked to him to make decisions both inside and outside official board meetings. At these meetings they adhered strictly to the principles, if not the rules, of parliamentary procedure for they were distinctly anti-authoritarian. In fact, Mitch once considered resigning because he had to handle a problem in a dictatorial fashion. And all of them tried very hard to be fair in their official judgments on others, trying not to allow personal relations influence board decisions. Individuals were controlled by direct ostracism, suspension, and expulsion.

Of the qualities they valued most in a friend trustworthiness, kindness, and personality were unanimously ranked most important while responsibility, loyalty, courage, and sincerity were ranked equally important by all but one. Good looks was ranked unanimously as least important with physical strength or prowess, experience with girls, and money following fairly close behind. In practice responsibility was the outstanding characteristic. All of them except Sport felt and showed a deep sense of responsibility - toward themselves by trying to

do what they thought was right, by holding their jobs and further their education, if only technically; in most cases; toward each other by being dependable; toward their families by paying rent, spending at least some time each week with them, and trying in the main to conform to their wishes; toward girls they respected by being what they considered mannerly and not getting them into trouble; and toward the agency by performing their duties. Nothing angered the majority of this group (both individually and collectively) more than someone who was not fulfilling his job as a board member, someone who was deliberately trying to cause trouble, or someone in a position of authority who was being unfair or unjust.

at the same time they also placed a great deal of value on having a good time in a wholesome way. They loved to dance, participate in sports, listen to music they liked, and talk about everything. And a few of them actively pursued hobbies which were related to their occupations. Going steady with a girl was quite important to them. They usually did not date a girl regularly unless they were fairly serious about her and apart from holding hands or dancing close together, they seldom displayed any kind of sexual relations in public places though at private parties there was frequently some heavy necking. Drinking at these parties was also fairly heavy; apart from that they only drank occasionally at the few local dances for adults or on the odd get together out of town.¹ Except for this drinking, driving without a licence, and perhaps engaging in premarital sex relations, they more or less obeyed the law. For "kicks", non-regular activities for fun,

¹. Several members, notably Red and T.J. who had belonged to a small, quiet group called the "Inebriates", were trying to give it up altogether.

excitement, or entertainment they held a few private parties, took occasional sport trips, raced cars when given the opportunity, and once in a while, about twice a year, went on an all-male drunken binge.

During a typical week most of their waking hours were occupied by their jobs.¹ Evenings were mostly devoted to academic or educational pursuits or sports in the appropriate seasons. In between these activities they met in small groups, read, or watched television. Tuesdays were reserved specifically for socializing amongst themselves as a group and any official meetings. Saturdays in the daytime they worked, helped around the house, watched television, visited each other, went into the City, or saw their girl friends. Sundays were much the same except that they did not work and more time was devoted to their families and in some cases to church.

Friday and Sunday nights both groups went to the movies. The junior board did not generally go as a group but took dates and stayed with them, very rarely making any noise or causing trouble. Saturday nights they attended the dance and were usually kept busy running the program though they found plenty of time to dance and socialize amongst themselves. They enjoyed tremendously the prestige of their positions and were elated when the program was progressing smoothly. Because of their duties they rarely moved about as a group during the dance except at the end when they all had to clean up;

1. Sport was the exception to this, having been unemployed several months prior to the start of the project. He supported himself financially by selling a secondhand car he had managed to acquire the year before, by collecting unemployment insurance, and by drawing a meager salary for his services as staff member.

after that they usually went to the drugstore, restaurant, or someone's house to eat and talk.

In contrast, the Eagles almost always moved as a group at the dance. They had a special corner where they collected after making a big show of being privileged to put their coats in the club room or the office where the junior board left theirs. They usually wore sweaters or jackets with their shirts and ties rather than sports coats like the junior board and they rarely danced fast dances. In between dances they would joke amongst themselves or go en masse for a coke or a smoke, down in the basement. Those with dates or girls they had picked up occasionally went with the group but more often stayed in "their corner" with their girls on their laps. And often the whole group stayed to help clean up as they could come in free the next week if they did. Afterwards those with pick-ups (usually only two or three) would "go for a neck"; those with steadies would deposit them and join the gang at the drugstore or milk bar.

Topics of conversation at these places or at any gathering of either group revolved largely around sports, girls, each other, the other group, agency activities, crime, local news, and past events of group life - in this case the Eagles referred almost entirely to troublemaking incidents while board members talked more about sports events and parties where they had been together. Both groups discussed television programs, records, and popular entertainers though this occurred more frequently with board members who also devoted much time to discussing manners, religion, and their work as well as their duties at the agency and its problems. The Eagles rarely mentioned

these subjects and generally discussed the police, family problems, summer parties of the past and future, and the big gang, though toward the end they would frequently talk about going back to school, going into the Navy, what kind of jobs they were going to apply for, and the utility of always causing trouble.

Board members did not associate in any way with the Eagles or the big gang (nor any other group for that matter though one or two of them had close friends who were either fringe members or who were not members at all). Both groups they viewed as immature and troublesome, the Eagles particularly immature and the big gang particularly troublesome if not actually dangerous. Property offenses committed by either group were held in contempt especially the more serious ones; crimes such as rape, murder, and selling or taking narcotics were deplored. Having engaged in similar activities as the Eagles, they felt somewhat more sympathetic toward them, sometimes even altruistic. Both groups, they believed, were jealous of their capacity for retaining their jobs, their position in the agency, and the community's consequent acceptance of them and respect for them.

The project they accepted with seriousness. In fact, they said they hoped to learn something from it and a few were slightly disturbed that the results would not necessarily be applied to practical situations. After these pilot interviews, most of them continued discussing the possible practical value of the study and its relationship to social welfare work - a field in which several members were quite interested; some even hoped eventually to become involved in it. A few of them discussed personal problems or religion.

CHARACTERS : THE EAGLES

- MAC: Aged 17. Born near East End; moved there when he was seven. Left school after eight years, having succeeded in passing the eighth grade. Dropped out before end of ninth grade before exams. Grades generally good. At the time of the pilot interviews had been working for five months as a machinist earning \$40 a week. Total number of jobs was four; average length of time - five months. Originally a Catholic, he changed to the United Church in 1949 when his mother changed. Like most of the Eagles he accepted the doctrine but stopped going to church at the age of 15. Both parents Yugoslavian. Divorced when he was about 11. Neither remarried. He resided with his father who was a construction worker; visited mother and two brothers once weekly. They lived in a town nearby; she supported them by taking in laundry. Was a founder of the Eagles in 1956.
- SHEP: Aged 18. Born in the City. Lived in East End for 13 years. Left school after successfully passing seven grades. Went to local trade school for a year but failed. Took another local trade course but failed it also. Was currently unemployed. Last job paid \$60 weekly. Since 1960 he had had six jobs; all carpentry; each lasting about five weeks. Accepted Catholicism but only went to church once every two months. Both parents from New Brunswick. Father was a salesman. Had three brothers and a younger sister. Oldest brother 19 apparently was never a member of big gang. Had been a member of the Eagles since spring of 1959.
- LEO: : Aged 17. Born in the City as were parents. Lived in East End for eight years. Left school after 11 years, having passed 10 grades successfully. Grades generally good. Had been junior clerk in office for seven months; received \$40 weekly. Only other job prior to that was for five months as an office boy. Accepted Catholicism and attended church weekly allegedly through boredom rather than spiritual interest. Both parents living. Father was a machinist. Had one younger brother and three younger sisters. Was a founder of the Eagles.
- DODGER: Aged 16-17. Born in England as were parents. Immigrated to East End when he was six. Left school after $7\frac{1}{2}$ years, having passed successfully the sixth grade. Had been enrolled in an evening technical school early in 1959 but left after several months. Had spent five months as a truck driver, two as a chef, and $2\frac{1}{2}$ as a photostat operator for which he was receiving \$25 a week. Was a member of the United Church, accepted its doctrine, but only went to church once a month. Father was a fire chief. Mother was a dietician. He had two younger sisters. Joined the Eagles in '58.

IRISH: Aged 18. Born in England as were his parents. Immigrated to a nearby community when he was 13. Left school after $9\frac{1}{2}$ years, having successfully completed the ninth grade. Grades were good to average until the last year. Had had five jobs, each lasting about five months. Was currently doing city maintenance work for \$65 a week. Believed in the Anglican doctrine but never went to church. Father was a sheet metal worker; his mother a housewife caring for two younger brothers and two younger sisters. Became a member of the Eagles in the summer of '59.

F.J.: Aged 17. Born in Nova Scotia as was his mother. Moved to a nearby community when he was 10. Left school after $10\frac{1}{2}$ years, having passed the ninth grade. Grades average. Had been a wrapper and reupholsterer for eight months each. Was a cutter receiving \$35 a week for two months when he was fired near the time of the project. Was unemployed at the time of the pilot interview. Father, born in Ontario, was a bus driver. He had one older brother and a younger sister. Had been a member of the Eagles since the summer of '59.

THE CLANGS: Born in East End and always lived in or near it. Both were Catholic, accepted their faith, and went to church every week. Father, born in Ireland, was a millwright; mother was a demonstrator at a department store.

JOCKO: Aged 16. Left school after $11\frac{1}{2}$ years, having passed successfully the eighth grade. Had spent three months in a trade school. Was first a wrapper for three months and then an usher for $2\frac{1}{2}$, for which he was earning \$43 a week. Planned to resign and return to trade school.

BEN: Aged 17. Left school after $9\frac{1}{2}$ years, having successfully completed the seventh grade. Enrolled in a trade school in Christmas of 1960. Had worked for two years on the week-ends as a carrier and had been employed full-time for three years at the same department store where his mother worked. Was receiving \$45 a week. Both became members of the Eagles in the spring of '59.

The Eagles were bound together by many mutual obligations, particularly money, almost identical interests, and similar backgrounds. Cliques in this group existed but were not very apparent. Mac, as the leader, was close to everyone except Ben whom he and Dodger disliked; he was least close to Jocko and Irish. Shep, Irish, and F.J. formed the only distinguishable clique though Dodger made it a point to be with or near Mac whenever possible; he also liked Jocko and F.J. very much. The feeling was not at all mutual in the case of F.J. Leo, although in the process of withdrawal from group activities, was tied closely to the group by his longterm friendship with Mac and Dodger. Ben was more or less accepted because he was Jocko's brother, but for reasons already given he dropped out of the group and the study. Members were controlled by direct ostracism, physical force occasionally, suspension, and elimination. Having decided after a long quarrel that no one was to be the leader, they strongly denied that they had one; they argued, to back the decision, that power corrupts and an authoritarian leader would enforce rules and leave the group open to threat by centralization.¹ Yet all of them looked to Mac to make decisions and to settle group quarrels. Moreover, they could plan something and exclude others but not Mac, and others' expulsion from a certain place made little difference to their attendance, but when Mac was barred they generally suffered with him.

In ranking qualities that they valued in a friend, the Eagles did not rate any given quality unanimously as most or least important. Also

1. This fear arose when some one wanted to sell them some goof-balls. The boy asked to be taken to the leader and apparently indicated that only he, should he exist, need be convinced and that the others would follow suit.

in contrast to the other group who felt that about half of the qualities were essential, they selected about three from the sixteen as being most important and thought that the others were important but not vital. Those three qualities were loyalty, trustworthiness, and courage; in each of these cases, all but two chose them as most important. Ranking close behind were personality, intelligence, a sense of humor, friendliness, and responsibility. Having money was viewed by six out of eight as being least important. Also unimportant were physical strength, sincerity, and good looks.

More revealing of their values were acts which they considered worthy of praise or punishment. Engaging in a fight was rewarded by consolation in case he lost or great excitement if he won. In either case he was bought something to eat or drink. Similarly rewarded were acts of bravery in the face of danger or acts of ingenious destruction. Informing, as distinct from bragging, was decidedly the worst offense and unless there were very special mitigating circumstances, was absolutely unforgivable and would require expulsion. Also unforgivable was addiction to or distribution of drugs and being too keen to commit serious crimes regularly. One provisional member was immediately dropped when they discovered that he wanted to steal cars "every night"; they thought this was unnatural and felt it would get them into too much trouble.

Despite their emphatic denial of the importance of money all of them made a point of paying for each other and anyone who failed to contribute a fair share over an extended period of time or who neglected to repay a specific debt was in serious trouble. Unless he had

no other redeeming feature, he would be tolerated but looked down upon and no one would give or lend him any money. Prospective members, however, have been denied membership for committing either of these offenses. And membership would definitely be denied for being cowardly or for appearing in any way dependent on one's parents; "parents were not asked permission for anything they were told". While these offenses were grave, they were forgivable provided that the prospect was otherwise desirable and was willing to change his ways.

What did they enjoy doing? Only Mac was seriously interested in sports. In fact he wished that he could convert the gang into a team but they were neither talented nor interested - though they were all anxious to form an agency sports club especially when it was denied them; "it would give them something to do". They liked to go to the movies but they rarely watched the films; even members of their own group who might have wished to see it could not stop the rest from being rowdy, cracking jokes, trying to pick up girls, constantly going in and out to smoke or to bowl downstairs. All of this activity was most frequent during romance scenes. War films and westerns were taken slightly more seriously but only when fighting actually occurred on the screen for they seldom followed the plot. Attending the dances was very important to them but most of them did not know how to jive and were "too shy to learn". One or two hardly danced at all and they were as restless at these dances as they were at the movies. Only two of them actually brought their girl friends to the dance. These two, Shep and Leo, spent about two or three evenings a week with them and occasionally took them to the movies on Fridays or Sundays when the gang went. They said that they did not like to walk the street but

that was what they spent much of their spare time doing - "hanging around": wandering from the snack bar to the chip stand to play mechanical games of chance and then over to the milk bar to play the pinball machine or read comics. And so it went two or three nights of the week, all day Saturday, and much of Sunday. When they were not with girls or out in the streets, they hung about a shack in back of Leo's house or until recently Mac's house. There they could drink and talk uninterrupted for hours.

Apart from staying in the shack or driving a car the only activity that they really seemed to enjoy was making trouble - as Shep put it, to do anything on the spur of the moment that would "bother people"; to plan such activities was "kidstuff". But there was no other subject which they liked to discuss more than their escapades, what they did for "kicks". Broadly, this consisted of drinking, fighting, vandalism, stealing, and pulling "crazy stunts". The nature and frequency of these activities will be described in full in the section on gangs.

The junior board, they felt, were "okay"; they even liked some of the individuals in it, though they knew that the group as a whole thought they were irresponsible troublemakers. The big gang they wanted to imitate but only in a limited way; the Eagles wanted to be better organized but were not keen on standing so far on the other side of the law. They knew the big gang laughed at them but felt that actually they were jealous of the Eagles' reputation. And they had annoyed the big gang tremendously on several occasions by getting them blamed for offenses they had committed.

Much of their waking, unemployed hours they spent "hanging around"

sometimes alone, usually with each other, and occasionally with girls. They spent very little time with their families, reading, or participating in any sports. They met regularly on Friday and Sunday evenings to go to the movies. Saturdays and Sundays during the day, they generally spent with each other to watch television, drink, talk, or "raise hell" for "kicks" - nothing really serious but something which will annoy the police and get attention. These occasions arose more frequently in the summertime when they went to other places for the whole week-end; they were almost always spontaneous, sometimes even accidental.

Like the junior board, they accepted the premises of the project and were endlessly curious about every aspect of it. And they were quick to admit that they enjoyed the increased attention they received because of it. Unlike the junior board, they seldom discussed anything serious after their interviews. About half of them said very little while the other half continued with great glee telling about particular times they had gotten into trouble.

THE ACTION

On March third rapport with the Eagles reached a peak. Since Mac, the leader, had been admitted to the movies (having been evicted the previous Friday) the gang was in particularly high spirits and afterwards made their first request; they wanted to go for a drive. Grateful for their recent co-operation, there seemed to be little reason not to oblige them. Half jokingly they suggested T... as a suitable place. When they discovered that they had a monopoly on knowledge of local geography, they "played it for what it was worth". After driving for about a half-hour without reaching the destination, it was obvious what had happened. The decision to go back to East End was immediately accepted and respected; in fact, it hardly interrupted their singing, reminiscing, and telling jokes. On the way back, I was counted one of the gang. And when they paid the gas, they expressed a great appreciation for the ride and going along with the joke.

Saturday the eighth Mac was expelled from the agency. The circumstances surrounding this event were most revealing. Upon arriving it was discovered that Andy had been drinking, something which he rarely did at all since he joined the board, let alone on Saturdays before the dance as it was against the rules. That he was a board member made the incident even more serious. Shortly afterwards about half the Eagles came in. No one would have known by their behavior that they had been drinking also. In their case, this was not unusual; they frequently drank in the afternoons before the dance. And many of the board members knew this but had tacitly agreed not to enforce the rule except in instances where the drinking party was creating a disturbance. So they

were genuinely surprised when Hank Hudson, the agency director, singled the Eagles out for questioning in public. Each one denied it and Hudson did nothing until he spoke to Mac who answered him "defiantly" in a loud voice. Hudson argued that Mac was always soft spoken unless he had been drinking, and called him downstairs to pronounce his suspension from the dance. The Eagles followed him and asked if this would affect the plans, suggested by Hudson himself, for a special weekly sports club for them. He said it would not but later changed his mind. He also had to change the punishment to expulsion after the Protestant School Board heard of the affair.

Needless to say, the whole episode created chaos. The junior board was furious; however much they disliked the Eagles personally, they knew that no one had done anything which called for applying the rule. Obviously someone outside themselves had informed Hudson. Moreover, they all knew that Andy had been drinking as well. Andy himself was livid with rage at the blatant discrimination involved and resigned from the board.¹ When they discovered that the informer was a new senior staff member, they were even more upset because they knew that he disliked the Eagles intensely and, they felt, had been constantly singling the group out for minor disciplinary measures.

Meanwhile the Eagles had returned from the street where they had attempted to follow Mac out of loyalty. But Mac had said he wanted to be alone and had ordered them back to the dance. Once inside, their sympathy for Mac reverted back into their initial anger and outrage.

1. The next time he was seen, though, he had consented to withdraw the resignation.

They wanted to take action immediately but did not know whom to take it against. Apart from Hudson's aggravating inconsistency, they did not blame him since they felt that he would not have taken the action unless he had been forced to and they knew that he could have expelled them all. Various hypotheses were put forward as to the identity of the informer. They finally agreed that it was Crew and started after him. When they discovered who it was in fact, they realized that there was nothing they could do though there was still some talk of a fight after the dance. In the end, they never were able to vent their feelings against the man. Someone, however, apparently had had his own revenge against me and smashed the headlight of my car. I learned several weeks later through Brian Saunders in whom Mac had confided that Mac himself had done it because I had made little effort to persuade Hudson to allow him back into the dance; but Mac never knew that I was aware of his guilt. In fact, subsequent evidence indicated that none of the gang knew he had done it either.

The following Monday Mac was scheduled for an interview about the gang's history. Apparently prepared for a scene he came with two others and demanded to know if I thought him guilty. He seemed satisfied with my answer in the negative and, after an outburst of indignation at having been singled out, proceeded with the interview. Toward the end of it he began wandering around the office and finally took some bolts from the filing cabinet. On the grounds that I would be denied use of the office if anything happened, I asked him to put them back and, when he did not, half jokingly took them from him. Later on he took something else. Failing to respond to pleas to return it or give it to me, I grabbed it out of his hands and in some rather strong

language ordered him to sit down, which he did. Quite amused by the little episode, Dodger commented that they had never before seen me lose my temper and implied that the stunt had been calculated to satisfy their curiosity. Perhaps this was the cause. However, when the remainder of the interview was concluded, Mac insisted on being the last one out, hinting that he might not leave at all. Apparently some kind of challenge or test of trust was involved, so I went in front of him; he followed immediately. Afterwards in the drugstore he was quite docile and friendly.

After the formal part of the junior board meeting the next Tuesday, Crew and Mitch began planning a triple date celebration of Crew's birthday the following Friday; they, Crew's closest friend who had a car, and three girls would go out dancing somewhere. Then it grew to include everyone present and consequently required a second car. My own car, obviously in incredibly bad condition, was disqualified on the grounds that it would never make the journey. Clearly one would have to be rented. They knew that I had driven a rented car during the coldest part of the winter and, being the only driver sufficiently old enough to rent one, I agreed to do it and let them pay for the gas as they had suggested.

Because Friday nights were usually spent with the Eagles and because they had all gone to the movies on Thursday the previous week, I called Dodger and asked which night they were going out, indicating Thursday would be more convenient if they had no preference. He said that was fine and I presumed he would discuss it with the rest of the group and let me know if they preferred Friday. Only half of them were there

and Dodger said the others had decided at the last minute not to come. All of them were depressed since Saturday was approaching and they were torn between their loyalty to Mac and their desire to go to the dance - in spite of the fact that Mac had generously ordered them to go without him. Partly to cheer them up but mainly to avoid any accusations of discrimination, I suggested that we pick up Mac after the dance and go some place in the car. Everyone but Dodger declined because they were going on a drunken binge. Dodger evidently had not been invited and asked me if the rest of the group could go somewhere for the evening where Mac could go, suggesting that it would be awkward for them to ask Mac to join them after having been to the dance. He promised that they would "pay the gas, wear ties and white shirts, and be very orderly". So I agreed.

Friday went according to plan except for one thing - the location. Although the chosen place had been called to make certain that it would be open, it was not. Through a series of inaccurate directions given to us to nearby places which might be suitable, we ended up near the border. With F... so near and definitely open, there was little point in going elsewhere.

Saturday afternoon Dodger 'phoned to make arrangements for that evening. He also said that they had all been arrested the night before. Blind, drunk, they had stolen some food from a restaurant, uttered some obscenities to a nurse, and nearly got into a fight with a man who came to defend her. After paying bail, all but one had been released immediately after the arrest. Since neither the nurse nor the man decided to press charges, they eventually let the other one go as well.

Finally he begged me to try and persuade Hudson to change his mind about Mac. In view of Mac's verbal determination not to go no matter what, it seemed pointless unless he indicated that he would in fact attend the dance, given the opportunity. Dodger said he would ask Mac to call me. By later afternoon he had not called. Since I had to telephone Hudson about something else, I went ahead and asked him about Mac. As might have been expected, he said there was nothing he could do about it; the school board had been informed of the incident and would not admit Mac to any function.

At 7:30 Dodger 'phoned again. This time, Mac, Shep, and Leo were with him,¹ and some of them had been drinking. He asked if I would take them in my car to some place which was quite a long distance. I explained that my own car was not capable of the journey and suggested going in a rented car if they wanted to pay for the gas. He reported my statement to the group and came back to the 'phone absolutely furious, saying that I had driven my own car on the night before and should do so again that night. At first they refused to believe that the car had been rented. By the time they were willing to believe that this might be so, other issues had become involved. Initially convinced that I was discriminating against them, they accused me of not caring about them and brought up the fact that I had spent the past three Saturday evenings after the dance with the junior board and that one of them had been Dodger's birthday. Secondly, Shep felt

1. It is significant that these people constituted the founders of the group and consequently felt the greatest loyalty to it and to Mac. It is equally significant that they, not Mac, did most of the talking.

that all of them should be informed personally as to when I was coming down and was annoyed that all arrangements had been made through Dodger.

After explaining carefully why these things had happened, I pointed out that I had tried to be fair by agreeing to Dodger's plan to take those who were not engaged to some sort of dance hall. This only added to his anger since he had not been consulted about that either. Apparently Dodger denied having proposed the plan and they did not know whom to believe; they decided on me and asked me to repeat the arrangement saying that they would "fix Dodger" if he was lying. In view of their present temper this could have proved quite dangerous. More important, the charge of discrimination, when and if understood from my point of view, would probably be dropped; whereas informing was never forgotten. So I refused and stated why. They accepted the statement and then they asked to be taken to F... I explained that we had only gone the night before by accident and that it really was much too far. The reaction was so violent that I tried to postpone going anywhere. Then came the threat; no trip, no interview. Barring giving up the project, I had no alternative. At that point Dodger managed to say without the others hearing that they had no money and warned me not to go. When Shep came back to the 'phone, I agreed to go if they could pay for the car rental and gas as I had no money. Suddenly they no longer wanted to go or argue about anything else and, as if nothing had happened, said they would meet me at the dance.

It was clear that a number of issues had been involved and that, from their point of view, they had good reasons for believing that I

had discriminated against them. First, they had been misinformed about the car as well as the intended destination of the previous evening. Second, Dodger had not consulted some of the members, namely Shep, about meeting on Thursday and had neglected to tell me that Mac would have to have been excluded since he always reserved Thursdays for visiting his mother. Third, his failure to consult or inform the gang about the Saturday night arrangement prevented them from realizing that I had made a special gesture towards them and his subsequent denial of suggesting the terms for the arrangement forced them to choose between believing him or me. That they chose me, made him feel awkward with them and me.

Fourth, I had made at least two errors of judgment. Staying with the junior board after the dances was the only means available to distribute observation time evenly since I had been unable to attend two of their meetings and a third was called off. I should have realized that Saturday night in their minds was special. That one of those nights was Dodger's birthday and that they had counted on my coming made my actions seem all the more unforgivable. By the time that Dodger had asked me to go to "a party" that night, I had already promised to observe the other group. Apparently the Eagles never knew Dodger had neglected to say it was his birthday. Also it was a mistake to rely exclusively on Dodger to find out where the gang was meeting even though those at the introduction had suggested it because "he was the only one who had a telephone". That this was not so was unknown to me until later and the leader's not having one was unavoidably unfortunate.

It was also clear that there were many issues underlying those

verbalized on the telephone. First, liquor always intensified their feelings and made them more vociferous. Second, no doubt they had begun to feel the burden of the large bail paid the night before, previously overshadowed by the excitement of their activities and being arrested. Third, they were well aware that they were going to suffer from Mac's expulsion; either it was going to split the group or it would deprive all of them of participating in the only social event available to them in the vicinity. After their initial anger at the informer had subsided, they blamed Mac for their conflict between loyalty and desire. And once re-angered by the misinformation, it was easy to use the incident as a means of venting their feelings stimulated by the approaching moment when they would have to choose. Thus, they stood united against a common enemy. Having shown their loyalty in defeating it by threat, they could retract the impossible demand without losing face and go to the dance without feeling so guilty.

What happened at the dance supports this interpretation. Although I was willing to take all the blame for not realizing that my actions might appear discriminating, they apologized profusely for "speaking out of turn". After they offered to shake hands signifying mutual understanding, they spoke freely of their concern for Mac's jealousy of their going to the dance and being with me; apparently he was beginning to consider me as a rival to his leadership. I do not know if this was the irrational outcome of his recent loss in prestige or whether this was a deliberate move calculated to unite the group. In any case, the fact was that he did; and having just re-confirmed my status of group membership, they viewed it as a serious problem knowing that future decisions about Saturday night would be all the more difficult

to make. Moreover, to complicate matters even further, the rest of the group, the rank and file who knew something but not what had happened, made a similar re-confirmation, independently, after the dance.

The next time the group was observed Mac said he still would not consent to being interviewed and left to meet his closest friend, Rob, the original leader of the group who had returned unexpectedly from the Navy. The rest of the group indicated that they were quite willing to be interviewed and thought that Mac was being unfair; however, they could hardly consent against Mac's expressed wishes. Also, they were upset because Mac had abandoned them to meet his old friend. They suggested that both problems would be solved by taking the group, including Mac and Rob, on the excursion that had never materialized. It seemed better than giving up the project or deliberately trying to split the group, so I agreed. The drive succeeded in easing the tension between Mac and the group as well as that between him and me. Moreover, the infamous Rob apparently had been transformed by the Navy and was immediately sympathetic to the aims of the project. During the week I was able to do two favors for Mac and by Friday, he said he would "consider" being interviewed. By this time also Rob had become more familiar with the project and was quite displeased by his friend's behavior toward the interviews. The next day he spoke to Mac about it and Mac called to make an appointment.

In view of Mac's sustained animosity, one might question the validity of his testimony. However, there are several reasons for believing that it was more frank and thorough than it might have been without the conflict. First and most important, within their own

system of values, it is a cardinal sin not to repay what they define as a debt regardless of their feelings for a person. And Rob, whose opinion he respected above all others, had convinced him that he owed me something - not because of anything I had done for him but because of his behavior toward me about the interview. Second, from the beginning of the project and in contrast to the other group, they had always tended to act existentially - giving themselves entirely to what they felt at the moment and they were incapable of hiding or disguising their feelings. They may never explain the cause of their feelings but one knew almost immediately what they were. And however changing those feelings were, most of them were ultimately guided by a deep sense of right and wrong as well as ^asurprising, if delayed, capacity for objective self-criticism. Mac simply admitted that he could no longer accept his own reasons for not being interviewed, and once converted, was obliged to be as co-operative as possible.

From the day of that interview with Mac, the 17th of April, until the end of the month when the project was to be completed, I virtually lived in East End. Since many of the Eagles were unemployed by this time it was possible to interview in the daytime but the school board refused to allow further use of the agency's office for the purpose on the grounds that it would disturb the school's routine so Rob offered the use of his house. All the interviews except one went as scheduled and everyone was most co-operative. During that time it was possible to become better acquainted with many of the mothers, especially Rob's, and to see the community as a whole. And because the interviews were at Rob's house almost all the time in between was spent with him and the delinquents; rapport was the best it had ever been. Moreover,

their lives were no longer so simple and carefree and they were genuinely concerned about their future.

Shep had not only lost a temporary job as delivery boy that he had managed to secure despite his shame at doing so, his father had expelled him from his home. Already, jealous of his father's differential respect for his older brother he quarrelled with the man over some new act of discrimination. His father hit him so he hit his father back. He tried living with Mac for a while but Mac's father threatened to expel them both if he did not leave. In the end he went to a cheap boarding house. Mac had also lost his job during that week. That combined with his expulsion from the agency, his recent arrest, and his father's threat convinced his mother that the time had come for him to live with her. Although she lived nearby, Mac knew his days with the gang were numbered since she planned to send him back to school and secretly he wanted to go.

Leo was contemplating marriage and would complete his withdrawal from the gang - adding another blow to its shaken unity. And Irish suddenly became more serious. The days before, during, and after his arrest he had not gone home nor slept. Although he had already broken his probation by not reporting and probably in other ways as well, he seemed particularly upset about his arrest, and even asked Hudson to drive him home after the dance, a very unusual request coming from him. He began seeing a certain girl rather frequently and made a deliberate effort to keep out of trouble and to become friendly with Rob whom he respected a great deal. He too was out of work at that time and was considering going into the Navy as a means of straightening himself out.

The fact that all of their problems came at the same time seemed to be entirely coincidental. Their attitude toward them, however, was strongly affected by Rob who was greatly concerned about the future of his friends. He made them admit publicly what they had confessed in their interviews or privately to each other - that they were to blame for their ills and that the only way to alleviate them was to adopt a responsible attitude toward life. Then, too, answering the questionnaire must have forced them to take stock of themselves systematically - to assess their way of life and their future prospects.

Regrettably the atmosphere of mutual appreciation and sympathy did not last long. Dodger perhaps wilfully destroyed it or, at the least, aggravated the processes which were to destroy it. Recently he had had most of his teeth taken out which must have upset him psychologically as well as physically. Also he was one of the few left in the group who still had his job; this automatically excluded him from all the daytime activities in which the rest of them were then engaged. He began making excessive demands on Mac by insisting that Mac inform him of everything that went on while he was not there and that Mac personally invite him to all group activities in the evening. The relationship between Dodger and Mac had always been rather one-sided and these actions began to irritate Mac tremendously - on top of all the other problems he had.

Then Mac himself began to show more signs of jealousy. He seemed suddenly to resent the amount of time Rob spent with me not only because of the actual amount involved but, more important, because Rob's association with me represented his refusal to revert back to the irresponsible,

careless way of life they had shared before Rob left. Rob had obviously changed and while one part of Mac wanted to emulate this change, the other wanted to destroy it. Mac, like many of the others in the group, was going through a momentous inner conflict; his growing doubts as to the utility of his present orientation paradoxically intensified temporarily his desire to maintain it. In view of Mac's ambivalence and his respect and attachment to Rob, he could hardly attack the real issue. I was the perfect scapegoat. If Dodger did not instigate these feelings of jealousy to protect his own interests, he certainly encouraged them.

Until Saturday Dodger's feelings had been obvious but inactive and Mac had made no demands of Rob. On the 22nd, however, Dodger apparently convinced the nucleus that they should go somewhere that evening but his sense of insecurity was so great that he had to disguise the source of the idea and somehow make Mac invite him. As the invitation was not forthcoming, he did not come to the appointed meeting place and he did not inform the rank and file as he said he would. They were nowhere to be found and, having been convinced of the plan, Mac was determined that the group should go anyway. Of those who had been left out only Dodger and Jocko, a rank and file member, were upset about it. And they both blamed me. The two others understood that we had either looked for them or had heard they had other plans.

The final week of the project started off smoothly without incident though the tension between Dodger and Mac and Rob was growing rapidly. Dodger was now excluded by Mac from some of the evening group meetings and Mac's comments about Rob's spending time away from him had lost their joking quality. Mac's very insistence on maintaining their re-

lationship on its old terms was perhaps too tempting for Rob to encourage; intent upon retaining his new values, he seemed to withdraw even further from Mac's grasp.

The tension came to a climax on Sunday, the thirtieth. I had stopped going to the dance for several weeks and thought it only fair to the other group to attend the one on the twenty-ninth as it was to be my last. Moreover, most of the Eagles had dates and wanted to go as well. Saturday afternoon, unbeknown to me, Mac made the mistake of forcing Rob to make a choice between going to the dance and staying with him. In the heat of the argument that ensued Mac went even further and put the choice on different terms: was Rob going to the dance with me or was he staying with him? Realizing perhaps for the first time the extent of Mac's jealousy and feeling sorry for his whole predicament, Rob calmed him down enough for him to accept a compromise; he would go the dance for its beginning but spend the rest of the evening with Mac. In this way, he could maintain his independence yet show Mac that he wanted to please him - despite his growing resentment of Mac's demands and attitude toward life.

At the dance then junior board made much of the project's coming to an end. On stage they presented a record which they had all signed. The signees were to meet afterwards at the only dance hall nearby. Rob came as well. Having been somewhat disgusted with Mac's inebriated bitterness,¹ he had returned to the dance and signed the record. Those

¹. Moreover, Mac had told him previously that he had not broken my headlight. Although Rob could not bring himself to ask Mac directly he realized that night that Mac had lied.

of the Eagles who were there were not friendly with the junior board and had not been asked to sign. In any case, they had been barred from the place since they had wrecked it a year ago.

Monday, Jocko did not come for his interview. That night after interviewing the last of the junior board, the Eagles were observed. Although nothing specific was said about Saturday Dodger and Mac were particularly hostile especially toward Rob. Mac, according to Rob, felt betrayed by Saturday's events and with Dodger's assistance had managed to gain the support of the Eagles present, about half the group. Clearly some kind of explosion was imminent. Because of this and the general display of animosity, I refused to take them for a drive unless they calmed down. Apparently annoyed, they said they were going bowling, asked Rob if he was coming, and left when he said no. Rob, Johnny (another of the original members), and I went into the milk bar. Shortly afterwards there were shouts outside and the car was missing. I returned to the milk bar to get Johnny and Rob. By the time we walked outside again there it stood on the sidewalk near the building, the hood open with some of its parts on the sidewalk beside it. Fearing that they had damaged the car, I spoke very strongly to them. Rob was so angry he could not speak; he simply turned his back on them and walked toward the car. As he did so Mac asked him if he was going to help me put the pieces back or go with them. Rob continued walking toward the car without answering and Johnny followed him. Mac had staked everything on that gamble counting heavily on the fact that Rob would have to make the decision in public. When Rob walked away everyone knew that the bonds of that friendship had been broken irreparably. Defeated and embarrassed, Mac signalled to the group, and walked in the opposite

direction.

The next day Jocko called and, oddly enough, consented to being interviewed. When he arrived it was obvious that it had not been his own idea. The interview went very badly. It is doubtful that he lied in any way but he restricted most of his answers to "yes" and "no". That night I went round to thank the members of both groups for all their co-operation and told them goodbye. Of the delinquents only Mac and Dodger refused to accept my apology for losing my temper the night before and to apologize themselves for their own behavior. Apart from them and Jocko who was still blaming me for having been left out the Friday before, they seemed genuinely sorry that the project had come to its end.

Until the middle of this project the Eagles were a cohesive group oriented to making trouble. Mac was their leader though he and the other original members still viewed Rob as the real leader of the group even though he was not present and did not know half its members. At the end of the project they were no longer led by the memory of Rob; the friendship between Rob and the founders had been irreparably broken; the very structure of the then present group was seriously threatened, if not altogether split, and they were quite uncertain as to whether they wished to continue their troublemaking activities, at least as a primary feature of group life.

These changes were a product of several events and forces. Outstanding was the initial blow to the structure of the Eagles - Mac's expulsion from the agency which forced the group to choose between two things which were extremely important to them. Either way they were

going to suffer and ultimately they blamed Mac for it, even though it was clear that they had been discriminated against. Whatever caused the nucleus of the group, those closest to Mac, to make that threat over the telephone, all of them except Mac felt that they had no legitimate grounds for doing so and regretted their behavior immediately. Perhaps because of that incident (it was certainly immediately after that), Mac began to blame me for his failure to get back into the dance (despite his assertion that he would not return if he was allowed), refused to be interviewed, and viewed me as a threat to his leadership and consequently a threat to the unity of the group. Clearly none of the others shared this view as there was no real basis for it whatsoever. Either it was purely a rationalization born out of Mac's insecurity or the rest of the group gave him reason to be jealous by using the project as an excuse to attend the dances.

In any case Mac's refusal to be interviewed hardly served to cement his relations to the group; whatever their reasons, the rest of the group obviously wanted the project to continue and were disturbed because Mac's decision forced them to refuse also. More damaging was Mac's insulting attempt to isolate Rob from the rest of the group; this action not only increased the distance between Mac and the others but also at the same time made them jealous. After these issues were more or less resolved by Mac's consent to be interviewed and Rob's integration into the group (at least physically), came the final blow or set of forces which would make them re-evaluate the long term fruitfulness of their orientation. First, the fact that all of them were suddenly and simultaneously without jobs and/or homes or becoming seriously involved with a girl forced them to examine their future plans. Second,

Rob shocked them by being so different from what they expected; the effect of his new outlook on life was so impressive and appealing that even some of the new members sought him out for advice regarding their future. Then, third, answering the questionnaire made them examine their style of life. Finally, they were at an age when they had had enough experience with employment without education and/or specialized training to realize that they could not rise very high financially without one type of education or the other. Their status of unemployment no doubt had much to do with this realization. Since virtually all of them were unemployed, they could no longer support each other in a time of need as they had in the past.

Whatever conclusions they eventually reached is unknown. Just before the project ended, however, the Eagles seemed much less inclined to make trouble than they ever had. Of course this may in part have been caused by a lack of money to spend on liquor. But another indication that they were truly entering a period of transition was the fact that they began discussing each other's problems, seriously in public or in the same way that they had previously reserved for discussion between one or two of them. Moreover, they had just begun to criticize the advantages of living to cause trouble and such heavy dependence on group activity. Lastly, almost all of them said in their interview that they were going to drop out of the gang or that they expected it to break up shortly. It looked as though the gang was slowly and quietly breaking up; each one appeared to be gradually drifting toward a different path from the other.

To some of the group this was very painful. Dodger, fearing for

his friendship with Mac, and Mac, fearing for his friendship with Rob, were perhaps the most upset by it and each began to make impossible demands on the person whose friendship they thought that they were losing. The circle became vicious when Mac started ignoring Dodger's demands and Rob began withdrawing from Mac. It seemed inevitable that the three of them could not continue their respective relationships as they had in the past. The climax came when Mac led the group to tamper with my car and demanded publicly that Rob choose between going with him or staying with me. Whether this attempt to unite the group against a common enemy was successful in the long run is not known for certain but further correspondence has verified that Mac and Rob have permanently parted as friends and indicates that at least part of the group was still together as late as the winter of 1962,¹ though F.J. died in a motor cycle accident in early '62 and Mac has more or less withdrawn from the troublemaking activities of the group. My involvement in the severing of this relationship between Mac and Rob, the at least temporary weakening of the group's structure, and the apparent dissatisfaction with troublemaking as a principal activity is, I believe, purely superficial and incidental. These processes were set in motion by specific events arising from the character of the community and the group interacting with each other. Finally, I do not believe that the events which occurred during the project affected negatively the nature or validity of the empirical data.

1. According to this communication from the agency director, a rumor circulated in late May of 1961 about youths in the agency program caused the School Board to stop agency functions altogether. Although this may have disappointed the group, it must have solved their conflict resulting from Mac's expulsion. In any event, they pooled their money to rent a room for collective use as a sort of "hang out" and for parties.

PART III PROJECT ANALYSIS

The Troublemakers and the Junior Board

In the attempt to paint full portraits of the behavior, thoughts, and attitudes of both groups, all raw material has been combined and will be presented in the following chapters. Special attention will be paid to differences between the groups, responses to particularly important questions, and certain background factors. The final chapter will try to bring together conclusions from the empirical data and those of the theorists discussed in Part I.

CHAPTER VIII

GANG LORE AND POLICE LAW

GANGS

The questionnaire section on gang membership was handled differently from other sections. From observation it was learned that all the subjects had been members of several different gangs or groups prior to becoming Eagles or board members. Consequently it was essential to obtain the historical sequence of group membership for each individual. To do this each subject was asked the same sequence of questions with reference to each gang of which he had been a member. Rather than present the chronological order of responses, it will be more useful to give the chronological order of gang memberships, derived from responses to the questionnaire section on gangs and data obtained from interviewing the leaders about the history of their respective gangs. After an analysis of these histories, the current values of the two groups will be discussed with emphasis on the code of the Eagles and factors influencing the gang. Finally, the effect of the gang on the individual will be considered.

Before describing the histories of gang memberships for the individuals in each group, it is necessary to note the amorphous nature of the infamous big gang. From all accounts this gang was clearly a near group as described by Yablonsky. Its size varied from 15 to 200 depending on the circumstances for its meeting. There was a small nucleus of about 15 or 20, which was composed of hardened delinquents and criminals and was considerably larger during the height of the "waves" of delinquency. Apart from this nucleus there were numerous attachments whose activities varied enormously. Some of these attachments were merely drinking groups, others were more interested in fighting, a few indulged in both drinking and fighting; still others thrived on various

forms of stealing, and some were drug addicts. These attachments, fairly cohesive groups in themselves, could go for considerable lengths of time without meeting each other, especially during the winter. Again this was less true during peak periods of delinquency as well as during periods when the agency was closed.

Any individual from 13 or 14 upwards could become a member of one of these attachments and thereby the big gang. The main (in fact only) requirements for membership were toughness and secrecy. An individual or an attachment could decline to participate in any raid, offense, or stunt called by the nucleus without damaging acceptance - though "goody-goodies" were definitely not tolerated. Usually, however, if an attachment was around at the time it would consent to participate, especially if the activity in question was fighting. Less acceptable, though prevalent, were vandalism and sex orgies. Most offenses requiring skill or timing were not spontaneous but planned and involved only a small number of individuals at any given time. Perhaps the most salient feature of belonging to the big gang was that an individual could be a member indefinitely without committing offenses more serious than drinking under age, fighting, and occasionally minor forms of vandalism. Equally important, though, was the fact that members were never fully informed of the more serious offenses committed by decidedly delinquent and criminal factions. These two facts explain why board members could have very different experience with and impressions of the activities of the big gang.

Nearly all board members belonged to non-delinquent groups before they joined the big gang or, to be more precise, an attachment of it. Most native East Enders belonged to a large group of boys and girls

called the Guards after the street on which many of them lived. Its activities included playing games and sports, hanging around, and visiting each other's homes. Sport and Andy were the only board members who did not choose the Guards or a similar non-delinquent group for their first gang. At eight Sport joined a local group (where he was then living) called the Tigers who "fought for exercise and did a bit of troubleshootin' on the side". He remained in this group until he was 11 when he moved to another neighborhood and joined another gang that emphasized "clean fun". He was only in this one for a year before he moved again to settle in East End. For four years he was not a member of any group. Hudson attributes this to local prejudice. According to him, those first few years in the community were very difficult for the boy. He was always getting into fights¹ but apparently was not involved with any of the delinquent activities of the big gang or any other until after he returned from the Navy at the age of 18.

That Sport joined the big gang at 18 was somewhat unusual because most of the others joined it at 14 or 15, though Crew did not become a member until he was 17 and J.T. until he was 22. Considering the diverse nature of the big gang, it is necessary to explain which attachment they belonged to or rather what type member they were.² Mitch and Red dropped

1. These fights may have been purely a means of combatting race prejudice but Sport, as his name implies, has always been very keen on a number of sports, including boxing. This in turn may have been determined by his color but the boy was quite talented in this field and might have had such an interest in any case.

2. What type attachment Sport belonged to is not known for certain. Although he hinted to everyone that he was a leader of one of the most delinquent factions, even his peers doubted this boast. Most likely he participated primarily in fighting and petty stealing activities, though there is some suggestion that he was involved in a car theft.

out of the Guards to join the big gang - Mitch at 15 because he was "bored"; Red at 14 because he "wanted " to offend his father. Red deliberately became involved with one of the more delinquent factions; drinking, fighting, car stealing, and causing trouble were its main activities. He remained in the group for two-and-a-half to three years and left it at the age of 17 $\frac{1}{2}$ because he "was scared of getting into too much trouble". After that he and a small group of like-minded souls formed a fringe group, "the Inebriates", and restricted their activities to drinking though when drunk at parties they gained a reputation for damaging property. This membership lasted for a year when he was elected Treasurer of the agency junior board.

Mitch joined a similar attachment but apparently he was not involved in any car theft. His group, according to him, caused "trouble - sometimes just mischief, sometimes vandalism". He left it after a year because it was "too fast". Between that time and the time that he was elected President to the junior board (about a year) he vacillated from one group to another mostly because of girls. He rejoined the Guards who had "become more mature" but "girl problems" made him drop out after four months. Until he started going steady with a certain girl two months later he "hung around" with the big gang. Apparently this girl introduced him to her own church group nearby and he stayed a member of that group as long as he dated her. It was shortly after that (when he was 17) that he became president of the agency in September 1959.

Andy and Crew were also members of the big gang for one year only. For Andy, aged 14 at the time, it was the first group he had ever joined. He was perhaps the least identified with the more delinquent members of

any faction of the big gang. In fact, his activities in the big gang were confined to "sports, dances, and parties"; his attachment broke up "because of marriage of its members" but, he added "it was gettin' pretty wild and I was goin' to get out any way". Crew became a part-time member of the big gang at 17. His faction was very similar in its emphasis on parties though the drinking was more serious and often involved car racing, fighting, and "pullin' crazy stunts" such as calling policemen for false alarms and so on. Like Andy, Crew left his faction because "it cost too much - you get a bad name for nothin'". "Others were rapin' girls. Goin' to work, people ask questions about it and associate you with it - it wasn't worth it so I got out."¹

From 14 - 19 J.T. was a member of two school groups in which there were "parties and sports - not troublemaking". Not long after he moved to East End he joined the "Inebriates" and "drank to show off". He remained in this group until it broke up through its members getting married. After that he joined a "fightin' and drinkin'" faction of the big gang but left it after a year because there was "too much fightin' and troublemakin'". As soon as he broke away he was asked to be on the junior staff of the agency.

Rex was in the big gang for $2\frac{1}{2}$ years. In his native country from five to twelve he was a member of a camping group that was distinctly non-delinquent. When he arrived in East End the next year he immediately

1. Crew's attachment was quite small (about 4) but on the week-ends they went to drink at the same out-of-town "hot spots" where several other factions were involved in obviously more delinquent activities than drinking, fighting, and car racing. This explains why he could be so easily associated with those activities without having had anything to do with them.

became involved with a group of French-speaking "toughs" who lived nearby. As soon as he realized what they were he dropped out and joined a non-delinquent agency group where he stayed until he was 15. At 15 he met a boy who was a fringe member of a big gang attachment. Like Crew and Andy he was only a part-time or week-end member. He and the other boy used to go out of town at the week-ends to the beer halls where the big gang debauched; but apart from drinking, fighting, and "datin' tramps", he remained quite uninvolved with its more seriously delinquent activities. He dropped out at 17 $\frac{1}{2}$ when he was forced by his girl friend to choose between herself and the gang.

It is clear from these boys' accounts that at the worst most of them were fringe members of small fringe groups associated with the big gang. That most of them were members for only a year or so is most revealing. More important only Sport and Red were highly involved with delinquent activities other than drinking, fighting, and minor vandalism. Finally, that every one of them left because the gang was getting into too much trouble is perhaps the most significant fact of all. The Eagles had very different histories.

Unlike the junior board who were members of non-delinquent groups until they were 14 and 15 (or even older), the Eagles were full-fledged members of delinquent groups by the time most of them were 12 and 13. And several had participated in minor forms of delinquency before that. F.J. started stealing in a minor way at the ripe age of seven and Mac indicated that he was not entirely innocent before he joined the original group of Eagles. In Great Britain Irish used to stay away from home until very late hours quite frequently; he also referred more than once

to having stolen a bicycle in his late childhood as though this was a very significant event for which he felt much guilt and concern.

Apparently the main group around Irish's first residence in Canada was a gang similar to the big gang in East End in that it was composed of some 300 or 400 members which were grouped into factions. Unlike the big gang, though, this group (despite its amorphous nature) was fairly well organized and was stealing cars and other things on a large scale. Irish, then aged 13, took part in this stealing and fighting for about a year and a half until he was caught and sent to a reform school where he met F.J. Also at 13 F.J. had joined a neighborhood group of semi-delinquents who fought, raided houses, robbed stores, and broke things (windows, lampposts, etc.) - all of which he found rather dull and unexciting. A year later he moved and joined another group more to his liking. "We really did get into trouble", he boasted. Apparently the second group participated in much the same activities as the first group but on a much larger scale. The next year his father recommended him for reform school where he stayed for a year and like Irish was released on probation. Both boys joined the Eagles almost immediately after they were released.

Shep and Jocko also joined their first delinquent gangs at 13. After moving into a new neighborhood in East End Shep became involved with a small group of boys (about 18) who drank heavily, fought, and stole cars; Shep was not allowed to be in on "such big deals as swipin' cars" but his older friends found his small size quite useful and "let him" break into places (transoms, cellar windows, and the like) for which they were too large. By the time he was 15, the gang was beginning

to break up because most of its members had acquired girl friends. Moreover, Shep's parents "clamped down" because he was drinking too much. Their efforts were not very effective, however, for he soon joined another group of older boys and began to drink regularly three to four nights a week, though he did cease some of his thieving activities. This gang was also broken up by "broad's wantin' to get married". Immediately after that he joined the Eagles. Jocko was slightly less delinquent. His gang played sports, "hung around", broke windows, etc. He was only in it for six months before his family took to the East End area. For about a year he did not belong to a gang. Then at 15 he, too, joined the Eagles, who by this time had quite a history.

It all started with Rob, a boy called Johnny, and Mac, who had been friends since they were seven and eight but who did not become close until they were 11 and 12. At that time they formed a group with Leo and several others and started spending their summers at the quarry. Here they would ride trains, steal dynamite, swim, cook out, raid shacks, and play games. In the winter months most of their time was spent "raising hell around the neighborhood". This included drinking, ringing doorbells, playing pool, swinging on cotton bales, stealing cord, and other very minor items, "teachin' little kids of eight and nine 'the trade'," cutting clotheslines, throwing fruit, and garbage at passing cars (especially police ones), and breaking windows.

In May of 1959 Rob joined the Navy. Within three months most of the others had dropped out, leaving a nucleus of Mac, Leo, and Dodger who had joined early in 1959. Shortly afterwards they decided to expand. This they accomplished by recruiting for members. Shep and the Clang

brothers were the first new members; F.J. and Irish joined a few months later. By tacit consent they decided eight was a sufficiently large number and stopped looking for new members. Not so tacitly or harmoniously settled was the question of leadership which they finally solved as was stated earlier by agreeing not to have an official leader; unofficially, of course, Mac emerged as their leader and policy maker on the basis of his popularity. Having settled these issues, they were free to continue the activities which the original group had established in its later years as acceptable. By the time it had partly disbanded in May delinquent activities had increased in number and had become more serious in nature as well as frequency.

Drinking was one of their favorite pasttimes. Most of them drank whenever they could afford to buy the liquor and frequently they drank when they could not. One or two of them, notably Mac and until about a month before the project F.J., drank a lot during the week by themselves. Otherwise most of them waited until the week-ends; Friday nights both winter and summer; Saturday afternoons but not Saturday nights in the winter until the end of the study; Saturday afternoons and nights out of town in the summer; Sundays were optional, though Sunday afternoon drinking in the summer was frequent. When their drinking was not diverted by the movies or the dances, they usually drank until they were ill. If they wanted to stay at any particular place they would be relatively quiet - dancing, talking, and listening to the music. If they were bored (as they were at the movies and sometimes at dance halls), terribly drunk, or angry they could make no end of trouble being rowdy, breaking things, and getting into fights. And whenever they drank they invariably created some kind of disturbance en route to

the place or going home.

Fighting was their next most frequent activity and considerably more effective than making trouble. They fought several times a month in the winter, more often in the summer. Their fights were seldom gang fights as such; they just usually occurred with individuals from other gangs who happened to say or do the wrong thing at the wrong time. Sometimes the fights were spontaneous and more or less friendly over some trivial matter; other times they were calculated from revenge. Often the Eagles by themselves or with another gang would stage a fight with the object of wrecking a place or simply of creating a disturbance and getting attention. This explains why they were barred from all but two eating houses, the nearest local theater, and all local dance halls and bars but one which was mostly frequented by regular groups of hard-drinking males whom they did not dare anger. Moreover Mac's father and local policemen were often there.

Next to drinking and fighting, stealing was their most frequent delinquent activity. Most of the time they stole small things - magazines, a pair of gloves, a pen - anything except money that they decided they wanted. Sometimes it was planned because they needed the object or because they were annoyed with its owner. Sometimes they would actually use the object, other times they would store it or throw it away. Stealing such objects was taken for granted and not usually viewed as exciting unless there were special circumstances surrounding the theft like the time they went in a big department store in the city. They often stole from this store but on this occasion one of them managed to start a motorcycle on display and began to drive it around

the floor. In the havoc it created, the others jammed their pockets with candy, sports equipment, and anything they could carry. Another time half of them started playing football in the middle of the store with the same object in mind.

About five or six times a year they stole cars. And although Mac had outlawed it since Leo had been caught and punished so severely, they had already stolen three that year. Stealing cars was always carefully planned, though not necessarily very far in advance. They would take the car and go for a drive, find some place to drink, and then return it, leaving it exactly as they had found it. Girls were never allowed to go with them on such journeys as the penalty would be more serious should they be caught; also they were less likely to keep the theft a secret. Much more often they stole objects from cars, especially ariels and hubcaps. And all truck drivers had learned to lock their vehicles when they were loading or delivering. Bicycles were also stolen by several members. Only in a very few cases did they steal large sums of money or big things such as expensive jewelry although it was for the latter that Irish was sent to reform school. (F.J. never divulged to anyone why he was sentenced to spend two and a half years in the same place.)

Counting all the time that small items were stolen, vandalism was not nearly as frequent. However, they appeared to enjoy telling about this destruction more than their larger thefts. Like petty stealing they could give no numerical estimate of the windows and street lights they had smashed, garbage and fruit or eggs they had thrown at passing cars (especially police ones), nor the times they had managed to break glasses and furniture in dance halls and bars. Also like petty stealing,

much of this vandalism was taken for granted and occurred mostly in the summer. What they enjoyed boasting about the most were their escapades at an abandoned quarry, which until 1960 they visited very frequently during the spring and summer. After swimming they liked best to raid abandoned shacks and literally wreck them - one to the point of collapse. On one or two occasions, they raided nearby estates left closed for the summer. Thinking possibly that it had been abandoned, they damaged one of them substantially. Leo estimated that repairs would have cost \$2000, but he tended to exaggerate. Considering though that they tore down the staircase and all but swung on the chandeliers, he might have been close to the truth.

In addition to wrecking shacks it was even more fun to blow them up, with dynamite stolen from oil company projects. In this way two shacks, a stretch of city sidewalk, and one tree disappeared. How they acquired the dynamite was quite fantastic. Mac, Leo, and another Eagle were caught stealing it. Mac used an ariel he had stolen as a sword and escaped the pursuing workmen. A second group of workmen they managed to escape by threatening to throw the explosives. Mac dropped his portion while he was running away. The other boy buried his in the town park. Both of these portions were recovered. Leo hid his in his home and from a television program discovered how to use it properly. The boys were severely reprimanded by the police who had to dig it up, but they were not punished further. The only other raid which received city-wide notice was the time they let all the pigs out of the slaughterhouse, wounding a number of them in the process.

They also acquired a great reputation for raiding parties. After

wrecking a private home in a drunken orgy,¹ they were no longer invited to private parties. If they found out about one and wanted to go or if only some of them were invited, they would often crash the party. Sometimes they damaged homes accidentally like the time when one of them stepped all the way through a wooden ventilator screen in the floor.

Goof balls they had tried as a group once but did not like them. One member, Shep, stated that he had taken them on his own about two or three times but they made him too ill to continue. It was in connection with this that he was held in detention for six weeks. He had been accused of selling them and being an accessory to other serious crimes. In the end the police let him go, as usual for lack of conclusive evidence, and he swore to the gang that he had been innocent of the charges. Apart from a few of them experimenting with marijuana cigarettes one or two times, none of them had taken any other form of drugs.

As far as it can be determined none of the subjects joined delinquent groups as a result of dissatisfactory or frustrating relationships in their original non-delinquent groups. What did happen was that once they developed a reputation for being delinquent and damaging property, they were not accepted by non-delinquent groups or invited to their parties. That Eagles could have been accepted into non-delinquent groups, had they wanted to join as a non-delinquent, is made abundantly clear by the instances (presented throughout these chapters) in which adults and peers alike judged youths primarily on the basis of their status.

1. At one girl's house they broke the chandelier and drinking glasses, urinated on the pool table, smashed several electrical appliances, wrecked the garden, and vomited all over the place.

That the two groups were distinctly different is evident from the histories of gang memberships and from the accounts of their activities. Board members were much less delinquent and began committing offenses at an earlier age. And although several of them have been arrested, only one was for anything more serious than fighting, drinking, or disturbing the peace. But most important, board members generally did not identify themselves with being delinquent or causing trouble, even when they were members of the big gang.¹ The fact that most of them disassociated themselves from the big gang within a year of joining - precisely because they were becoming associated with its activities is very significant. In contrast, the Eagles, once they joined their first delinquent group, made a deliberate effort to maintain their delinquent contacts and expand their delinquent activities. Further evidence for pronouncing the two groups significantly different with respect to delinquency, may be found in the next section where contact with the police is examined.

This is not to say, however, that Eagles saw themselves specifically as delinquents or seriously considered delinquency as a career. To the contrary, in conversations amongst themselves and in interviews Eagles saw themselves as Troublemakers - not delinquents.² Technically, of course, any troublemaking activity which violates the law and might result in an official response is a delinquent activity by definition.

1. Notable exceptions to this were Red and Sport who perhaps pretended to be more delinquent than he was.

2. Only two of them ever used the word "delinquent" with reference to themselves. Dodger once said after a hair-raising journey in the car, "You must think we are a bunch of delinquents". Mac's comment on the subject is described below.

Psychologically and sociologically, however, the troublemaker is a special type of delinquent. What differentiates the two is the all encompassing fact that the troublemaker limits his activities in ways which other types of delinquents do not. On the basis of observations and interviews a troublemaker may be defined paradoxically as an individual who seeks to cause enough trouble to receive public and/or legal attention but not so much as to endanger life or get into serious trouble with the police. This was the unwritten gang code and self definition of the Eagles.

How is a troublemaker limited? A glance at the history of Eagle offenses reveals that they were highly limited in range, degree of seriousness or extent of damage, and rank order of target choices. Regarding range of offense, Eagles did not specialize as professional thieves or drug addicts but their habitual offenses - drinking, fighting, vandalism, and theft - were quite limited in number and character. Any teenager anywhere could commit these offenses tomorrow if he so desired. On the whole commission of these offenses does not require great imagination, skill, or knowledge. The professional thief needs trainers, contacts, and "fences" to buy his goods; drug addicts need someone to sell them narcotics; troublemakers need no such agents. Because of this, it does not require the support of a criminal subculture - a most distinguishing feature of their type of delinquency. Equally revealing of the limitedness of Eagle offenses is a consideration of the opportunities they refused. They had ample chances to take drugs, distribute the stuff, steal on a professional basis, engage in gang warfare with the French, and extortion - to name but a few. The fact that all of these activities were easily possible but rejected by the Eagles shows clearly how

deliberate their effort to limit the kind of offenses committed by the gang.

Also limited was the extent of damage caused to persons and, to a much lesser extent, property. Eagles insulted and occasionally struck adults but they never attacked them. Those whom they struck or with whom they fought were always male and capable of retaliation. If an adult was struck, it was usually a stranger whom they had insulted and who was willing to fight. Fighting with peers was more or less accepted on both sides as a form of exercise and a means of releasing tension. Damage to property, though much more frequent and extensive, was also limited. Useless, unowned, or allegedly abandoned property were objects most devastated. Next, were minor objects such as street lamps, windows, and clothes lines. Only under extreme circumstances would they damage extensively owned property. Although Eagles may have been irresponsible, self-centered, and insensitive; although they lived existentially for the feeling of the moment without regard for the feelings and property of others, they were not truly malicious, brutal, or violent.

Equally revealing is a breakdown of the rank order of targets attacked by Eagles. Unowned or abandoned property ranked first; minor property owned by strangers, corporations, and the city ranked second; and owned property of known individuals ranked third. In terms of frequency of insult or assault on individuals, known and unknown peers ranked first, strangers second, and known adults third.¹

¹. These frequencies are very rough estimates based on an analysis of observed behavior and verbal references. The category "unowned property" refers generally to the numerous abandoned shacks, dumped refuse heaps, and unowned land surrounding the old quarry cite and woods near East End.

Choice of target was determined by several factors but mainly by two. Unowned property or property owned by strangers, the rich, corporations, and the city were chosen because ownership was impersonal (unknown or intangible) and because the owner could, in their view, afford it. Moreover, the rich and corporations, since they could afford it, were least likely to press charges. Derogatory and resentful remarks were sometimes made about the rich but it is doubtful if such a general and vague feeling would cause them to choose deliberately to damage property. Eagles simply thought, or wanted to think, that the rich would not miss it. The logic and sincerity of this reasoning can be seen in Mac's statement about it (presented below). Why they did not steal from the poor was more moral in tone; they thought it was wrong to take from those who might really suffer by the action. It was much the same with attacking persons. Strangers were insulted most frequently primarily because they were strangers.

Attack on the person or property of known individuals was quite different. First, they usually did not attack seriously such objects unless they were extremely drunk. This applies to the many houses (including Dodger's) which were wrecked during drunken orgies where Eagles were invited guests. It also applies to the number of beer halls and bars damaged while drunk. Judging from their accounts, damage in both cases was sheerly a product of drunkenness, except where fighting occurred, and in those cases fighting, staged or real, was stimulated at least in part by drunkenness. Second, if the person or property of known adults was attacked seriously and they were not very drunk, it was usually because they were really hurt or strongly provoked by the particular person. When Shep struck his father, for example, he was

outraged at the man's treatment of his wife and humiliated by rejection. Third, the person or property of known adults was sometimes attacked out of drunkenness or revenge for a specific action interpreted by the Eagles as being against them. This accounts for damage to the property of those who neglected to invite them to a party.

Occasionally some of the more determined ones (namely Rob, Mac, and Shep) managed to achieve when sober a mental attitude or condition which was normally peculiar to a state of extreme anger or bitter drunkenness - a complete self-centeredness which seemed to negate momentarily any conscience they had. It was as if they suddenly had been possessed; a most extraordinary phenomenon to observe! First, the face hardened and there was a change in their eyes which went very dull. For that moment it was as though the individual thought himself invincible, supremely tough; and when he spoke, it was with the authority of an absolutely determined will.

This shifting, as it were, of mental or emotional states did not occur very often but when it did it was invariably at a time when they felt extremely insecure about something such as disillusionment about the loyalty or integrity of a friend. Under these circumstances they would say and do things that they would not do otherwise, attacking the person or property nearest at hand regardless of its value to themselves. Fortunately, it was a very temporary state, usually degenerating into some form of irritability and withdrawal or hardening of their feelings toward the person to make themselves invulnerable.

It is evident from this breakdown of targets and reasons for their choice that no single class or group of persons was singled out for

social
 victimization by virtue of their/status. In general, only those whose identity was impersonal, those who allegedly could afford it, or those who provoked a gang member were chosen for attack. Otherwise most of the damage to persons and property was the result of drink or proximity. It is also evident from this analysis that their delinquent behavior exhibited a small range.

In addition to limitations on behavior, troublemaking was limited philosophically in time. Only one Eagle, Leo, was even considering the possibility of becoming a professional criminal. The others viewed troublemaking as an activity of the young to be stopped when they were no longer juveniles legally¹ or at least when they became men.² This is clear from their statements about their future. As has been stated previously, all of them were approaching or past the age of legal adulthood, and were seriously considering giving up troublemaking in the immediate future; and in ten years' time they saw themselves "settled down" in various steady jobs, most of them married, and planning a family. One could be a carefree troublemaker and "live" while one was young; having had that fling, one should be ready and willing to "quieten down" and assume the responsibilities of adult life.

Why do all these limitations exist? The main reason is simple - fear of official consequences. All the most frequent offenses committed by Eagles (drinking, fighting, vandalism, and petty stealing) were more or less tolerated by the local police.³ Car theft, though not tolerated,

1. In this province, one is legally defined as a juvenile up to but not including the age of 18. Census Report on Juvenile Delinquency. (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Catalogue 85-202, 1961) p. 7.

2. Most of them believed that boys became men in their middle to late twenties.

3. See the following section on the law, p. 203 ff.

was planned so carefully and committed so infrequently as to insure success, or failing that, a mild official response. It was known locally by adults and young alike that official action against juvenile car theft was highly dependent on numerous factors. Presuming that the owner was willing to press charges (and many residents did not if their car was returned safely), punishment was determined largely by motive and previous record of the individual(s) involved. The parents' attitude was also important. In view of these public facts, it was entirely justifiable by local experience for Eagles to believe that they would not be punished severely for "joy-riding", i.e., borrowing a car, driving it for a short time, and returning it safely with the correct amount of gas. Taking goof balls was not tolerated at all and no doubt this is the reason why they went out of town to a secluded place to experiment with them. But it is most probable that, having satisfied their curiosity once, they would not have continued to take them even if they had not been made ill by the stuff. That such limitations were based mainly on fear of serious official consequences portrays a decidedly utilitarian approach to delinquency.

While this is perhaps the most outstanding reason for limiting their range of offense and extent of damage, Eagles gave other important ones. To have been caught and punished for one serious offense was unfortunate but not considered dangerous to one's economic career; they knew that criminal records were definitely held against the individual by perspective employers but they thought that juvenile records were not held against them at all. Moreover, involvement in a serious crime once or a few times was not considered immoral as long as the offense in question was not a particularly violent one such as rape

which they abhorred. But to have a criminal record or to commit habitually such grave offenses as car theft, rape, or taking drugs was tabooed not only because of the possible legal consequences or the consequences to one's career but because it was abnormal and wrong. That the Eagles thought the professional car thief was "sick", that they ostracised Leo for his alleged desire to become a racketeer, that they refused to steal from or offend the poor - these attitudes illustrate well their moral character. But even more revealing was a comment made by Jocko's brother which was strongly supported by the rest of the group. When Jocko and a boy called Eddy were caught after a week's absence from their home, Jocko's parents signed the release and paid the bail but Eddy's parents did not. As a result he was given a week's detention. Led by Ben all the Eagles were lamenting this because the boy would be thrown into contact with hardened criminals and, disheartened by the acute boredom, might become influenced by them! Serving a sentence at a reform school was different according to those who had done it. Although a troublemaker met hardened delinquents, he was not so confined that he could not avoid them if he wanted to; moreover, there was so much work to do and technical skills to learn that most of the time was fully occupied.

For an Eagle to feel that certain kinds of delinquent activities were wrong does not mean that he felt his own brand of delinquency was right. About this question of their own morals, they were somewhat ambivalent. In casual conversation they gave several excuses which, in effect, were attempts to neutralize or reduce the impact of acceptable norms as effective checks on their behavior. Thus, they sometimes denied that the offended person was really hurt or that wealthy persons

were not substantially harmed by petty theft. And if they were angry, they argued that the person "deserved what he got", or if they were drunk, they occasionally tried to blame their offense on drink and thereby deny responsibility for the action. Rationalizations such as these were used to explain their behavior to themselves and others. And they may have served the purpose of reducing temporarily tension arising out of guilt. But Eagles did not really believe them; these rationalizations were purely on the surface, as it were.

Actually, the Eagles exhibited an amazing capacity for being honest with themselves. In their few serious discussions and in interviews, they were the first to admit that their delinquent activities were wrong - by their own standards of judgment. They also admitted that drinking, anger, and ability to afford it were poor excuses for their offensive behavior. Their whole attitude toward delinquency is summed up in a series of statements made by Mac. It is quoted at length because it is a summary and because it reveals so perfectly where their ambivalences lie. The first statement was made spontaneously by Mac in the interview on the family:

If I'm a bum or a juvenile delinquent it's my fault - not all that jazz about when you are small your parents argue and you feel they're pickin' on you so you go out and break a window. I used to feel rotten about stealin' little things but I got over it; I just put the thought out of my head of what would happen to me if I got caught.

Question: Why should you want to steal?

Answer: You want it - you get it.

Question: But don't you feel guilty taking what does not belong to you?

Answer: Yes, but not for long. When you're young, you feel it all the time. If you know there's no chance of gettin' caught, then it's okay. It's not good to steal from the poor but the rich don't miss it.

Question: What if you were rich and someone stole from you?

Answer: I've thought about that. If it was the first time and not serious, I wouldn't press charges. But if a gang damaged my property, I'd get them. Shouldn't steal from friends - that's dirty but if you don't know them, it's just for kicks.

How chaotic a troublemaker's inner life must be. This statement illustrates clearly the multiple ambivalences of attitudes, each fighting persistently for predominance; the recognition that delinquency is deviant and wrong even by his own morals; the attempts to justify offending the rich and strangers; the indirect admission that these attempts are unsuccessful, that he would not accept behavior similar to his own if he were rich; the constant battle against guilt; the inability to explain his own delinquency except by desire; the refusal to blame his parents despite the shame and pain they have caused him. However ambivalent he was about his own delinquency, his motivations, and the causes, his attitude toward society is clear; he may offend it but he has accepted its mores and has judged himself by them. It would seem that the troublemaker's rebellion is not against society but against himself, a reaction to his own confusion and inner conflicts.

Throughout this discussion of troublemaking as a style of delinquent behavior much emphasis has been placed on drink and anger. This is because both factors strongly affected their behavior. If they were in a good humor, they could hardly keep themselves from almost literally shouting for joy, laughing, and singing. If they were depressed, they became bitter and hostile and felt sorry for themselves. If they were angry, they became loud, tough, and defiant. They had great difficulty controlling their tempers when they were sober; drinking made it impossible. Other notable factors which influenced group behavior were

size and respect. The larger the group, the more intense the feeling of the moment. Similarly, the greater the disrespect for a person or institution, the more hostile they were toward it; people whom they respected, they treated appreciatively with respect. The influence of these two factors can be seen clearly in the difference in their behavior toward the police and the social agency. Both groups, they knew, wanted to reform them. Yet the police they treated with the utmost disrespect while agency personnel they respected and more or less obeyed. Although it is true that the agency offered them a much valued prize (attending the dance) in return for co-operation, Eagles did appreciate agency efforts over and beyond self-interest.

It cannot be said that either causes delinquency for causation is obviously more complicated but there were several factors including drink and anger that strongly affected the intensity or seriousness and timing of delinquent behavior. At the least there was a very high positive correlation between drink and/or anger and delinquency; whenever they drank or were angry they almost invariably committed some kind of offense, though many offenses were committed whilst they were neither drunk or angry. Their vandalism and stealing in the quarry area, for example, were usually committed when they were sober and car theft was too dangerous to commit while drunk but fighting as well as attacks on humans and property where the ownership was known were almost always committed under the influence of alcohol or anger. Also, offenses committed while very drunk or very angry were usually more serious than the same type of offense committed sober or nearly sober.

The main reason, it would seem, why these two factors so strongly

affect delinquent behavior is twofold: drink and anger exaggerate the feeling of the moment while at the same time they obscure clear thinking and reduce the impact of accepted mores so that the individual becomes much less inhibited by them than he would normally be. Like anyone who drinks heavily or has a rather violent temper, the Eagle simply lost his self-control when he was drunk or very angry.

To understand why Eagles drank so often and so heavily would be a major step in understanding why they were delinquent. Although it is not possible at this point even to attempt to answer this question, it may be useful to present the explanations that Eagles gave. Superficially they had many reasons for drinking. More than once Mac said he drank because it made him happy; when he drank he felt full of confidence and could forget his problems. Similar comments were made by Shep and F.J.; like Mac, they believed themselves to be shy and drinking eliminated or reduced this feeling of inadequacy. Once, however, when asked if he really believed that, F.J. said he did not. Drinking, he thought, did effect some temporary relief but he knew that it was not a valid solution. Unlike the other three, Dodger, Leo, Irish, and Jocko made active efforts to control their drinking and they rarely drank in order to get drunk. They had discovered that it was too difficult to hide from their families and that the consequences were not worth the risk. Most probably they drank because they were bored and enjoyed the effect of a limited amount of alcohol. That the others placed so much emphasis on drinking may also have been a partial reason; at least it would have been virtually impossible to refuse to drink at all and expect to maintain membership.

One aspect of gang life of which little has been said directly is the effect of the gang on the individual. In contrast to the junior board the spirit and behavior of Eagles was different when they were in the presence of the entire gang. In small groups of two's and three's or with adults whom they respected, they were usually quiet and orderly. Whenever the whole group gathered they became loud and boisterous and somehow always managed to be conspicuous. Esprit de corps was fairly strong and there was always much effort "to look out for the other person" - to take care of him if he became ill with drink, to warn him of impending danger, to cheer him up if he was discouraged, and so on. At times they resembled an excited crowd, each restless and on edge as though they were waiting for something to break the monotony of their everyday lives. On the whole, though, they seemed to have greater confidence and much greater daring; few individuals would ever consider doing on their own what the gang did for delinquent "kicks".

Unlike the gangs in Whyte's Street Corner Society, there did not seem to be a relationship between position in the gang or popularity and self-confidence.¹ Mac who was easily the most popular and Shep who ranked next in general popularity were among those who appeared to have least self-confidence and more than a couple of times were heard to make such remarks as, "I guess I've made a mess of my life". Dodger who was only popular with a few members prided himself on his ability to control himself and the situation at all times; in restaurants or other public places of service he was invariably the one to take charge of placing orders and if any one of the group managed to escape detection while the

1. For verification and elaboration of these statements on self-confidence see "The Self and Individual Development", pp. 299-333.

others were caught it would be Dodger. Leo was also popular only with a few and he, too, boasted of his self-confidence but considering his extreme nervousness, intensity, and confusion of mind, it is likely that it was merely a facade. Irish had little self-confidence and he put himself to be more unpopular than he actually was; but he and F.J. who was quite popular were clearly the most independent (as distinct from stubborn) in the group. Finally, Jocko was very unpopular with Mac and a few others but he appeared to be quite self-contained or satisfied, if not abundantly self-confident.

In sum, the histories of gang membership revealed differences between the two groups with respect to patterns of change. Board members did not come into contact with delinquent groups until they were about 15, tended to remain on the fringe of delinquent groups, and left them within a year or two specifically because the group was too delinquent. Whilst in these groups delinquent activity was limited largely to drinking, fighting, and occasionally vandalism. Eagles had made their first contact with delinquents mainly by the time they were 12 and 13 and tended to seek out other delinquent groups thereafter. Offenses committed by Eagles included drinking, fighting, petty stealing, vandalism, car theft, grand larceny, and taking drugs - in that order. Although engagement in these activities constituted delinquency, their delinquency was highly limited not only in its range of offense but also in targets of attack, and in concept. This wilful restricting of activity to troublemaking was largely the result of fear of consequences for participation in more serious offenses/^{but}also of gang code or morale. Unlike the junior board, delinquent behavior was strongly affected by drink, anger, size, and respect. Also unlike the junior board, Eagles' spirit and character were affected by

the presence of the entire gang.

THE POLICE

Before presenting subjects' responses to the questionnaire section, it is necessary to comment on the organization and practices of East End's illustrious police force. In the first place, most of it was French and many adults as well as delinquent and non-delinquent youths felt that it discriminated against the English. Secondly, there was a fairly high degree of socializing between policemen and residents, particularly in bars.¹ More than a few times policemen in uniform were seen being familiar with women at a quiet local bar where several of the subjects used to go for a private conversation. They were also observed on numerous occasions coming out of local taverns talking casually to residents with whom they had obviously been drinking. And the friendly relationship of Mac's father with a certain policeman was well-known amongst members of both groups.

Third, the leniency of the police was frequently the topic of local gossip - adult and juvenile. East End had its own police force but delinquency came under Provincial jurisdiction, therefore all cases were heard at the Juvenile court in the City. But "naturally", according to the Town Clerk, "a juvenile is taken to court only on serious offenses (though) he may also be taken before the judge for reprimands".² In

1. According to the famous J. Kennedy, ex-Commissioner of Police for New York City, this practice is and should be discouraged; it breeds an unhealthy familiarity which enormously complicates the carrying out of official duties. (An informal talk made at Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts, February 1962.)

2. In a personal communication, April 6, 1962.

practice this meant that unless the offense was very serious, a juvenile who was apprehended for such offenses as drinking under age, fighting (disturbing the peace), vandalism, or petty theft would be brought to the station; his name, address, and offense recorded; charged a nominal bail fee of \$10-\$20; and released within a few hours. If the offender was very drunk he usually spent the night in jail. If charges were pressed by a complainant, the bail was usually higher, the amount depending on the seriousness of the offense. And parents were not generally notified of their son's offense, unless 1) the offense was very public (blowing up a sidewalk) and/or very serious (rape); 2) the offender could not pay bail; 3) the parents themselves were the ones to place the complaint (as was the case when Jocko and Eddy ran away). In these instances punishment was largely dependent on the parents, namely whether or not they were willing to pay bail and/or be responsible for the offender by signing his release.

Why were the police so lenient? Apart from any general policy there may have been to that effect throughout the province, it seems that the police themselves were engaged in a number of illicit practices. The most outstanding and well-known was the sale of liquor to juveniles. There were about three "blind pigs" in East End. At least one of these "establishments" which sold liquor in off hours to adults and juveniles alike was not only supported but also run by the police. All of the subjects knew about this and several of them had actually been served by policemen. At first this seemed difficult to believe but it was confirmed by several parents and adult leaders within the community; in fact it was they who pointed out the fact that East End police "tip off" all blind pigs when they expected a raid from the provincial police.

The townfolk also suspected strongly that the local police were engaged in other illicit activities such as graft from publicans and criminals as well as bootlegging itself.

The effect of such activities (proven or suspected) in the community cannot be overestimated. Quoting Commissioner Kennedy, Harison Salisbury writes, "Maybe it's bad for kids to beat each other up but what do you think of the effect on a kid if he sees an officer taking money?"¹ Salisbury's answer to that question applies not just to graft but any kind of illicit activity on the part of the police. "Such officers ... usually make little effort to conceal their activities from the boys ... The average gang boy views the policeman as a kind of legalized gangster - a man whose badge makes him immune to ordinary rules. More than one street boy would like to grow up to be a cop - that kind of cop."²

Although none of the subjects wanted to be "that kind of cop", there was a distinct and widespread disrespect of the police throughout the community. Considering the lack of secrecy about the force's illicit activities, it could hardly have been otherwise. This does not mean that the town was generally a corrupt one or that there was little regard for law. That parents wanted their children to be honest, "respectable" citizens can be seen throughout this presentation. What it does mean is that both parents and children disrespected law enforcers, not the law itself; by tolerating illicit police activities, they expected the police to be tolerant of theirs. And in view of the fact that nearly all the Eagles' delinquent offenses were committed under the influence of

1. Harison Salisbury, The Shook Up Generation, op. cit., p. 222.

2. Ibid., p. 223.

alcohol - in some cases sold to them directly by the police - one could say that there was a symbiotic relationship between crime or delinquency and law enforcement.

Whatever the effect of illicit police activities, there were substantial and significant differences between the two groups' current relationship with the police. A glance at the age and reasons for first contact with the police reveals one of the most important differences. The average age of first contact with the police for board members was 14. The reasons? Mitch, aged nine, throwing a snowball at a train; Red, aged 11, built a raft which sank and police had to rescue a girl who could not swim; J.T., aged 20, riding in a stolen car; Andy, aged 18, insulting an officer when "wrongly" accused of causing trouble; Sport, aged 11, fighting; Rex, aged 16, disturbing the peace when associated with the big gang; and Crew, aged 14, robbing apples. The average of first contact with the police for the Eagles was 10. The reasons and ages stated were: Mac, aged 12, breaking windows; Dodger, aged 8, burning down a field "accidentally"; Shep, aged 12, skating on the river; Leo, aged 10, stabbed a boy;¹ Irish, aged 10, stealing a bicycle; F.J., aged 7, "throwin' corn at the cops", and Jocko, aged 13, ringing doorbells.

Generally speaking board members were not chased very often by the police.² And when they were it was largely for mischievous, not de-

1. According to him, he had been hit across the leg and stomach so he "went in the house, got a sword, hid it behind my back, asked him for a fight, and stuck it in his ribs. I told the police it was an accident - the Judge always lets you off. All cops want is money".

2. The exact wording of the question was: How many times have you been chased by the police but not caught?

linquent behavior. J.T. had never been chased and Rex had only been chased once. Red, Andy, and Crew had been chased about four, 12, and 20 times respectively for such pranks as ringing doorbells, buying cigarettes, and climbing rooftops or for being rowdy and speed racing in cars. The two exceptions to this were Mitch and Sport. Both claimed they had been chased at least 100 times: Mitch, mainly for getting into mischief (yelling at cops, stopping cars at night, and the like); Sport for more serious offenses (truancy, robbing apples, breaking street lights, and so on). In contrast, Eagles' estimates of the number of times they have been chased begin around 20 and extend into the hundreds. And their offenses were generally much more serious. Various forms of minor vandalism, burning down a farm, wrecking shacks in the woods, wrecking newly built houses, killing rabbits, fighting, stealing (cars and other things), and doing damage generally were typical answers to this question.

When asked how many times they had been caught by the police and what were the offenses, responses showed the same differences. Four board members had been caught twice and Rex had never been caught. Mitch and Crew had been caught 10 and five times respectively. The offense most often cited was fighting; three had been arrested twice-each for that activity. The others were varied, but apart from J.T.'s riding in a stolen car and Andy's stealing an air rifle once, the rest were for mischief or accidents such as Red's raft incident. In nearly all cases, they were released immediately frequently without being fined or placed on bail. J.T. was the one exception. For riding in a stolen car he was fined \$500 and stayed in jail for three days; for being caught on a raid when the police were looking for a car thief despite his innocence,

he was fined \$225, held in jail for one night, and placed on \$200 bail.

Eagles' list of offenses was considerably longer and more formidable. The average number of times that an Eagle was actually caught by the police was 11. Three of the gang (Mac, Dodger, and Jocko) had only been arrested for relatively minor offenses: beating a boy with a bicycle, drinking, fighting, petty vandalism, and petty theft. For these offenses they were taken to the police station, given a lecture, and fined. The other four have all appeared before court and spent varying amounts of time in detention, jail, and reform school. Shep had been arrested 10 times at East End, six times in the City, and twice out of town for drinking, involvement in a car theft, doing "dirty tricks", and loafing. In addition, he had to appear before the City Juvenile Court three times; twice on similar charges, once for suspicion of taking and distributing goof balls. On the latter charge he was detained for six weeks. Leo had been arrested at least 12 times for fighting, drinking, hitchhiking, disturbing the peace, and stealing a car - for which he was sent to reform school. Irish's four out-of-town offenses and sentences include a stolen car (20 days in jail - his first offense); a theft of \$200, a gold watch, and a rifle from a private house (several months at reform school, psychiatric testing, and indefinite probation); vagrancy (five days' detention); and stealing gas (two hours in jail). In East End he had been arrested four times for possession of lethal weapon, stealing papers from a newsagent, throwing watermelon, and running through a group of police; on all four occasions, he was taken to jail, given a lecture, and fined. F.J. had been arrested four times; once for wrecking a farm, once for cutting down fences and letting out the cattle, once for a similar vandalism. Each time he was taken to the police station and

fined. The reason for the last arrest he would reveal to no one but whatever it was that landed him in reform school for over a year must have been quite serious.

As a final means of measuring delinquency in both groups, subjects were asked to estimate the number of times they had offended the law without being chased or caught and to describe generally the type offenses they committed. Three board members, J.T., Andy, and Rex, had not broken the law apart from the times for which they were chased or caught. The rest had only broken the law about four or five times apart from times for which they were chased or arrested; in all cases the offenses consisted of petty theft, trespassing, or speeding. The one exception to this was Sport who could give no estimate of the number of times he had broken the law but he did say that it was always for fighting and petty theft. In contrast, most of the Eagles reckoned that they had broken the law and gotten away with it at least 100 times, not counting drinking and fighting which none of the subjects considered an offense unless they were chased or arrested for it; on the whole it was for petty theft and vandalism. And considering how often they were observed to commit such offenses during the relatively "quiet" winter months, that figure is probably no exaggeration.

As might be expected both groups viewed the police very differently. Eagles spoke vehemently of their hatred for the police and referred to their corruption. And, of course, most of them thought that policemen were "out to get them", not only because they were English but also because cops were just "rats". Actually, this attitude toward policemen was at least in part deliberately developed for reasons which had nothing

to do with the behavior or personality of policemen. In the first place it was vital to the gang to appear tough. One of the easiest and most fashionable means of doing this was to shout insults about the police. Nothing pleased them more than to think that they had aroused the force. It was with obvious pride, for example, that several Eagles told of how and why they had to stop wearing their "uniforms". And if the police were not around when they were feeling devilish, they invented the pursuit of imaginary policemen; this happened more than a few times during observation, especially during rides in the car. They thoroughly enjoyed manufacturing excitement and scaring themselves into thinking that they were in some danger and would quickly hide whatever bottles they had or whatever items they had managed to acquire for the day. Thus, their attitude toward the police was simply part of a game they were playing. But the depth and complexity of the rules were far greater than any of them cared to admit. When Mac said, "You hate cops, see. You gotta be tough with 'em 'cause they're out to get you, you gotta outsmart 'em", he knew he was acting a part but he did not know why.

In some of their weaker moments Eagles admitted that they did not really hate policemen. In fact, Dodger was openly appreciative of the force's leniency and believed it was because members of it sympathized with their circumstances, i.e., that "they were not really bad boys", that their parents would not or could not do anything about them, and so on. And several Eagles actually liked individual policemen. But the comment heard most frequently in this respect was, "If we lived in (the City), we'd've been in jail long ago - and for much less than we get away with here".

Board members admitted that they had much the same attitude when

they associated with the big gang. Before and after that association, however, they felt simply that policemen had a job to do like anyone else. And like any other group, the force had its "good guys" and its "bad guys". The alleged corruption they deplored but philosophized that law enforcement was necessary and that the good that law enforcers did exceed the bad. Concerning the force's leniency, they were less tolerant. If stiffer punishments were allotted to offenders, they argued, there would be a lot less crime. Moreover, they felt it was wrong for the police to be lax about notifying parents of their children's offenses; half the time parents did not know what their sons had done.

Also as might be expected, the effect of being arrested was very different for the two groups. On the whole board members seemed deeply disturbed by it at the time it happened. "It hurt me, I let my parents down." "It scared the hell out of me and I made sure that it would never happen again." "I figured I was wrong." "It was terrible, I was so embarrassed - it involved physical violence and we were told we were children." And, "It was the last time I ever did anything without thinkin' of what I was supposed to do or had been told not to". These answers reveal significantly not so much a fear of the law or legal consequences but rather a deeply felt and unambivalent sense of having done something which was wrong. Only Sport appeared nonchalant. He said, "The first time it worried me; after that, I knew they weren't goin' to do anything".

This attitude, so atypical among board members, was common amongst the Eagles: "It scared me at first, but then I figured they only wanted our money": "When inside (the police station) I'd feel, 'what the hell have I done - I don't want to be caged'. But on the outside, I'd want

to do it again". "Got a lecture from my father, I was scared but not sorry." "Just 10 minutes of wasted time, they never do anythin' to you." Similarly, any change of attitude that was reported had to do entirely with fear of the consequences: "Now, I'm an adult, the term is stiffer and I don't want a criminal record". And, "Now I want to get away from that stuff, they got so much on me."

Unlike responses of board members, there was no sense of shame or regret in answers given by the Eagles - only fear of the consequences. This may be a product, at least in part, of the gang's emphasis on being tough, impervious to the law. Alternatively, it may indicate that they have not internalized appropriate mores or more likely that they have chosen to violate the law even though they may agree in theory with it. That is, they may be fully aware of what is right and wrong from a legal and social point of view, may agree or accept those standards in principle but nevertheless offend them without necessarily knowing why.

This latter interpretation is supported by Eagles' responses to the next three questions: At what age were you aware of what is right and wrong? What was your view of it then? And have you always felt that way? F.J. said he had been aware of the law "when I started to steal at six or seven". "I knew it was wrong but I was just gamblin'. If I got caught, I got caught. If not, okay." Others answered similarly though it was several years in most cases before they began to violate it. All of them had known since childhood, at the latest 10, what was right and wrong and they accepted it. Leo accepted it so much that he used to feel guilty for being out five minutes past the old curfew. Shep's response, however, was unique: "When there's somethin' you're

not supposed to do, you want to see what you can do, how people react and after a while, you just don't care." How badly he must have wanted to feel cared for.

Most of them said they had not changed their views. Apart from the defiant "now I don't care" statements, only Mac and F.J. had really changed. Having never received any serious punishment Mac could legitimately say, "Now they know we won't listen, so they hit us where it hurts - our pockets." F.J. who had been punished seriously, had changed in a different way. "Now I know the score; I know what's going to happen to you if you get sent up".

Although the age of awareness was about the same for board members, their initial attitudes toward the law were quite different from those of the Eagles. Most of them simply accepted the law: "If Mom and Dad weren't breakin' the law, I saw no reason for me to do it". "Thought I would respect it and live up to it." And so on. Only Sport and Rex had anything negative or defiant to say about it. Sport said he always thought the law was fair but he never "went along with it" - meaning, he felt it did not apply to him. Rex's quarrel was more specific and less defiant: "I knew I'd be home by nine o'clock (the curfew hour) but I didn't like the idea of bein' forced to". Both changed their views subsequently; Sport since the previous summer after he had been associated with the Naval Military Police(!) and Rex, since he disassociated with the big gang.

About half the board did not know what the police thought of them. Two (Mitch and Andy) reckoned that the police thought they were "ordinary guys" or "okay". The other two (Sport and Crew) felt that the police had

disliked them when they had associated with the big gang but since their disassociation had come to respect them. These two and Mitch were the only ones who cared what the police thought of them; the others said that it did not matter to them one way or the other what the police thought of them. In contrast, all the Eagles were convinced that the police thought they were "bums" who should be "put away", and insisted that they did not care what the police thought of them. Whatever views the subjects had regarding the police's view of them and whatever their attitudes toward it, most of the subjects in both groups thought the judgment was a fair one.

When asked how much of the law the subjects actually expected to be enforced, most of them said all of it or just the "serious things like traffic and stealin'"; drinking and fighting were individuals' concerns. And apart from board members' informal criticism about the leniency of East End policemen (stated above), only a few of the Eagles felt that law enforcement practices should be any different from what they were. Mostly they objected to the habit of collecting information about them from others and not listening to "their side of the story".

As to the type of person a policeman should be, both groups were more or less agreed. He should be fair, honest, understanding, and unprejudiced. Also he should not abuse his authority; that is, he should neither hide behind his badge nor laud his power. The two groups were similarly agreed about whether or not East End policemen lived up to this expectation; most of the subjects felt that they did not and emphasized the various forms of corruption in which East End police engaged, including their extreme leniency. Finally, four in each group

thought that they had been singled out unfairly by the police. On the whole the four board members in question referred to one or two isolated incidents whereas Eagles tended to be more general, saying, "Sometimes we got picked up for somethin' we didn't do".

Considering all this evidence, then, it would seem that police practices were most conducive to delinquent behavior in two major ways. By being so obviously lenient, at least with regard to minor offenses, fear of punishment was not the deterrent that it could have been. And by being so corrupt or having such a bad reputation, the force made a hypocrisy of the law. Supporters of the force would undoubtedly disagree with this argument on several grounds, namely, that the delinquency rate was not excessively high, that arrest was a sufficient deterrent to the non-delinquent group, and that the alleged corruption of the force did not affect that group adversely. On the other hand, it is clear from board members' statements about the effect of their arrests and their original attitudes toward the law that they were not at all ambivalent about the law; not only did they accept it in theory but they did not make a practice of violating it even in minor ways. For the child who is ambivalent, as were the Eagles, simple arrest and nominal punishment are perhaps not enough. Provided that the youth is truly ambivalent, that he is not decidedly bent on a specifically delinquent and/or criminal career, it is quite conceivable that stiffer punishments from men whom they respected would indeed have acted as a powerful deterrent. It obviously worked in the case of F.J. and Leo, who began to quieten down immediately after they were released from reform school. Lastly, fear of punishment was a partial deterrent to the Eagles for the commission of many major offenses; apart from the fact that Eagles thought

such serious offenses as rape, murder, taking drugs, professional car theft, and so on were morally wrong, they were extremely scared of the consequences for such activities. For these reasons it is argued that police practices were conducive to delinquent behavior in general and that they were a primary factor in structuring the range of offenses committed by the Eagles.

The most delinquent of the Eagles were Leo, Shep, Irish, and F.J. Two were Catholic and one was an immigrant. The greatest offenders on the junior board were Red (for nature of offense) and Sport (for frequency of offense); only Sport was an immigrant and neither were Catholic. Thus, three out of four in one group and one of two in the other group were either immigrants or Catholics. In terms of problems with the police (perception of police discrimination), the incidents were so isolated in the case of board members and so general in the case of the Eagles, it is doubtful that individuals in either group considered them problems and therefore no cross-analysis regarding religion or origin need be made.

In view of the evidence presented in both sections in this chapter, it may be concluded that the two groups were significantly different with respect to delinquency. By admission of guilt, history of associations and identifications, listing of police contact, and analysis of attitude toward the law - by all these indices, there is no doubt that board members, despite their very minimal past involvement in delinquent activities, could validly be described as being essentially non-delinquent individuals. Equally unquestionable is the fact that although Eagles were decidedly delinquent, they were in no way professionals and they did not

desire any kind of delinquent and criminal careers. Their type of delinquency was limited to troublemaking and would be given up upon reaching adult status.

CHAPTER IX

FRUSTRATIONS FROM PRIMARY RELATIONS

FAMILY

Most subjects were observed at least once with at least one of their parents and in two cases, Rob and Mitch, the observation was much more intensive as the homes of both these boys were visited regularly for meetings or interviews. With the exception of the two Eagles, Irish and F.J., who did not reside in or very near East End, all the subjects lived within a few blocks of each other in prefabricated houses. All the agency reports make much of the "bad conditions" of these homes and refer to lack of privacy, uncleanness, and so on. Frankly, these houses seemed to be very well maintained. Floors were usually covered with linoleum with carpets in various rooms. Whatever taste they were decorated in, the furniture was ample and in fairly good condition, excepting the homes of two board members, Andy and Sport. Most of the subjects in both groups where families were large shared a room with a brother as do many youths whose parents earn more money. In addition nearly all of the subjects' families owned such basic appliances as refrigerators and cooking ranges as well as such "luxury" items as cars, television sets, radios, record players, and tape recorders. In several cases, some of the latter items were purchased by the subjects themselves or their brothers.

All of the subjects had both parents living with the exception of Rex whose father died when he was seven. And there was only one case of divorce or separation in each group. Mac's parents had been divorced since he was 17; neither had remarried. Mitch's parents were divorced when he was extremely young; his mother remarried fairly soon afterwards and Mitch did not know that the man whom he thought was his father was

in fact his stepfather until he was 15 when his brother Doug told him. On the whole all the families tended to be large with one or two parents in each group taking on the care of several foster children. The mothers of four Eagles, Mac, Dodger, Jocko, and Rob were employed in such jobs as taking in laundry, dietetics, demonstrating products at a department store, and part-time work at a hospital. Most of the fathers of subjects in both groups were skilled workmen, frequently allotted night shifts.

On the whole board members rarely discussed their families in group meetings. When they did, they rarely made negative or resentful comments about paying rent. Mitch's mother was the most frequently discussed parent. When they met at Mitch's house on Tuesdays she prepared food for them, joined in their serious discussions, always made jokes with or about them, and sometimes engaged in mock wrestling matches with them. As a result her efforts were greatly appreciated by the group and she was more or less considered an honorary member of the group.

In contrast, Eagles frequently discussed their parents usually in tones of annoyance or dissatisfaction especially regarding their fathers. Those who paid rent resented it and judged their families materialistic for requiring it. Most of them made reference spontaneously to specific fights that they had had with their parents - in some cases these fights were physical such as the time when Shep hit his father for abusing his mother or the time when Mac fought with his father one night during the summer prior to the project. Apparently he had come in quite inebriated and demanded that Mac and his friends stop their drinking and leave. Thinking that the demand was highly hypocritical under the circumstances,

he refused, was consequently struck by his father, and fought back. Despite these dissatisfactory relationships with their parents, five of them mentioned (also spontaneously) on various occasions that they tried to behave and to show relatively good manners at their own homes and at the homes of their friends. Two of them, Dodger and Jocko, said that their parents would not allow them in the house when they were drunk and, because of this, they rarely became drunk though they drank heavily. This was confirmed by observation. Actually Jocko added that when he "slipped" (occasionally became inebriated) his mother would secretly wait up for him and let him in without telling his father.

In answering the questionnaire section on the family it was evident in nearly all cases that subjects especially Eagles had had a series of family problems. Rather than present each individual's problems as they came out by bits and pieces in the interview, it will be more meaningful to describe the complex of problems as the individual experienced them.¹ The point in the interview at which the respondent actually discussed the particular problem will be noted accordingly.

When asked if they had any problems regarding their family two board members, J.T. and Crew, responded negatively,² one (Andy) had a problem

1. Some of the information regarding their family problems was gleaned through listening to conversations the subjects had amongst themselves, or through private comments made outside the interview. Such spontaneously given material will be noted where it is relevant.

2. Actually Crew said no - with one exception. Several years ago he had borrowed a friend's outdoor speedboat motor and someone stole it. His parents found out and his father thought he had sold it because he had been out of work. This isolated incident angered him enormously at the time but he soon got over it. Considering the rest of his interview which shows a very positive attitude toward both parents, it would seem that this was not a major problem with serious or damaging long range effects. Moreover, it did occur long after his initial association with the big gang.

with his sister, two (Mitch and Rex) had problems with their siblings and their parents, and the rest had problems with their parents alone. Their histories were as follows:

Andy's main problem was his sister who "always had a difference of opinion" and they did not get on well together. Apparently this was not a question of sibling rivalry for when asked if he thought his parents loved him as much as his siblings he said yes and there was nothing else in the interview or observation to indicate that this was not so. The other problem he mentioned was quite separate - the time he ran away as a result of difficulties in school. He added, however, that he had felt much closer to his parents when he returned.

From the time that he was 14 until the time of the interview Mitch felt that his biggest problem was his brother Doug "who has no respect for anyone". Actually Mitch had discussed spontaneously his brother several times in private and referred to those discussions to express his feelings. More than once he had said he hated Doug for the shame he had brought to the family through his delinquent activities and honestly thought him capable of murder, though he himself had often said he could kill Doug. Moreover, Mitch was certain that Doug hated him as well. This, however, was only partly true. Doug hated his brother less than he hated his parents' constant unfavorable comparisons, which he had suffered since early childhood.¹

At 15 when Mitch was told by Doug out of spite that his father was in fact his stepfather, this discovery was a great shock to him for a

1. This was learned from Doug, himself, who frequently used to discuss his problems.

period of two years until finally he came to terms with the situation and accepted it. At the time of the project he loved, respected, and got on with his parents equally.

Even before his father died Rex loved his mother the most. He began to feel this way after his father beat him as a punishment for lying. His mother had "saved" him. After his father died, Rex resented his mother's attempt to prevent him from "goin' out and doin' things". The effort had, in his view, a very bad effect on him in that it only made him want to be all the more independent. He finally received that independence after his older sister's wedding which was the source of his second problem. When he was 14 she married a colored man and he was so upset that he did not attend the wedding.¹ Also he hated his brother for refusing to emigrate with the family. He was additionally disturbed because the event upset his mother; "Any problem to her was a problem to me since my father died". After this marriage he began to work on weekends and then during the summers to compensate for the income once provided by his sister. This, combined with his mother's distress, earned him more freedom. Full freedom came to him the next year when he left school and began to work full-time. At the time of the project he was dissatisfied with his not having used that freedom very well; he felt he spent too much money and went out too often.

Since early in his childhood Sport had been jealous of his older brother (especially when the family had helped him financially to pur-

1. Ironically this race prejudice did not seem to color his relationship with Sport. Perhaps he was like many people who are not generally prejudiced against those of a different race but feel differently when marriage into the family arises.

chase a car) who was considered the "pet" of his parents, particularly by his father. Also he resented the fact that he was beaten when he did something wrong which in their eyes was all too often, according to him. Relations were so bad that he joined the Navy at 16 for two years. When he came out he was a changed person in almost every way. In terms of his family he began to resent bitterly his father's cruel treatment of his stepmother. Tension came to a head two years later in July of 1960 (when he was 20) and he moved out. He said that it was solely because he "would be independent, on (his) own". However, everyone knew that Sport did not get on with his father and he never visited his mother when his father was there. Local gossip indicated that he was expelled by his father but there was no concrete evidence for this.

Red's main problem was also his father who was an alcoholic. He was 12 when the man began to stay out late and keep his mother waiting up. At that time he began to argue violently with his father and two years later began "frequently disobeying (his) father on purpose by getting into trouble with the police". Soon after his seventeenth birthday in June, he joined the Navy but was rejected after two months for medical reasons (respiratory problems). Short as it was, the involvement changed him in many ways. Among other things he began to come to terms with the problem caused by his father's drinking. Although he still resented it at the time of the interview, he realized then that his delinquent behavior was only hurting himself, not his father, and he broke his relations with the big gang entirely.

Thus only in three cases were there continued, dissatisfactory relations with either or both parents.

The Eagles, including Rob, had very different stories to tell. Their histories were as follows:

According to Mac his parents began having marital difficulties when he was seven, the year his father lost his business. It upset him badly to hear them quarreling and to hear from others about his father's drinking at the local tavern. As the years went by his drinking became worse, as did his efforts to make quick, easy money through what Mac considered "stupid business deals"; also the man began to beat his mother. His parents became separated when he was about 11 and divorced when he was about 18. At the time of the project Mac was avoiding his father as much as he possibly could.

Shep's father had a college education but received his degree during the depression when he was only able to be employed "in a lower job" which, according to Shep, he hated "because he knew he had brains for a better one". From the ages of seven through 12 he "hated" his father for his drinking, and for constantly comparing him unfavorably to his older brother. At 13 when the drinking became worse and when the man began maltreating his mother, he rebelled by talking back to his father and threatened to "fix him" if he ever hit her again.

At 15, his father was promoted and received more pay but began to gamble most of it away so that there was often not enough to eat - in which case it was Shep who was served last. That his brother always received such "better treatment" was somewhat justified in Shep's mind during those years because he had caused the family trouble and because his brother was employed, contributing to the family income. What he resented were the constant unfavorable comparisons between him and his

brother. He also resented his father's apparent gloating whenever he hurt them; he would come home "laughin' after he had just lost his salary by gamblin'" and he laughed the time he gambled away the money his wife had given him for Shep's bail. Shep's mother admitted to him during this period that she was no longer having sexual relations with her husband.

The climax to these tensions came in the middle of the project when Shep asked his father (after a particularly violent argument) if he regretted having him for a son. His father did not answer directly but said ambiguously, "You know all the answers". The boy then told his father "not to fool around" with him in very strong language, moved out to live first with Mac and then at a boarding house, and had yet to speak to him again by the end of the project. Whether he left voluntarily or was expelled was not entirely clear but, whatever the case, his father barred his return.

At first Jocko denied he had any problem regarding his family but later in the interview he said that he did not respect his father because he drank too much. He became aware of this problem at the age of 13 just before he joined a semi-delinquent gang in his neighborhood. The real cause of Jocko's running away from home several weeks before the start of the project is not known. Shortly after the project started he volunteered that he and his friend, Eddy, had run away "for the hell of it" and refused to give any further explanation. But he frequently spoke of arguments at home or being punished constantly and it was evident that he had not been on good terms with either of his parents but particularly his father and that the act had much to do with his

relations at home.

Dodger had also run away from home shortly before the start of the project. Apparently he had wanted a bicycle at the age of 14½ and his parents said he could have it when he was 16. This delay was disappointing but acceptable and he waited patiently. When the bike was not forthcoming at the specified date, he was quite hurt but not yet angry. He began to save money for a motorcycle and when he had half the necessary sum, his mother contributed the second. But his father refused to sign the license and thus prevented him from having it. This made him furious and he left immediately afterwards for two days. Whether or not he accepted in fact his father's decision to postpone buying the bicycle for two years is debatable. Whatever the case he said at four different places in the interview that his father had not understood him for several years.

Irish had always resented his parents' constantly favoring his younger brother and sister who were observed to be very quiet and studious but managed to get on with the family until they moved to Canada when he was 13. In Great Britain his father had taught Sunday school and been employed during the week in a steel factory which was apparently acceptable to the man himself and the rest of the family. When they moved to Canada he became a sheet metal worker. Quite spontaneously one afternoon, Irish said privately that his father had "messed things up since they moved", that he had initially obtained that job as a temporary measure since presumably they had migrated in hopes of improving their economic status but had "gotten into a rut" and not found other means of employment. He also implied that his

father agreed with this view. Relations within the family gradually became intolerable. Irish constantly fought with his parents as well as his brother and sister. These relations were so bad during the project that Irish ran away for two days. He did not tell anyone specifically why he ran away, saying vaguely that his "old man and doll (mother) had gotten on (his) nerves"; but the event occurred immediately after he had attempted (unsuccessfully) to "borrow" his father's car, which incidentally was a large family car.

Leo's problem with his family is not altogether clear. He spoke at great length about his parents when questioned in the major interview as well as when he was questioned about himself. But frequently he would change from one aspect of the relationship to another with no apparent logic and his feelings towards his parents and himself were highly ambivalent. He said several times that he hated his parents and could kill his father yet when asked if he loved them he said yes. Similarly, he vacillated between viewing himself as a docile and well-meaning but persecuted person to seeing himself as the all-powerful persecutor of his parents.

It is doubtful that the boy was actually lying for it seemed that he was deeply disturbed.¹ When he spoke of himself as being persecuted he would begin quietly and fairly calmly. But, as if he felt terribly guilty or ashamed for allowing such persecution to be perpetrated upon himself, he would become extremely intense and nervous and shift

1. Although his friends liked him, they felt he was very "mixed up", easily confused, and desirous of displaying courage which they felt he basically lacked. According to Mac, Rob used to enjoy making Leo do bold stunts "to save his pride". Ironically Rob and Mac were among the very few people about whom Leo cared deeply.

abruptly into viewing himself as persecutor with a strong sense of revenge. Actually, he said several times that his parents had tried to make him see a psychiatrist but he had refused. Each time after he referred to this he would say something like, "I'm not crazy. I know I'm not. Do you think I'm sick?" Whether or not the subject was in fact psychologically ill is hardly within the scope of this project to decide. However, he was certainly disturbed and his responses to questions concerning himself were so closely related to what he said about his family that the two sets of responses will be partly combined in order to present a comprehensive picture.

According to him, his problems at home began when he was about 12 though there is some evidence that he was miserable before that. He spoke much of being beaten for smoking, staying out late, beating his sister, and doing anything which they viewed as wrong. Most of these activities began after the age of 12 and he insisted that "up until 12, they (his parents) thought I was an angel, thought I'd be somebody". Yet he said later "they hurt me inside. ... I did all I was told and was always scared of everyone. ... It was the same at school... I hated bein' pushed around all the time".

When he was 14 he ran away to his cousin's house in another province for two months because of an incident at school, described elsewhere. When he returned his mother "treated me like a king. Once I knew that she was breakin' down (not going to punish him), that was it". This last statement meant that he knew or felt he had "won" as it were. "After I ran away I was good for a year. Then 15 was a big year." It was some time during the early part of that year that he was sent to

reform school for car theft.

After his parents discovered that it was he and not his friends who instigated many of the delinquent activities in which he was involved, they were so shocked "they nearly had a heart attack". According to him, they became afraid of him;

"They have restrictions but I break them and threaten to break them". When asked if he enjoyed having this power, he answered yes, "because I'm gettin' back at him (his father) for something. ... I enjoy havin' this revenge - for certain people - but it will always have to build up. There's a Frenchman - I'd like to rip his eyes out but I won't be ready for about another six months. Has to be a time limit, build up. It wouldn't do any good if I hit him now; I'd help him up and be sorry".

Later he added, "I'd change if people would give me a chance. It's my parents really. They think they treat me nice but I don't. ... I'd be normal if everyone hadn't pushed me around so much... That's why I won't fight - will let someone hit me 'til I get mad enough to kill him".

When asked if he really thought it all out in his head and wanted people to hit him in order to make him mad, he responded, "I don't think it's nice to think that way - I'm not nuts on the inside. You're the only one I've ever said all this to".

Despite the length and depth of his responses, the specific causes of Leo's troubles are hardly evident. He attributed his problems to being "pushed around" by everyone, particularly his father, but obviously much more is needed to explain the extent of his disturbance. The cause, it would seem, definitely lies somewhere within his family relations. His emphasis on his father's strictness of restrictions and severity of punishment would suggest that the boy's frustrations at home were caused by a father who demanded too much. This interpretation is supported by

several factors. Clearly his father was an enormous problem to him, yet apart from these demands and punishments, Leo did not mention any other quality such as cruelty to wife, inadequacy as a provider, or alcoholism, that would cause so much disturbance. Second, Rob once said that Leo's father had "always been aggressive towards (Leo), always on his back, pushing him to be a better student at school and eventually end up to be somebody. The only mistake in that attitude was that he never gave any praise whenever (Leo) would achieve something".

Third, apart from his reference to beating his sister once, there is no further evidence that jealousy of his siblings might be a partial cause for his ills. In fact, he said that his parents loved him more than them; she was always saying, "I'm first". Considering the worry that he must have given them, this seems hard to believe. On the other hand, he was their only son and it is apparent that they were highly ambitious for him to succeed in the goals they had set out; perhaps their dependence on his success made him feel that he was loved more than his sisters. Also, he spoke for four and a half hours without stopping and referred to his siblings only twice - the two times mentioned above. Whatever the specific causes, it seems clear that the root of the problem lies somewhere in his family relations, especially in the relationship with his father. Perhaps analysis of his responses to other questions will clarify his position.

Although Rob was not interviewed, he discussed the problem he had with his family. He was the youngest of three boys and had a sister younger than himself. Whereas his eldest brother had always been quiet, serious, and persevering, he was spirited, adventurous, and daring. As

far back as he could remember his parents had compared him to both his brothers but particularly the eldest, constantly making such comments as, "Why don't you behave like Ted?" or "Your brother applies himself in school, why don't you?" And so on. Rob loved his parents but hated their refusal to accept him for what he was and the fact that he had no separate identity from his brothers.

F.J. had a similar problem. He was constantly compared unfavorably with an older brother. In his case, though, the older brother was more delinquent than he was but somehow had managed to conceal it from their parents, and therefore the injustice seemed all the more cruel to F.J. Actually he had gone through a major change just before the start of the project; his sentence to reform school which was requested by his father had already done much to convince him of the futility of being a delinquent, but his parents' discovery of his brother's delinquency at that time was the crucial turning point in his relations with them. "Now", he said with pride, "they like me more..."

Although F.J. said he respected both parents equally and rarely discussed his parents outside the interview, there is evidence that he was somewhat ashamed that his father was a bus driver. During the pilot study interview he blushed profusely and giggled nervously with embarrassment when he replied what his father's occupation was. When asked further if he did not approve of the job, he muttered something which sounded rather negative but rather than lose rapport with the boy by asking him to repeat what he had said and thereby cause him further embarrassment, it seemed best to go on to the next question.

Having described historically the essence of any family problems

the subjects had, it is now possible to present briefly the rest of their responses to the questionnaire section on the family. In general both groups spent some time every day with their families. During those periods in which they worked, associated with delinquent gangs, or had problems with their families, they naturally spent less time. All of the Eagles discussed any problems they had with their mothers and sometimes their fathers before they joined the gang. Upon joining five of them stopped asking both parents for advice. At the time of the project only Mac and Dodger continued to "talk things over" with their mothers. In contrast, most board members had always discussed their problems with their parents whenever they had them, especially with their mothers. Only two of them stated that there had been any change in that practice; Mitch stopped discussing his problems at 15 when he discovered his mother had been divorced and Sport ceased when he moved out.

All the Eagles used to do things with their families until they joined the gang. Since then they occasionally went on picnics or family visits but most of them got on so badly with their families that they tended to avoid being with them. The board members, too, used to do more things with their families but their main reason for the change was quite different; most of them participated in less activities after they began to work.

When asked what they were rewarded for all the board members except Rex¹ mentioned scholastic achievements first, and four mentioned good

1. Rex said that his mother did not believe in rewarding her children. "If I do something, I try not to show it; we just knew that we did it and that was enough."

behavior second. In general they were rewarded by verbal praise, privileges, and in a few cases, gifts. Most Eagles were rewarded for the same things - good grades in school and good behavior and were rewarded mainly by praise and sometimes gifts but not privileges. Board members were punished for various things: all for disobedience of parental orders such as no smoking or drinking, coming in early, and so on; three (J.T., Andy, and Sport) for playing hockey or doing badly in school; three (Mitch, Red, and Sport) for getting into trouble with the police. Punishments usually consisted of losing privileges or being given lectures and prevented from going out. Three (Mitch, Red, and Sport) were strapped or "cuffed on the ear" if the offense was considered serious. Similarly, most Eagles were punished for disobeying orders, breaking the law, and getting into trouble with the police, but none of them mentioned doing badly in school. And Shep claimed he was never really punished even though he was often wrong. Punishments for the Eagles seemed to be slightly more lenient than those for board members. Mostly they were simply given lectures though two (Mac and Irish) said they were hit occasionally and of course Leo insisted that he was frequently beaten as well as kept in.

Four in each group thought that their punishments had been fair at the time they had been issued. Board members Crew and Andy thought their punishments were unfair whereas Eagles Irish and Shep thought that their parents' orders were too strict. One in each group (Sport and Leo) thought that their parents' orders and punishments were too strict. All subjects except Leo agreed that, looking back, they were fair and just.

Four board members loved their parents equally. Red was "prejudiced"

toward his mother when his father drank. Sport said he loved them both equally at the time of the project though he used to love his father less. It would seem, however, that he was using the word "love" very loosely for it conflicts with what he had said about his parents but perhaps it was possible for him to love them even though he resented deeply their favoritism. Rex's sentiments have already been described above. The situation was just the reverse for Eagles. Four of them stated that they loved their mothers more than their fathers. Mac's comment on this question is noteworthy. He replied "I love my mother but not my father. I hate him even when he's trying to be nice. He's promised me so much and never fulfilled any of it. Mother always came through even though she worked hard for it". Irish responded that he did not love either of his parents. Jocko and F.J. claimed that they loved both their parents equally.

Most board members respected their parents equally. Apart from Rex who said that he was too young before his father died to respect anyone, Sport was the only one who did not respect his father, and considering his earlier statements it was surprising that he said he had only begun to disrespect his father two months before the project began. Although he insisted that there was no specific explanation for the change, his precise identification of the date of the change would indicate that this was not so. The only three Eagles who did not respect their parents equally were Shep, Mac, and Jocko; largely because of their fathers' drinking, they did not respect them as much as their mothers.

The same three Eagles did not get along with their fathers for the

same reason. Two others, Leo and Irish, did not get along with their fathers because of their constant nagging. F.J. and Dodger had not gotten along well with their fathers until recently due to their inability to be understanding. Whereas none of the Eagles got along with their fathers as well as with their mothers four board members got on equally well with both parents and Rex, of course, never really knew his father. Red and Sport were the only ones who did not get along with their fathers: Red because his father drank and Sport because his father nagged him.

There was very little difference between the two groups with regard to ideas their families had about school, church, their friends, and their occupations. All subjects' parents wanted them to finish high school and a few in each group had hoped their sons would go to college as well. Similarly all subjects were encouraged (a few in each group forced) to attend church. Catholics were given no choice as to which religion they should accept whereas parents of Protestant subjects urged their sons to be Protestants but were not very particular about which kind. All board members and five Eagles stated that their parents discouraged associating with boys who were known to cause trouble. Only two who said their parents thought their friends were "okay"; it was known, though, that these two subjects, F.J. and Jocko, rarely brought their friends home for observation. Concerning their occupations five in each group responded that their parents left the choice up to them though several in each group were encouraged to attend trade schools which would train them in the occupation of their choice. Two in each group (board members Rex and Crew and Eagles Leo and Jocko) were encouraged to go into office jobs.

On the whole board members came closer to fulfilling these expectations than the Eagles. Both groups were about equal in the number of grades they passed successfully in school, though board members had made more effort than the Eagles to educate themselves further. Eagles attended church more often than board members but it was only the Catholics who did so regularly and all the Eagles seemed less concerned about Christian values and being Christian than board members. Both groups disappointed their parents by associating with troublemaking friends but in the case of board members the period of association was much shorter than that for the Eagles. Finally, parents of all subjects were more or less satisfied about their son's choice of jobs but parents of Eagles were clearly disappointed that their sons had failed to maintain steady employment.

Whether or not subjects fulfilled parental expectations most of them agreed with most of their parents' desires for them. Four board members and five Eagles agreed fully with their parents' desires at the time that they were specified. Two board members agreed partially: Mitch, with everything except his parents' evaluation of his friends during his association with the big gang, and Rex with everything except his mother's encouragement to take an office job. Although he thought being president of a large corporation would be an ideal job, he really hated dressing and being formal. Two Eagles, Leo, and Jocko, and one board member, Sport, thought at the time that their parents should not make any demands but rather let them lead their own lives. Since they had been working, however, these three as well as Mitch had changed their minds and like the others (except Rex), agreed fully with their parents' views. The only one who ever felt that his parents' desires

were different from others in the community was J.T. He thought that his parents emphasized good manners, cleanliness, and neatness perhaps more than other parents in the community.

Subjects' views of their parents' views of them were varied. Three board members (J.T., Andy, and Mitch) thought their parents had always had a positive or very favorable view of them while the others knew their parents were upset about their behavior and associations when they were in the big gang. In contrast, nearly all of the Eagles thought their parents were distressed about their behavior and attitudes especially in recent years. Although Dodger said he did not know what his parents thought of him, his constant reference to his father's failure to understand him would indicate that there was some perceived ill feeling in that relationship. Shep's fear that his father did not love him at all has already been discussed, as has Leo's insistence that his parents thought he was an "angel" before they discovered his delinquent activities; F.J.'s perception of favorable feelings since his parents discovered the delinquency of his brother; and Irish's feeling that his parents loved him much more before the family moved to Canada. Mac figured his parents probably loved him but thought he was a "bum" for causing so much trouble. Jocko was the only one who thought his parents' view of him had always been more or less favorable. Considering, though, the times that they had punished him for stealing cars and running away (not to mention minor errors), this seems debatable.

Most of the subjects expected similar things from their parents - support, guidance, respect, security, and so on. One or two in each group said they had no particular expectations though four Eagles (Mac,

Irish, Shep, and Leo) had come to expect nothing since relations with their parents had deteriorated. And four board members had changed their expectations. Both Sport (since he left the Navy) and Rex (since his sister's wedding) began to expect and receive more independence; Crew who expected nothing while he associated with the big gang, had begun to wish that his parents had been more strict with regard to his schooling, and Mitch did not actually change his expectations but, since he left the big gang, began to appreciate his parents much more than he had in the past.

When asked if their parents had lived up to their expectations five board members gave an unqualified yes answer. The other two felt that on the whole their parents had but Rex said he never had "much freedom or toys"(!) and Red wished that his parents had taken a more active interest in his affairs especially his schooling. Answers to whether or not there was anything their parents should have done but did not were similar. Five said no. Red mentioned his parents' lack of interest and Mitch said, "Yes, a couple of good kicks". Of the Eagles who expected anything from their parents, only Dodger said yes though his father's alleged lack of understanding is well known. The others said no although Mac added that his parents had always seen that he had enough clothes and allowance. Yet when asked if there was anything his parents should have done but did not, he said that his father should have looked into his problems and supported him but "shouldn't have gone out drinking, spent all his pay, and not provide food for us". The other two who said yes to this question were Leo who thought his parents should have tried to see his "side of the story" and been more lenient, and Shep who said his father "disappointed" him: "When I was

small, he cared, now he doesn't. At first he'd take the time. Later I found out when I got into serious trouble that he was more interested in himself... he wouldn't help me out at all when I wanted to save for a car. That's when I started drinking again quite a bit".

Shep was the only subject who did not think his parents loved him. Although all subjects except Shep felt that they were loved, one board member (Sport)¹ and four Eagles felt that they were loved less than another brother. In three cases, Sport, Mac, and Shep, they felt it was only their fathers who discriminated against them; the other two (F.J. and Irish) felt that both parents discriminated against them. One in each group, Rex and Leo, claimed that their parents loved them more than the others, though in Rex's case he did not discover it until two months before the project when his mother was ill and told him so as she thanked him for having helped so much around the house.

When asked if they thought their parents had tried to understand them and support them in any problems they had, five board members said yes they always had and Sport figured that his parents had only done so recently since he had moved out. Rex asserted that he never told his mother his problems as he felt she had enough of her own. The Eagle Jocko responded similarly in the negative but gave no such altruistic explanation. The rest of the Eagles felt that either or both parents had failed in this respect. Mac, Dodger, and Shep replied that their mothers had always made an effort to understand them whereas their

1. Actually Red said, "My younger sister gets away with more because of her whole age group". This rather casual comment, it would seem, should not be classified in the same category with those who obviously felt a deep sense of jealousy.

fathers had not, though Shep had admitted earlier that his father had probably tried when he was very young. Leo felt that neither of his parents had ever tried to understand him while Irish guessed his parents had stopped trying since they moved to Canada. And F.J. was pleased to report that his parents had begun to understand him after their discovery about his brother.

Although the final question in this section unfortunately was not added until halfway through the interview series, the results of the few in each group who did answer it reflect the general difference between the board members and Eagles concerning their families. Board members spoke in glowing terms about their parents using such phrases as "best in the world", "straightforward", "fair", "easy going", and so on. In contrast, Eagles described their fathers especially with such terms as "rough", "lacking in understanding", "unfair", and so on.

Unless stated otherwise in the analysis these responses to the questionnaire were confirmed by observation. That is, there was nothing the subjects said spontaneously to each other or in private to contradict the statements they made in the interview. Moreover, nothing that was observed in the parent-child relationship contradicted what the subjects said about their parents.

From these descriptions it would seem that the differences between the two groups with regard to the family are most outstanding and significant. Although five board members had several problems, one (Andy) perceived his to be a problem exclusively connected with his sister (that is, having nothing to do with his parents) and one (Mitch)

regarded the problem he had with his parents as purely a temporary one lasting for two years. Thus only three board members (Red, Sport, and Rex) had serious problems with their parents long before they associated with the big gang.¹ Of those three only one (Sport) perceived unjust discrimination from his parents. Of all four board members who had problems with their parents, three were primarily the result of some perceived lack in the parent-child relationship as opposed to some disrespected quality or activity in the parent himself, as was the case with Red (his father's drinking) and eventually Sport (his father's cruel treatment of his mother) - the two were most deeply involved with the big gang.

In contrast, all the Eagles including Rob had serious difficulties with their parents, especially their fathers, long before they became delinquent. Six of them perceived a lack in the parent-child relationship: Leo and Dodger because of strictness and lack of understanding; Rob, Mac, Shep, Irish and F.J., because of discrimination against themselves in favor of a brother. In addition, Mac and Shep hated their fathers' drinking and cruelty to their mothers.

At this point one may ask about the shame Mac, F.J., Shep, and Irish felt about the economic positions of their parents: what type problem, exactly, was it? This shame, it would appear, was not based on the fact of their fathers' occupational and financial status, that is, with the exception of F.J., they were not ashamed of the type work in which their fathers were employed or the amount of money they earned.

1. The correlation between the beginning of family problems and the beginning of delinquent associations and activities will be discussed later in Chapter XI, Section 2, pp. 312 ff .

Being a salesman or laborer was quite acceptable and none of them felt economic deprivation as a result of the amount of money earned by their fathers. What they did resent was the fact that through admitted bad judgment and mismanagement, their fathers had descended the economic and occupational ladder or failed to rise after making promises that they would and then wasted the money that they did earn on such things as drink and gambling. And they, because of their fathers' own sense of shame and inadequacy, had been made to feel this burden. Thus they were not ashamed of their fathers' actual positions but their inadequacy as men. Consequently, this problem will be considered a family problem rather than an economic one.

That Eagles had more disturbing family problems is evidenced by the fact that five of them had run away or moved out whereas only two board members had done so. The full significance of these disturbances cannot be assessed until all the material has been examined but the universality and seriousness of such problems within this group cannot be overemphasized. Because the essence of responses concerning the family problems has been presented at length and analyzed above, there seems to be no need to analyze further responses to the specific questions upon which that presentation and analysis were based - except to point out that there was no correlation between religion or origin and the number or type of family problems perceived by the subjects.

GIRLS

There were few differences between the two groups concerning their experience with and attitude toward girls. The members of both groups started dating between 10 and 14, the average age of first date being 12. Board members currently preferred dating "nice" girls who were "fun to be with" but three (Mitch, Rex, and Crew) admitted that they had gone out primarily with girls whom they considered tramps (sexually immoral) while they were in the big gang. Similarly five Eagles stated that they had always dated nice girls as a rule (nice meaning girls who are not sexually promiscuous and who do not drink heavily) while two, F.J. and Mac, dated "different kinds" of girls and "treated them accordingly" - meaning that they treated those whom they respected with respect.

Although board members had gone "steady" more often than Eagles, this difference could certainly be accounted for by the difference in the ages of the two groups. Reasons given by both groups for "breaking off" were varied. The most outstanding reason stated by Eagles as well as board members was being "fed up with" or "tired of" the girl in question. Moving out of the neighborhood was the second most frequently cited reason for breaking off with a steady. Red was the only subject who admitted that he had been "jilted" by a girl and Dodger was the only one who had ever gone steady with a tramp but he broke off with her as soon as he "discovered what she was".

A few in each group had never had sexual intercourse though all subjects said that they had had much sexual experience with girls. All subjects stated curiosity as the reason for having engaged in sexual intercourse or "heavy petting" for the first time. Presumably having

satisfied their curiosity, board members thereafter had intercourse or petted heavily with girls only when and usually because they cared for the particular girl and viewed their sexual activities as an expression of their love and affection. Only J.T. had intercourse sheerly out of sexual desire; girls about whom he cared he would "never even ask" to engage in intercourse with him. Two members, Crew and Sport, were less rigid in their views; they frequently had intercourse for both reasons - because they cared and because of sexual desire. This same double standard, as it were, may be seen in the Eagles. In general most of them had had sexual intercourse only with girls whom they did not respect. "I never touched a broad I really cared for" or "I like her too much" were typical statements made by the members of both groups.

When asked if they classified girls in any way board members were more reluctant to give a definite answer. Over half the group simply did not classify girls. The other three (Mitch, Rex, and Crew), the same three who had dated tramps while they were in the big gang, classified girls solely on the basis of their sexual morals; girls were either good, nice, and sexually moral or they were bad and sexually promiscuous. Eagles, though quick to classify girls, were much less clear in the basis of classification. Irish and Dodger were the only two to differentiate girls purely on the basis of sexual morals; according to them girls were either "easy" (whores) or "not so easy" (nice).

The others mixed class and personality qualities with sexual morals. F.J. thought girls were "pigs, lovable, cozy, or intelligent". And three others referred, among other things, to snobbishness. Leo responded, "some I don't like because they are too snobby - talk too much; others

are sluts. My girl's different she's quiet; she's the average girl". Shep stated that he did not really "class girls" but immediately went on to say without any prompting that some were too "high class; some, a bunch of teasers, and some were okay". Before he joined the Eagles Mac did not classify girls; afterward, however, he felt that girls were "snobs - high class - or low down. Some think they are higher than you, then you find out her parents are better than yours".

In all three cases it is difficult to discern whether the mention of snobbishness and class are pure references to social class. On the surface all three statements appear to indicate an awareness of differences in social class. Yet there are several reasons for believing that the references are not at all pure. First, the use of the word "classify" may have been unfortunate; that is, those unfamiliar with the correct usage of the word could have interpreted it much more literally than was intended; and being younger, less experienced, etc., than board members, Eagles may have been more prone to interpret the word literally. Secondly, in the case of Leo and Shep the phrases immediately following suggest that the differentiation is at least in part on the basis of sexual morals or personality factors. Thus, high class may well mean high moralled. This interpretation is supported by subjects' responses to the question concerning the type of girls they dated (which was purely on the basis of sexual morals) and their responses to the question concerning types of girls who would not date them: Mac gave an unequivocal "no" response. Shep said, "a hell of a lot - all types" but then Shep enjoyed bragging about the time that one girl's parents had caught Shep in the act of having intercourse with their daughter as well as the total number of girls he had "had". In view of this, it is hardly

surprising that any girl who wished to remain a virgin or have others believe that she was, would certainly avoid associating with the boy. Leo's responses were most revealing. He said, "high class, sophisticated girls" (would not date him). "I'm not that kind of guy. They want a goody-goody - in good with their parents." His equation of class with degree of sophistication suggests that the reference to class is very impure. Moreover, it is clear from the rest of the statement that he was referring to judgments made by girls and their parents regarding his actions - not his or his family's social or economic class as such.

Mac's statement can be similarly explained. Before he became an Eagle, he joined a non-delinquent, well respected social group of boys and girls because he wanted to go out with two particular girls. He was accepted by that group including the two girls in question and only left it because the group would not accept his friend Rob. His acceptance by the group and the girls proves that he had no need to feel any discrimination on the basis of his parents' socio-economic position. By the time that Mac dropped out of that group, his father's drinking problems and marital difficulties were well known. Subjects in both groups indicated that his father's actions were somewhat damaging to Mac's social reputation.

Thus it would seem in all three cases that references to class were anything but pure and could hardly be understood entirely, if at all, as proof of the existence of class consciousness (in the accepted sociological sense of the word). Clearly they did not judge others primarily on the basis of social position nor did they feel that they were judged by girls and their parents primarily on the basis of social

class. More likely, and in keeping with responses to other questions as well as observed behavior, they judged girls and perceived themselves judged by girls and their parents on the basis of actions and not status.

When asked what ideas their families had with regard to their dating habits, nearly all the subjects responded that their parents said very little about it. All subjects said their parents wanted them "to be careful" and "not to get into trouble" (concerning participation in sexual activities) though board members' parents emphasized treating girls with respect and going out with nice girls more than parents of Eagles. Nearly all subjects agreed with their parents and felt that such ideas were emphasized for their own good. Only Irish disagreed; he quipped, "It's my own business if I get a disease".

Most board members stated that they had always felt girls thought of them as being "okay", "average", "ordinary", and so on. Three Eagles did not know what girls thought of them. Two, Leo and F.J., felt that girls viewed them as "average" and "good" respectively. And two, Irish and Shep, believed girls were divided in their opinion of them. Some girls, they figured, felt they were "good" or "okay" while others hated them or thought they were bad. The differences in response to this question are most probably a product of age and greater contact with girls. By themselves, these differences do not seem to be significant. What is significant is that those who perceived a judgment at all, perceived that the judgment was made on the basis of their personal qualities and actions. Finally, it is significant that no subject felt that he was viewed as being substantially different from others.

One or two in each group expected to receive from girls, experience

or preparation for marriage. Most of the others in each group expected to find certain qualities in girls such as friendship, intelligence, and so on. Leo wished to be made happy by any girl he should take out. Whatever their expectations from girls none of the subjects felt that their expectations had been fulfilled, at least by a single girl. Yet virtually all subjects felt that there was nothing that they should have gotten out of their relationship with girls but did not.

When asked if there was any particular type girl that they would not date three board members vowed that they would not date "tramps" whereas five Eagles refused to go out with "pigs" (the equivalent of tramps). Other types of girls that subjects would not date were those who were "stuck up" (J.T.) and those who were "too soft, who wouldn't stand up to you" (Shep). Five board members could not think of any type girl who they felt would not date them and Sport did not know. Only Crew said yes, "a high class one - (I) wasn't her type. Didn't matter then but it bothers me now, not much though". About half the Eagles did not know if there was any type girl who would not date them. Three said yes. Shep and Leo (whose responses have been discussed above) and Jocko who mourned that "good looking" girls would not date him. Nearly all the subjects wanted to get married eventually when they were between 25 and 35 and had achieved adulthood as well as financial stability.

Observation certainly confirms the responses of each group to the questionnaire. Board members seemed to care whether the girl they dated or went steady with was nice and their relationship with girls appeared to be stable and responsible. For one thing they actively dated girls

rather than saw them, as did most of the Eagles. That is, they arranged ahead of time to go out with the girl in question, went to her house to pick her up, attended to her at the specified place (usually the dance or movies), and then took her out to a restaurant before taking her home around 12.00 or 12.30 p.m. Frequently board members double dated and visited each other's houses with girls to play records, talk, and so on. Whether at home, at the dance, or at the movies, they were usually fairly quiet, orderly, and polite especially in their language. Because this type relationship existed board members were usually very well known to and on friendly terms with the parents of girls whom they dated.

The three Eagles who went steady with girls, Leo, Shep and Irish, behaved in very similar ways except that their relationship to their "steady's" parents is not known. The others, however, behaved very differently around girls. On the whole their relationship with girls was very casual and irresponsible. Most of the time they had very little to do with girls, even at dances and movies. Occasionally different members would pick out a girl with whom they wished to dance or neck, remain attentive to her until the particular end was achieved, and then rejoin the boys. They rarely conversed with these girls in between dancing or necking but when they did their language, except when speaking to a girl whom they respected, was often deliberately full of obscenities. Unless they wanted to go to her house, they almost never saw the girls after the dance or show. And if they went to parties, only those who were going steady brought a girl to the party.

This considerable difference in behavior may be the result of

differences in ages especially when one considers that those Eagles who went steady were among the oldest. On the other hand, the members of the big gang who were still active are believed to have had similar relationships with girls as the Eagles. This would suggest that attitude toward girls is largely a product of gang code. Certainly membership in a gang discourages steady relationship with girls for several reasons. A steady girl friend made heavy demands on the individual's time and energy, if not money and loyalty. Obviously girls who went steady were usually known to be against gang membership precisely because it did absorb so much time, energy, and money. And because Eagles (like many delinquents oriented to making trouble) would only go steady with girls whom they respected, it follows that she would be against participation in troublemaking activities. Finally, to treat girls in ways described above, casually and irresponsibly, was supposed to be a sign of independence from them and to show great "toughness" of character - both of which were quite desirable according to gang morals.

Actually, the Eagles maintained a double standard, as it were, in their treatment of and attitude toward girls; they treated with respect those girls whom they respected and they were quite irresponsible, if not cruel, towards girls whom they did not respect. Moreover, they wanted girls about whom they cared, to be virgins, loyal, and responsible. This was proved in their observed behavior toward girls, in their casual conversations about girls, and in their responses to the questionnaire section on girls. It suggests a deep commitment to accepted social values and it reveals much about their character.

Observation also revealed a tendency to judge and be judged by

actions and personal traits rather than status. In casual conversation not one Eagle was ever observed to comment on the socio-economic position of a girl or her family. When they made remarks or judgments, they were always based on the girl's morals or personality. In the questionnaire the extent that they made and perceived judgments to be made of them on the basis of their class status rather than their actions is not known conclusively. It has been suggested, however, that none of the three Eagles who referred to class had any clearcut notion of social class as such and in fact was using the word "class" to indicate type of sexual morals or personality. And when one considers the offensiveness of their behavior toward girls and their parents, it is surprising that only three Eagles felt that they had any kind of problem concerning girls.¹ Certainly several parents as well as girls were heard to make judgments about Eagles because of their behavior or their parents' behavior - not on the basis of socio-economic positions. It would seem, then, that personality and behavior are the general or primary basis for making and perceiving judgments.

1. Because this number is so small, it does not appear to be very significant. That two of the three Eagles were native born Catholics may have been important. On the other hand, none of the other three Catholics experienced any kind of problem with girls and the one board member who perceived discrimination was neither an immigrant nor Catholic.

CHAPTER X

PRESSURES FROM OTHER SPHERES

EDUCATION

Although neither group was observed at school or taking trade courses, their responses to the pilot interview section on educational background gives a good indication of how they did in school. Ironically, it was the delinquents who were slightly better academically.¹ Although most subjects in both groups passed successfully an average of eight grades, the junior board members had to repeat more often; the average number of total years devoted to formal education was 11 for them and only nine for the Eagles.² Moreover, the only scholarship ever held by a board member was a religious one awarded to Red for his interest and, according to him, "fanatic devotion", whereas both Mac and Rob had won scholarships for the year before they left. These scholarships were based entirely on their academic achievement; Rob was second in a class of 63 and Mac was third. Grades on the whole, though, for both groups were mainly average (C's), sometimes good (B's), and in certain years failure.

Why did all the subjects drop out of school after only a few years of training at the high school level? It is significant that not one of them mentioned teacher discrimination, financial necessity, or parental pressure as a reason. About half in each group left because they lacked interest or just did not like it. Only two board members

1. Though Brian Sanders who taught most of them maintained that they were about equal in intellectual ability. A few in each group were not very bright (but not stupid), and most of them were average or fairly bright.

2. The school leaving age was still more or less comparable for both groups since it was two board members in particular, Mitch and J.T., who pulled this average down so far.

said they left because they had failed (though a third also failed his final year) and two Eagles indicated that they would have failed in their final year had they stayed. One of these, Irish, said, "I knew at the time I should have stayed but I didn't; it was hard to get used to after British schools. I didn't work it right, took too many subjects. If I had stayed, it would have changed my whole life". Other reasons given in both groups were that they wanted to work and have their own money or to go to trade school. A few of the Eagles mentioned the gang as an additional or secondary reason for leaving.

Apart from the fact that nearly all the subjects dropped out of school around the eighth or ninth grade and the reasons they gave for doing it, there is nothing unusual or different about their attitude toward school, their teachers, and education itself. Like most youths, the members of both groups liked and disliked certain few of their teachers and subjects and several in each group disliked homework or liked sports, recess, girls, and other non-academic aspects of school. Similarly they felt that most of their teachers liked them or thought of them as "average" while a few disliked them - in most cases justifiably so, according to them. And three of the Eagles said that they felt their teachers liked them personally, and knew they were capable of learning but did not apply themselves. On the whole about half in each group generally liked school while they were there and most of those in both groups who generally disliked going to school thought it was important to be educated.

The three board members who disliked it were Mitch, J.T., and Rex; all three were immigrants, two of which were Protestants and

one was Catholic. Interestingly it was not the immigrant Eagles who disliked school but the Catholics, Jocko, Leo, and Shep. There does not seem to be any immediate explanation for this difference. The junior board immigrants who disliked school were not significantly older or younger at the age of immigration than Eagle immigrants who liked school. And two of the four Catholics went to Protestant as well as Catholic schools; in fact Leo liked his Protestant school much better than the Catholic one to which he transferred in the eighth grade. The other two Catholic Eagles went exclusively to Catholic schools.

There was considerable difference in response to the question concerning the purpose of education. Five board members, at the time they went, viewed going to school vaguely as a means of "getting educated" while only one saw it primarily as a means of attaining a better job. Obversely, five Eagles thought one received an education in order to obtain a better job while one saw it as an end in itself. And one in each group went to school solely because he was sent and saw no purpose in school. This difference could be the result of differential parental emphasis. However, all subjects stated (in regard to questions concerning the family) that their parents had urged them to finish high school and two subjects in each group believed their parents wanted them to go on to college. Most probably this difference arose because they confused their post-school feelings with those they had while in school. In the first place, at the time of the project they had only been out of school for about two years. Second, only two of them - as compared with nearly all the junior board - went to trade school immediately or shortly after leaving school. Third,

without this additional or simultaneous extra training, they averaged a starting salary of \$35 whereas the average starting salary for the junior board was \$50. And the two Eagles who did go to trade school before or during their first full time jobs received \$43 and \$56 respectively. Fourth, at the time of the project, they were painfully aware of this lack of qualification.

F.J. explains why they could leave school to work at the same time that they believed education to be the means of getting a good job. When asked if he had changed his mind since he left school, he responded, "I always thought the purpose of education was to get a job but it didn't register; a year after I left (reform school), I realized". The other three Eagles who said they thought, before they left school, that education was a means of getting a better job responded in a variety of ways when asked if they had changed their opinions. Two realized that education was an end in itself; the other (who had an office job with a training course thrown in) said, "now I think education is important for matriculation and getting degrees but not necessarily for getting a good job". The other two Eagles had not changed their view; one still thought that it had no purpose and the other that it was an end in itself. Ironically, of the five board members who reasoned that education was an end in itself, three had changed their minds after they left and began to calculate it as a means of obtaining a better job; the two who attended because they were sent went through a similar change after leaving school. The other two did not change.

What they expected to get out of school while they were still there corresponds closely in the case of the board members with their view of

the purpose of education and in the case of the Eagles with their general attitude toward it. The five board members who saw education as an end in itself expected vaguely "to be educated". According to Andy, this meant "as much schooling as possible"; to J.T. this meant "everything - a better standing in life for success". And so on. Those who attended because they were forced to expected nothing. Similarly the five Eagles who disliked school generally expected nothing or did not know what to expect while the other two expected to get general training or "more brains".

In the main, neither group felt any kind of serious discrimination, unfair treatment, or discouragement from their teachers. Five board members referred to certain teachers who disliked them without cause. In two cases it was simply a question of recognizing the dislike, resenting it perhaps, but denying that it had any real or negative effect on their work. The other three had more serious problems. The only case which could definitely be interpreted as class discrimination was that of Crew. Apparently one of his teachers asked all the East End boys to stand up so that he "could see who the bums were".¹ The other two cases seem to be the result of personality clashes. Red felt his French teacher disliked him personally and indicated that it was because of this dislike that he could not do sufficiently well in that subject to pass it; on the other hand, he ultimately blamed himself for not trying harder than he did. Andy told of one teacher whom the class hated and whom the authorities eventually expelled for allowing personal feelings to influence

1. He explained later that many of the boys from East End had a bad reputation which many of them deserved. This, he argued, was no excuse to prejudice a person.

his academic judgment; apparently this man particularly disliked Andy¹ and was a partial cause of his running away from home for two months.

Only two Eagles felt any discrimination. Apparently Leo had been in a very small class (allowing much special attention) several years before he changed to a City Catholic school where the classes were much larger. According to him, his teachers "didn't give a --- about me", and eventually one of them hit him without justification and caused him to run away for two months. That year he failed and joined the Eagles though he did not drop out. For that failure he still blamed the school though he added, "I guess they had others to think of so it wasn't all their fault". He had another complaint as well. It seemed that he did not have enough subjects for his junior matriculation and, for reasons which he failed to make clear, he thought the school's decision not to admit him the following year was unfair and still felt that way at the time of the project. Dodger's case was quite different. Due to a mastoid operation he missed a year and a half of school and the school authorities refused without trial or examination to readmit him to the class of his own age group. He resented this action tremendously as he felt quite out of place with boys two years his junior. He tried rather halfheartedly to do well until he received low marks in a certain class. Apparently the principal asked the teacher in question to give all those with low marks some special attention. When she failed to do so, Dodger gave up altogether and left. Although he blamed the school and the teacher for being unjust, even at the time he left, he (like Red) ultimately blamed himself for not trying harder.

¹. The other reason was that he had been working at night to earn some extra money and the strain was too great for him.

Ironically the three board members who had serious problems with their teachers were not the same three who disliked school. Moreover, none of these were immigrants or Catholic. Of the two Eagles who experienced serious problems with teachers, Leo (a Catholic) disliked it while Dodger liked it despite his problems and the fact that he was an immigrant.

Apart from these five serious cases, there was no other perceived discrimination. Actually, many in each group, including some of those who disliked school or had problems with a particular teacher, said that several of their teachers gave them special attention or recognition. And when asked if they thought there was anything the school could have done for them but did not, five in each group said no. Interestingly Andy was not one of these; and although Red's answer was positive, he was referring to the enforcement of rules - he felt that the school should have been more strict. Mitch was the other board member who said yes but he, too, blamed himself: "It was their job to see that I matured properly and they didn't but I guess I didn't give them much of a chance". The two Eagles who responded in the positive were Leo and Doger; both referred to the incidents described above. Six in each group said they could have studied harder, received better grades, and learned more.

Finally, all board members who were taking education or vocational courses planned to continue doing so and Crew had decided to go to night school the coming fall. Only one Eagle (Shep) did not plan to further his education in the future. Dodger and Irish said they definitely wanted to go back to school but would wait until they finished their

proposed travels. Leo planned to continue his job training course and thought he might some day try to go to college. The other three, Mac, F.J., and Jocko planned to go to night school or take a trade course within the year. Actually, correspondence has revealed that Mac did begin night school in the fall of '62; whether or not the others carried out their plans is not known.

It is clear from these responses to the questionnaire that there were no substantial differences between the two groups in their reasons for leaving school, attitude toward education, their expectations from it, and their perception of differential treatment. If anyone, it was the board members who perceived such treatment! It is worth noting that of all those who had any kind of problem with their teacher, Crew was the only one who perceived disapproval because of his background. Apparently the others were the result of bureaucratic red tape, their own admitted bad behavior, or personality conflicts. The only outstanding difference was the Eagles' widespread association of education with attaining a better job - both at the time they were in school and at the time of the project - whereas the board members did not have this association until after they left school. Reasons for this difference have already been given and it appears to have little significance in itself.

What may be significant is that all those who disliked school were either immigrants or Catholics. On the other hand, it seems equally significant that the only three board members who experienced serious teacher problems were native born Protestants. And it is certainly worth noting that nearly all (6) of the board members either disliked

school or had serious problems with their teachers whereas only four of the Eagles either disliked school and/or had serious teacher problems.

It is also clear that whatever the members of both groups missed in school or failed to get out of it, ultimately they blamed themselves and not the educational system, their teachers, or the authorities at their particular schools. Both groups were committed to the value of education as an end in itself or as a means to an end before they left school as well as after they began to work; even those in both groups who did not like it recognized its general importance at the time they went. That they were serious in this commitment may be seen in the number who had attempted to further their technical or academic education or who were going to do so.

Although neither group discussed education in group meetings, they said nothing to contradict any statements they made on the questionnaire. Usually when they talked about school, they discussed particular subjects and more frequently teachers that they liked or disliked. And, of course, whenever they talked about school, both groups inevitably would mention various stunts which they or youths they knew had perpetrated during school hours. There were, however, the few occasions when both groups discussed education seriously. Each time most of the subjects reaffirmed the value of being educated, especially the Eagles toward the end of the project. As soon as they had started working, they had realized the truth of the principal's statement, "(East End) is a dead end for anyone who doesn't succeed in education".¹

1. February 1961 interview with the man who was principal of the East End Elementary school for two years, 1958-1959 and 1959-1960.

RELIGION

The two groups were quite different with regard to religious denomination, acceptance of doctrine, attitude toward religion, and frequency of discussing it spontaneously. Of the six Protestant board members, four belonged to the United Church of Canada. J.T. was a Lutheran and Mitch was an Anglican. Rex, the Ukranian from France, was the only Catholic in the group and was completely bi-lingual. Of the four Eagles who were Catholic only Shep was of recent French¹ descent; he had been reared entirely among English-speaking Protestants and consequently did not speak French. The other members of the delinquent group were Anglican or belonged to the United Church of Canada.

Only three of all the subjects did not generally accept their religion and all three were Protestant board members: Red, the one-time religious fanatic, was agnostic; J.T., the Norwegian - an atheist; and Sport, the Negro from Barbados, was somewhere in between agnosticism and atheism.² Ironically both Sport and Red were the only board members asked to teach Sunday school classes and Doug, Mitch's older delinquent brother who had been a ringleader of the big gang, also taught for several years.

Because neither group was observed with any regularity on Sundays it was not possible to confirm statements referring to practice. But in response to the questionnaire section on religion most of the subjects

1. A new fringe member of this group who was not interviewed was also a French Catholic and could hardly speak English. His father was a policeman!

2. Although he did not believe in God, he still said his prayers, especially when he was drunk!

said they used to attend church regularly until they were about 15 or 16. Mitch was the only Protestant board member to say that he still went to church weekly. When they did attend church only one or two in each group went by themselves while the rest went with family or friends. When asked why they went to church or Sunday school, there was a variety of answers. Three of the board members reckoned they attended because they were forced by their families. Strangely enough these three were Red, Sport, and Rex. Four in each group attended perhaps partly because of parental encouragement but mostly because they wanted to go, to learn more about their particular doctrine. Of the remaining Eagles Dodger said he attended church only because his friends did while Jocko and Leo responded immediately that they went because the Church advocated it. F.J. figured he went because he was forced but when asked why he stopped going he replied that he had lost interest, so presumably interest was at least a partial reason for his attendance.

Both the English speaking and French churches boasted in the Fiftieth Anniversary pamphlet that they offered a variety of social, educational, and recreational programs for young people. But, according to Reverend Loney, this was not at all true until 1959, when their \$90,000 Christian Education Center was officially opened. In an interview early in the project he regretted that there were few such activities in the winter and none in the summer. The church was too "absorbed in clearing ground for the center, a new house for the minister, and a new organ for the church", to be able to offer its services to the young people in the community. Apart from a few church sponsored dances and "get-togethers" in the school gymnasium or auditorium, the English speaking teenage population had only the social

agency to provide organized social activities during the day or at night.

The church did, however, have a social welfare fund to help the unemployed, the sick, and youths in trouble. Although there was no direct relationship with the police, the church did aid youths in trouble, among other things, by providing funds and guidance (at its own discretion) to those who asked for it. While this may have been an admirable effort, it is not likely that it was very effective since it required youths to come to the church and accept its terms rather than going out to them. The only other way the church was able to establish contact with youths was through the reverend's capacity as padre of various social, Christian organizations for pre-teenagers.

In view of this deplorable lack of facilities and trained personnel, it was hardly surprising that the members generally named Christian but agency-sponsored clubs and groups when asked what social programs were offered by the church during the time they attended it. Those who did mention specific church activities said that they did not participate in them because of the highly religious atmosphere in which they were conducted or because the "guys who went were no fun". Although no reference was made in the questionnaire to the new center, it was the subject of one or two spontaneous discussions within each group; apparently most of the subjects had been to the center "to try it out" but they came to the same conclusion - "that everyone was out to get you to be religious".

Of the subjects who stopped going to church or Sunday school, most of them attributed it simply to lack of interest or sheer laziness, though one Eagle (Shep) had recently begun to attend it once again after

a long period of absence. Sport stopped teaching because he was going into the Navy and because "one kid made (him) nervous". Red stopped teaching at 16 after an incident in which the father of one of his pupils saw him drunk and became angry so Red just resigned; he felt that his freedom to behave as he chose was more important.

When they went to church most of the subjects had similar thoughts about the church. About half in each group thought it was "okay",¹ while the other half did not like it or did not think much of it; these were usually the ones who lacked interest in religion and went because they were forced to go or because their friends went. All board members estimated that they had thought a lot about religion both when they went to church and after they stopped going whereas few Eagles devoted much time to considering their doctrines.

About half in each group had no particular satisfactions from going to church or out of their religion. The others believed that they had "felt better after going to church" and that they had felt vaguely comforted by their religion. Similarly about half in each group said they had no specific problems concerning going to church or churches in general. Two board members were disturbed by what they considered to be the authoritarian nature of Catholics; Rex who was Catholic agreed with Red that the church was "too pushy" and tried to control too much of one's life.² The other board criticism came from Andy who argued that the church did not adequately explain religion; in school he had learned different

1. "Okay" was accepted as an answer since observation showed that it always meant an affirmation or acceptance of something.

2. Rex did not feel this about the church in France which he thought was "great".

things about his religion. Both Andy and Red were native born whereas Rex was not. Only two Eagles had any kind of problem concerning the church. Irish thought that the church in Canada was "always grabbin' for money and doesn't give to the poor-especially the Catholics". Native-born Mac was not disturbed by anything that the church itself did, he was upset that "people go, feel sorry for their sins, and then do the same thing all over again when they come out".

When asked if there had been any change in their thoughts, satisfactions, or problems relating to the church or religion, most of them responded negatively. One in each group, Rex and Irish, the two most recent immigrants, said that they "used to get a lot out of (their) religion and going to church but not over here". And F.J. replied that after he had stopped going, he thought "church people were a bunch of crooks who only wanted money". Since he was Irish's closest friend, this view may easily have originated in that friendship. Red was perhaps the most deeply disturbed by religion. Shortly after he stopped teaching he "began to look around and discovered that religious people were usually queer or abnormal in some other way". He concluded that their worst sin was that they were "a bunch of hypocrits". Only Mitch had changed in a positive way. He had been disturbed because he could believe in all of his doctrine except that Mary was a virgin. After some thought and enquiry he had "settled that Virgin Mary business" to his satisfaction.

Responses to the question of what type of person they thought the church wanted were varied. Two in each group said they did not know or had not thought about it. Also two in each group thought the church

wanted its members to live up to or practise its particular doctrine. The others figured that the church wanted people "to be good", help others, and so on. There was little change in these views.

Of those who had an opinion of the type person the church desired, only a few had any reason why the church advocated such things. In general they attributed it simply to the doctrine. One in each group felt that it was a means of guiding people in "the right direction". Apart from a few references to Hell most of them had no concept of the consequences for failing to conform to the image promoted by the church though most of them more or less agreed with that image and felt that they had tried in their own way to live up to it. All the Eagles who said this, however, admitted spontaneously that they usually did not. Only two board members disagreed with that image and therefore did not try to conform to it because it was too strict; the church, in their view, only wanted people who did absolutely no wrong.

There was considerable difference in what subjects thought the church thought of them while they were still attending. Most Eagles did not know. Two of them (Catholics) replied that the church did not think in terms of individuals; no doubt this could account for why the other two Catholics in the group had no view. The rest of the Eagles and board members generally thought the church viewed them as average, ordinary, or, in a few cases, a fairly good member of the church. Only Crew and Red mentioned the time when they had associated with the big gang. Red said he hoped that most of the new people did not know he had been a member for he knew the older administration had disapproved of his activities at that time. Crew admitted that his gang had caused

trouble but felt the parish ought to have remembered when they were young; "besides", he accused, "there were others causing more trouble than we were." Apart from Crew, the others felt the church's judgment to be fair. And both Red and Crew perceived that the church had changed its view since they dropped out of the gang.

About three in each group had no specific expectations regarding the church or religion. The others expected a certain security and comfort or faith. Only Andy, who expected more "proof", had thought differently; that is, all but him had always had those expectations. Of those board members who had had any expectations, all except Mitch replied that their expectations had not been fulfilled, and it is clear from their dissatisfactions who they blamed - the church. Yet when asked if there was anything that they could have gotten out of church or religion but did not, only two, Andy and J.T., said yes - faith; native-born Andy blamed the church for inadequate teaching while J.T., the Norwegian, blamed the nature of the doctrine itself, calling it a "fairy tale". In contrast, all the Eagles who had specific expectations believed that they had been fulfilled. Only Mac felt that there was something the church could have done but did not. According to him, "they should've been more understanding".

Rex and Irish were the only ones who reckoned that they had received any special attention from the church; Rex had been asked to perform a special duty when a high official came to visit the church and Irish had been asked, in Britain, to be in the choir. Ironically, none of the Eagles felt that the church itself had ever discouraged their attendance though two of them mentioned spontaneously in a group

meeting that they had tried "to get in with the church group and their dances", but the atmosphere of the dances was "too religious" and they "broke with the church group because not all of them were invited to their private parties". At first the uninvited persons would crash the parties but when they began to get a reputation for this, none of them were invited. Eventually they stopped most of their attempts to crash the parties. Subsequent enquiry proved, however, that those who were not invited were those who were notorious, notably Rob and Shep, for damaging property. None of the board members ever referred to such experiences either in their meetings or in the interview. But three of them felt that their attendance at church had been discouraged by the adult congregation: Crew and Red for reasons stated above and Andy once - because he had been seen quite inebriated on a Saturday night, had been stared at the following morning but there were no further repercussions and, according to him, the incident had little effect on his attendance or attitude toward church except that he thought it was unfair.

That the Eagles were not invited to the parties of their peers was confirmed by Hudson as was the fact that the congregation frowned^{on}/drinking and/or association with the big gang. Hudson was inclined to attribute both experiences to class discrimination. In his view, the vestige minority of "respectable citizens" who constituted the majority of the congregation looked down on all working class youths. Although this may have been true and may in fact have been the reason why so many of the wealthier citizens emigrated from the community, it does not seem to be applicable to the attitude taken by youths who refused to invite certain Eagles to their parties or to the attitude taken by the congregation toward drinking and association with the big gang.

A more likely explanation for the Eagles' experience is simply self-protection; no parents want their children to invite people to their homes who are known to be destructive. The very fact that some of the Eagles were initially invited indicates that there was no inherent and wholesale class prejudice toward them. Similarly, because a father does not want his son taught about God by a youth whom he has seen inebriated in a bar the night before, there is no reason to assume, without further evidence, that there is any class prejudice involved. Nor is it reasonable to argue that because a congregation (however hypocritical it may be) discourages drinking and delinquent associations, that it does so out of class discrimination. The fact that all three board members reported that they perceived a change of view when they stopped drinking or associating with the big gang suggests that the congregation disapproved of the boys' actions and associations and not specifically their class.

Plans for the future with regard to religion were varied in both groups. Two in each group had no specific plans. Two board members, Crew and Mitch whose brother was still associated by the community with the big gang, wanted to join the church officially as soon as possible. Andy and Rex simply wanted to be good Christians and Sport said that he would continue to go occasionally. Although three Eagles did not plan to become re-involved in the church, they did want to be married in the church and wanted their children to attend church. Shep hoped to go more often while Jocko replied that he would carry on going to church.

Apart from the existence of important differences in their religious denominations, the striking feature of these findings is that, if anyone,

it was largely the native, Protestant board members who were dissatisfied with their religion, who felt that their expectations had not been fulfilled. This difference was confirmed in observation. Board members discussed religion at some length on several occasions and four of them were clearly disturbed either about some specific doctrinal point or about their own negative attitude toward religion in general, that is, wanting to believe but finding they could not. In contrast Eagles never talked spontaneously about religion as such. In fact the only observed reference to religion at all was made by Jocko who on two occasions, both of which he had been drinking, went around to everyone in the room asking who was Catholic (a good indication that they did not discuss religion amongst themselves) and seemed upset when anyone responded negatively.

This difference does not seem to be the result of any difference in age since most of those who were dissatisfied claimed that they had felt that way before they stopped going to church regularly or, in other words, when they were slightly younger than the Eagles at the time of the project. This difference may be partly explained by the difference in denomination. All those who were dissatisfied with their views were Protestants (though not all Protestant subjects were disturbed), and it is axiomatic that the Protestant religion generally tends to encourage independent thinking perhaps more readily and at an earlier age, than Catholics. The difference may also be explained by a difference in parental emphasis on religion. Moreover, all subjects said in answer to questions concerning the family that their parents urged them to attend regularly. But, most of the Protestants, especially those on the junior board, said that their parents left the choice of their

religion up to them. Consequently, if they were at all interested in religion they had to think about it and come to some kind of conclusion regarding it.

The other striking feature is that it was native, Protestant board members, if anyone, who felt any kind of discrimination within the church, whereas Eagles perceived discrimination through their peers' refusal to invite them to parties. While both acts of discrimination were confirmed by conversations with Hudson, they seem, for reasons stated above, to be a product of delinquent associations and/or acts of delinquency rather than a cause of it. Whatever acts of discrimination were committed and by whom it has not affected to any significant extent the affirmation on the part of both groups to the validity of Christian values, if not specific points of doctrine or church attendance. This affirmation is clear in the majority acceptance of the ideal type person desired by the church as well as in the fact that most subjects plan to continue church membership, join it in the immediate or distant future, remain Christians without necessarily attending church, or rear their children in the Christian faith.

THE SOCIAL AGENCY

The East End agency, like all national branches sponsored by the same or similar welfare organizations, emphasizes Christian and democratic values in all its programs. In the past as well as at the time of the project, the East End branch offered a variety of programs to youths under thirteen. In general these programs were educational as well as social or recreational as was the one available to teenagers at the time of the project. Apart from teaching democratic and Christian

principles, the immediate aim of the pre-teen programs was to educate the participants about given practical subjects such as forestry, arts and crafts, and so on. The majority of subjects in both groups participated in such programs before they "graduated" to the teenage program which consisted of a weekly sports night for each two year age group under 18 and the Saturday night dance. Only two in each project group participated exclusively in the teenage program and Leo was the only one who had not been a full fledged member of any program though he did attend the dances occasionally.

According to their responses to the major questionnaire section on the subject, both groups¹ were generally satisfied with whatever programs in which they had participated. Although board members seemed more appreciative of the educational opportunities offered to them than the other group, both universally appreciated the fact that they had something to do. Despite a few isolated personal arguments in both groups with the director, only one in each group felt that he had a serious problem concerning the teenage program. Mitch derived much satisfaction from his capacity as president and enjoyed the sports night as well as the dance but felt that all his efforts toward improving the program were not duly recognized. Irish was just plain bored by the program. The only changes which occurred were from Mac, Dodger, and F.J. who, at the time of the project, were most distressed about the action taken against Mac and the denial of the special sports club. All those who had problems were Protestant and of the five, three were immigrants.

1. Leo, for reasons he kept to himself, said that the questions in this section were "irrelevant" to him as he had never been a member and he refused to answer any of them.

All subjects had always been well aware of the type person considered desirable by the agency - one who more or less abides by the rules and does not cause trouble. Also all agreed in theory that such behavior was necessary and several Eagles agreed with board members in thinking that it was beneficial to the individual as well. Of the board members only Rex and Andy had more or less obeyed the rules even during their limited association with the big gang. The others had tried their best to disobey them wherever possible when they were members of the big gang. At the time most of them thought the rules were "stuffy" and unjust though in evaluating this response it must be remembered that the agency was then ruled authoritatively by outsiders who, according to general legend, believed in enforcing all the rules all the time.

Eagles, even at the height of their delinquency, agreed in theory with the rules and their enforcement. F.J. was the only one who had begun to think that they were generally childish or, as he put it, "kid stuff"; ironically, he was the only one who obeyed them. All the others boasted that they had broken them. Most of them mentioned drinking and fighting as their most frequent offense as though such activity was sufficient evidence of their prowess at breaking rules. Actually it was interesting to observe which rules they broke and which ones they did not. In general they abided by rules that were strictly enforced or those which, if disobeyed, would be so obvious that it would be almost impossible to break without being discovered. This applies to dress, behavior on the dance floor, indiscreet use of obscene language, drinking at the dance, and taking or distributing any form of narcotic, which the Eagles persistently avoided after they

had satisfied their curiosity. The rules they broke were usually those which they thought they could break without being detected such as drinking before the dance, playing crap in the cloakroom, or stealing such momentarily unguarded items as soft drinks, cigarettes, or clothes. The only circumstances under which they broke rules indiscreetly were when they were too inebriated to restrain themselves or when they were exceptionally angry; and even then their desire to continue going to the dance was usually strong enough to prevent them from doing anything which would change that.

When asked why they broke rules which were acceptable to them in principle most of them did not know. Irish maintained that he broke them because everyone else did. While some rules, such as kissing on the dance floor, were broken by everyone at one time or another, most of the attendants generally obeyed most of the rules and Irish knew it. The others attributed their misbehavior to drink or anger. This explanation was confirmed by observation and it certainly accounted for nearly all of their most serious offenses and a majority of their minor ones. Occasionally, however, they would engage in a prank, such as turning off the lights, sheerly out of mischief and/or boredom. And sometimes when they were not drunk or angry they would break a rule simply out of defiance but this did not happen often.

Perhaps the most salient feature of their behavior at the dance was not how often they broke the rules but how often they obeyed them. The dance was to all teenagers the social event of the week and its importance to the Eagles was intensified by the fact that they were barred from so many other public places. Their desire to attend the

dances was usually stronger than their desire to do anything which would prevent them from being admitted. Second, even though they disliked some board members personally, they respected them because they thought they were fair. This applies to the senior staff as well except for the new one who reported Mac during the project. They felt, as did board members, that he had "picked on them" unfairly since he had arrived. Third, they did accept the reasoning behind most of the rules and thought that their enforcement was usually just. They knew which rules were in fact enforced and the punishments involved in breaking them. If they broke a rule and were caught, they were usually willing to accept the consequences.

Time and again the same pattern was observed inside the agency as well as outside of it. Immediately after they were caught doing something they showed great anger and defiance and spoke of "injustice" whether or not it was relevant. This reaction, it would seem, was more a manifestation of anger at themselves for having been caught than a genuine sense of injustice. Shortly after the outburst of indignation, anger would subside and be replaced by resentment. Again, it would seem that the resentment was more the result of having to pay the consequences than a real dislike for the rule or its enforcer. Resentment rarely lasted very long and frequently it was a matter of hours before they would admit that they deserved the reprimand.

The anger and resentment lasted much longer if they actually thought some injustice had been perpetrated. According to Dodger, it was six weeks before they "cooled down" their anger at Hudson for reporting Shep to the police on suspicion of taking drugs. In the end they

realized that the man had been acting on information which he had believed to be the truth and was simply doing his duty. Because they felt that they had been singled out unfairly by the new staff member, a few of them were still in the resentment stage during the final interview.

When asked how they thought the agency staff viewed them, the responses of the two groups were quite different. The junior board knew that the agency had strongly disapproved of their association and activities in the big gang, but felt that they had "proven themselves since then and won respect". Three Eagles did not know what the agency thought of them. Mac and Dodger knew very well the agency thought they "fooled around too much". F.J., having obeyed the rules faithfully, felt that he was generally liked by the staff.

What they expected the agency to do for them was varied. Of the board members only two, Sport and Rex, expected nothing. Mitch wanted the senior staff to show more gratitude for his efforts. Crew thought the agency should provide adequate sports and recreational programs. Red felt the staff should listen to individual problems. And J.T. said he expected "exactly what it is doing - everything". The only one who had even expected anything different was Sport, who had previously hoped for a greater variety of programs. In contrast five Eagles expected nothing - of whom two felt this way "because they had never given anything". Dodger expected simply to be accepted as a member and Mac argued that the staff should have kept its promise regarding the special sports club. None of them had any change of expectations so far as they could recall.

Of those board members who had had definite expectations, three (Red, Andy, and J.T.) had been satisfied by the agency and available programs. Mitch and Crew, both Protestants - one native and the other immigrant, felt that their expectations had not been fulfilled. Despite these dissatisfactions, all board members stated flatly that there had never been anything they thought the agency or programs should have done for them but did not. Of the Eagles who had had definite expectations, Mac and Dodger, both Protestants - one native and the other immigrant, perceived that the agency had acted unfairly regarding Mac's expulsion and the denial of the club. It is significant that the majority of the group, despite their disappointment over not having the club, felt that there was nothing that the agency should have done for them but did not. As was expected Mac and Dodger answered this question by referring again to the fateful night when Mac was expelled.

All but two board members, Rex and Crew, who only became an official member at the end of the project, felt that they had received much special attention from the senior staff by virtue of their jobs. Red also mentioned his appreciation for the amount of help in solving his problems given to him by the senior staff. On the whole all of them felt that they had not been discriminated against by the senior staff, though Rex thought that once he had been unjustly blamed for breaking some windows and Mitch resented Hudson's actions when he reported Mitch to the police for what Mitch described as "borrowing" the agency car. Eagles unanimously felt that they had received no special attention with regard to the teenage programs but Mac and F.J. said that they had been asked to lead the group in two of the pre-teen programs. Mac and Shep, both natives - one a Protestant and the other a Catholic, were the only two

who felt that they had been singled out unjustly for various offenses; what they resented was not being caught or blamed but being singled out amongst a group of guilty persons.

In spite of their feelings Mac,¹ Dodger, and Shep planned to continue their membership. The others had no particular plans with regard to membership or attendance. All the board members planned to stay a member of the association, though Mitch and Rex planned to resign their posts for lack of time and, in Mitch's case, lack of gratitude. Red, Andy, and J.T. hoped they could go into welfare work. Actually, further correspondence revealed that Mitch and Andy resigned at the end of their term in May of 1961 and Red became chairman. The fate of the agency after that has already been described.

Observation of official board meetings and the dances not only confirmed all the data received in the interviews but also provided much material on the interaction between the two groups and the relationship between the two groups and the senior staff. The respect that the Eagles had for the board members was evidenced in several ways. First they accepted the authority of board members even from those whom they did not like personally. If a board member asked them, for example, to be quiet they generally did so without resentment. Second, they appreciated the fact that the board did not enforce certain rules unless they had to; they thought this discretion was just. Eagles' relationship with the board was most clearly revealed the night that Mac was expelled. They

1. Mac could not attend the dances but he was still allowed to participate in the Tuesday sports night. This is not to be confused with the special sports club which had been planned exclusively for the Eagles.

knew the board did not enforce the rule about drinking before the dance unless the person(s) involved made it obvious that the rule had been broken. Their first assumption after they were caught, it will be recalled, was that someone other than a board member must have told Hudson. And they did not resent the fact that Andy had been drinking before the dance or that he was not caught; what they objected to was being singled out by the person who informed on them.

Board members had an earnest desire to help and reform the Eagles. This desire only became active, however, in relationship to the agency. That is, they recognized both formally and informally that the Eagles were a problem to themselves and the community but they made little effort to do anything about it except through the agency. This, it would seem, stems in part from their contempt for the Eagles' trouble-making activities but also from an inability to see how anything could be accomplished informally, outside agency programs and activities. They never, for example, invited the Eagles to their homes and although they would socialize with them in public places or at parties, they rarely ever made any real attempt to become friends with them. What they did try to do was to be as fair as they possibly could with regard to any disciplinary action that had to be taken against the Eagles. If one of the senior staff allotted a punishment which they thought was unfair, they expressed their feelings and tried to alleviate the situation as best they could. Moreover, if they themselves had to take any disciplinary action, they made every effort to be understanding and just.

Actually, this concern for justice on the part of board members was not restricted to the allotment of punishment at the dances. In board

meetings if any known delinquent had to be considered for admission or committee membership, the whole group questioned the sincerity of the person in question to reform and behave according to the rules. They also compared his past group membership and activities to his current associations and behavior in order to assess whether or not there had been any substantial change. Then they discussed whether or not admission or committee membership would help to reform the person. Occasionally one or two of the board members would overemphasize the delinquency of a candidate and imply that he was beyond reform but any statement of this type was quickly undermined by the rest of the group who would remind the speaker that most of them had been somewhat of a problem themselves. This sense of justice was also seen in their strict observance of democratic procedure. In fact, Mitch always made a special effort toward this end by constantly checking for formal approval of official actions and by frequently encouraging the discussion of specific disapprovals.

The groups' relationship to Hudson in their formal meetings as well as at the dances was very friendly. All of them liked him and respected the principles he represented and his efforts to serve the community, though one or two of them thought that he was too lenient, especially with those whom he liked. But, above all, they deeply appreciated everything he had done to help them improve themselves.

Eagles also appreciated Hudson. They recognized him as an intermediary between them and the police - as witnessed by the fact that he was often the first person they turned to when they were in serious trouble. And unless it had anything to do with a disciplinary action

taken by the agency, they knew they could always discuss freely with him any other problems they had. Apart from the few times that they were angry with him, the relationship was a very friendly, often jovial one. On the whole they respected him and responded quickly to any requests or orders he made. They knew that he wanted to change them and they accepted this general attitude without any resentment. In fact, they never said so but it is quite probable that they were very grateful for the interest he took in their welfare.

Both groups liked, trusted, and respected the two main senior staff members Brian Sanders and Bill Richards. Having been brought up in East End, both men clearly understood the problems of the community and were very sympathetic towards the problems of all the subjects. Although they supported any official action taken by Hudson, they never dispensed particular punishments; consequently their relationship with members of both groups was somewhat closer than that of Hudson. The new staff member, Malcolm, was an outsider and disliked by both groups who thought that he was much too strict and authoritarian as well as prejudiced against the Eagles.

In sum, there were few differences between the two groups with regard to participation in agency programs, satisfactions derived from them, or problems with them. Both groups were well aware of the behavior required by the agency and it is significant that all the subjects accepted the validity of such requirements. Because they defined themselves as troublemakers it was expected that the Eagles would break the rules; it is very significant that in fact they broke very few rules, obeying those which were strictly enforced or too difficult to break without being obvious. This discretion does not appear to have been

simply a question of expediency since they did not make a concerted effort to break those rules which they thought could be broken without detection and since they did accept the reasons behind the rules, including those they broke, and generally they did not mind being punished. It was also expected that there would be a difference in the two groups' perception of the agency's view of them. Significantly all subjects referred in this respect to personality or behavioral characteristics rather than background, educational, or economic characteristics. Although the junior board felt they had won respect since becoming members, Eagles as well as board members at the time of their association with the big gang perceived accurately disapproval from the agency as a result of their behavior and associations.

Board members did expect more from the agency but this in itself does not seem to be particularly important. Whatever expectations either group had, they were considered in the main to have been fulfilled. It is true that several Eagles resented the action taken against Mac and the denial of the club but all the evidence from observation would indicate that despite the discrimination involved in that particular incident, Eagles generally respected and appreciated agency authorities and their efforts; this included the junior board. Considering how reliable board members were in performing their duties and how much they improved the teenage program, it was not surprising that the junior board felt that they received special attention by virtue of their jobs. It was surprising, however, that the Eagles did not mention their special privileges at the dance (putting their coats in the club room or office, etc.) or the encouragement from the senior staff to discuss their problems. Finally, apart from the one or two isolated incidents in each group,

neither group perceived that they had been discriminated against.

ECONOMIC POSITION AND STYLE OF LIFE

It was learned from the pilot study that the two groups were quite similar in economic position. About half in each group were skilled workers and one in each group had an office job; the rest were unskilled laborers. Although board members averaged about \$10 a week more than their delinquent counterparts, wages correlated with age and amount of vocational training rather than group membership. And all board members paid from \$12 to \$15 weekly rent to their families whereas only a few Eagles contributed to household expenses.

Actually the most significant feature of the subjects' economic position was their present income: board members averaged \$3300 and Eagles, \$2800. They earned more in wages than did 87.9 per cent of the employed, non-farm population of Canadian males under 19. Since only 6.6 per cent of that statistical sector earned from \$2500 - \$2999,¹ subjects in both groups (but especially Eagles) were in fact quite highly paid. Whatever their social class, one could hardly argue that these teenagers were in any way economically depressed - despite their lack of education and vocational training. Moreover, it is clear that they did not suffer from any kind of job discrimination. On the other hand, the size of their income does not alter the classification of their social status as that of working class. By type of occupation, degree of education, and style of life, they were all undoubtedly working class boys.

1. Calculated by the author from Census Report Distribution of Non-farm Incomes in Canada by Size (Dominion Bureau of Statistics; Catalogue 13-517, 1959) Table 30, p. 42.

Perhaps the most outstanding difference in economic position was board members' apparent capacity to retain their jobs for longer periods than Eagles. The average number of jobs held by board members was four while the average number held by Eagles was three but board members, because of their greater age, had been working from one to two years longer than Eagles.¹ Furthermore, nearly all of them had been employed at their then current jobs for at least a year and a half whereas the longest job held by an Eagle prior to the project was 7 months and the average length of time employed in jobs prior to the project was three months. That these differences are largely products of age differentials is evidenced by two facts. First, board members, when they were the same age as the Eagles, had held about as many jobs as that group had. Second, there was no great difference in reasons stated for leaving a job: board members quit somewhat more often than they were fired whereas Eagles were fired more often than they quit; but both were laid off about the same number of times. Finally, there was very little difference in general attitudes toward the various jobs the subjects had held; each group felt positively about half the jobs they had held and negatively toward the other half.

In their major interviews on economic position all subjects said they had saved money on a number of occasions. Interestingly it was the Eagles who saved on principle; that is, they saved money for the sole

1. J.T. and Sport were the major exceptions to this. Being 24 at the time of the project J.T. had been working off and on for some 10 years and had been employed in a total of 9 jobs. This large figure is partly the result of age but also the result of several changes of address and the nature of his work - construction. Sport, aged 21, had been working for seven years - not counting the two years he had spent in the Navy. During those seven years he was employed in a total of three jobs.

purpose of saving money whereas/^{the} junior board usually saved because they wanted something in particular. At the time of the project four were saving specifically for a car and the others had saved money off and on for an assortment of things such as a radio, hi-fi set, bicycle, and so on. All subjects paid for their own clothes, cigarettes, liquor, transportation, and entertainment. During the period when board members associated with the big gang they spent more money on liquor than anything else. At the time of the project what they did not save, they spent mostly on clothes and objects they wanted. Eagles, ever since they had been earning money, had always spent more on liquor than anything else.

When asked what they would have done with a lot more money had they had it, four board members thought they would have spent it on something in particular such as a car, boat, or house; two others would have spent it on clothes, girls, and drink and Mitch would have saved any extra money he received. Three Eagles figured they would have saved or invested most of it and, like the others, spent the rest on a car or house. Irish said he would have used such a sum of money to go back to school as well as buy a house. Both groups gave much the same answers when asked what they would have done with substantial wealth, had they been born into it. Responses to these two hypothetical questions show that the taste of subjects in each group is very similar and not very different from that of youths in other classes. More important the objects they desired could hardly be termed extravagant. In casual conversation they spoke of secondhand cars advertised as economy models or medium priced ones, and houses which they pointed out as acceptable were modest by any standard. Only a very few ever dreamt of luxury

living. Given such modest tastes, then, it is entirely possible that with thrift and instalment purchase, the things which they desired most could be considered within their financial reach, certainly by the time most of them would be getting married.

This same modesty may be seen in the plans subjects had for the earnings they hoped to attain. All board members merely wanted their wives and children to live comfortably "without pinching pennies" - in other words not much above the margin. Over half the Eagles, being younger and thinking less of marriage in the immediate future, said they would save some of it and spend the rest on such major items as a car and a house. The others desired simply to get married (2) or travel for a while before settling down(1).

Similarly, the amount they hoped to earn was not extravagant. Subjects were asked to estimate the amount which they actually hoped to earn - that is, the amount which they thought they might actually achieve at the peak of their careers, not the amount which they hoped idealistically to earn. Most of them hoped that they would earn around a hundred dollars a week (though about two in each group desired substantially more - between \$150 and \$200). How does this compare with their then present earnings? Board members averaged about \$63 a week (or \$3300 a year) and Eagles, about \$53 a week (or \$2800 yearly). Thus, the junior board hoped to reach a peak two-fifths more than their present earnings while Eagles hoped eventually to double theirs. Considering the relative smallness of their present average wages, the desired increases for each group are very close and do not appear to be unrealistic; in other words, it seems entirely possible that a skilled

laborer starting out in his early teens at \$2800 or \$3300 could be earning \$5000 - \$6000 at the peak of his career. And if the subjects completed the educational and vocational programs that they were taking or planning to take, the chances of achieving their financial goals are even greater.

When asked to estimate what they believed to be "a really good salary", most of the subjects gave figures just under \$6000 - the same figure most of them hoped actually to earn. About two in each group even thought that \$3000 - \$5000 was a very good salary. Only one in each group (Red and F.J.) gave relatively high figures such as \$10,000 and \$12,000. Thus, there is virtually no difference between what the two groups considered to be an ideal income. And equally significant, there was virtually no difference between the subjects' proposed earnings and their concept of ideal earnings. This suggests strongly that there was no discrepancy between monetary ends that they actually hoped to achieve and those emphasized in their social system. Certainly their economic ambitions were in keeping with those of their parents.

But how do subjects' financial goals compare with those of others? Although there are no statistics on the financial desires of others, the average yearly earnings per worker for all industries in 1960 was \$4707 in the United States,¹ and \$3943 in Canada.² Thus, there is little

1. Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1963 (Washington D.C.: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1963) Series No. 460, p. 343.

2. Calculated by the author from Canada Yearbook 1961 (Ottawa: Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1961) p. 740.

difference between the subjects desired monetary status and the average figures for the United States and Canada. One could argue, then, that because the average income in these two countries is often equated with middle class or lower middle class status, the subjects desired a middle class status. On the other hand, with the current cost of living such an income, presuming an average family size, is not more than adequate (even in the lesser developed areas) for such basic comforts as living in one's own house and owning a car. In fact, Leon H. Keyserling, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors for President Truman, has directed a report¹ that considers a family income of \$4000 or under a year as "poverty" - and goes on to define the lesser ordeal of "deprivation" as a family income of under \$6000.² In view of this, it would seem that an income of \$5000 - \$6000 cannot in fact be interpreted as a distinctly middle class income and that the desire to earn such an amount cannot be interpreted as a desire to achieve middle class status but must be seen simply as a desire to live comfortably. In any case, it is definitely not a desire for great wealth or financial success in the terms of which Merton speaks. And above all it is consistent with what the members of both groups define as economic success.

A similar though less pronounced consistency may be seen with regard to the subjects' actual job goals and their ideal job choice. Nearly all of them wanted the same type job which they held currently or for which they had been trained - namely skilled labor and minor

1. Conference on Economic Progress, Poverty and Deprivation in the United States (Washington, D. C., April 1962.)

2. Peter Jones, America's Wealth (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1963) p. 332.

office jobs. And in most cases this corresponded closely with the occupation of their fathers. Only one in each group wanted a job which was very different from their own and/or that of their fathers; Sport was practising to be a professional football player, and Irish had always had his heart set on being an engineer draftsman. Also F.J.'s chosen occupation, a dental technician, differed substantially from that of his father but it was a job for which he was already trained in reform school; he was waiting until he was old enough to begin practise. Leo presented a special case. He boasted to everyone that he was going to be a racketeer when he was 25 and had made the necessary "contacts". Actually, he was most content with his job as assistant accountant and hoped soon to be promoted. He did insist, though, that if he did not succeed in his legitimate career choice he would in fact become a racketeer.

When asked what careers they would choose if they could have any job they wanted, the two groups responded in almost exactly the same way. Explanations of ideal job choice, where it was different from their actual jobs or those for which they had been trained, correlated similarly. Two in each group named their own occupations or those for which they had been trained. Two in each group chose a specific position of highranking governmental or industrial importance. Red and Leo wanted to be government officials because they wanted to help the people; Red would "tell the Communists where to go" and Leo would aid his mayoralty by "bein' nice to the people - helpin' them and gettin' them to respect me". Rex would be head of a large corporation and the less ambitious Dodger would be head accountant in a fairly big concern for the same reasons: according to them, the job was clean; the work was

good; and the pay was high. One in each group, Sport and Mac, named types of popular entertainers (singer and drummer respectively) because of the exciting way of life it would entail. The remaining four choices and explanations of them were varied. Board members Crew did not know what he thought was an ideal job and Andy thought he wanted to be a missionary because then he could "travel to distant countries and help people - do something good for them". Finally, the two Eagles named the highly technical jobs of electronics (Shep) and engineer draftsman (Irish). Nearly all subjects whose ideal job choice was different from their own job felt that it would not be possible for them to consider seriously changing from one to the other due to lack of qualifications.

Actually nearly all the subjects felt somewhat unqualified for their current jobs. Rex was the only board member who did not feel that he needed further education; and except for Red who wanted more general education, all the others desired greater technical training or experience. Board members began to feel their inadequacy almost as soon as they started working and as pointed out previously, in the section on Education, most of them were then in the process of doing something about it by going to night school, taking correspondence courses, and the like. In slight contrast, four of the seven Eagles felt that they lacked the necessary qualifications for their job goals - Mac, Dodger, Irish, and Jocko. At the time of the project Jocko was the only one who was going to trade school though, as was learned from later correspondence, Mac went to night school in the fall preceeding the project, and the other two planned to educate themselves further in the near future. Shep and F.J. had already received substantial training in their respective fields of carpentry and dental technician

and Leo was then in the process of being trained as part of his assistant accountantship. All subjects who felt a lack of qualifications blamed themselves for missing "the education they threw away".

At this point it may be asked how do individual economic or occupational problems correlate with religion and birthplace? As stated earlier one of the most important aspects of responses to this section was the high degree of homogeneity. Only one or two in each group differed with regard to any given question from those within their own group or in the other group. Of these minor differences, there were only two questions where respondents whose answers differed from others were Catholic or immigrants. The two whose job goal differed substantially from their present job or jobs of others were Sport and Irish; both were Protestant immigrants. And the six whose ideal job choices differed substantially from their present jobs, their job goals, or the job choice of others were board members Red, Rex, and Sport and Eagles Leo, Dodger, and Mac. One in each group (Rex and Leo) was Catholic. One in each group (Sport and Dodger) was an immigrant. The remaining two were native-born Protestants. As it can be seen these differences are so slight that they seem quite inconsequential.

Due to the nature of some of the questions it was not possible to confirm by observation all the answers to questions in this section of the major interview. There was, however, nothing the subjects did or said in casual conversation to contradict their formal statements. In fact, from the general tenor of all the various remarks about money, employment, and style of life made by subjects as well as numerous adults - judging from all this one could say that East End was a typical

example of a genuine and solid working class community as described by Richard Hoggart in The Uses of Literacy.

Apart from the remaining vestige of industrial managers, engineers, and technicians, the English speaking population, it will be remembered, was composed almost entirely of laborers (unskilled, semi-skilled, and skilled), labor managers (such as factory foremen and dock supervisors), and a few white collar workers (including salesmen and office staff) - all of whom lived in a very small geographical area completely cut off on three sides by bodies of water and huge industrial plant complexes. Despite the various social problems of the community described previously, the working class element of the English speaking community - the vast bulk - had all the appearances of being a cohesive, relatively stable, and outgoing group with all the familiarity and casualness of a small rural town. Because it was originally conceived as a garden city all the houses, though quite close together, had lawns in the front and back of each one so that there was a sense of spaciousness and rural openness which can be seen in thousands of towns dotted across the face of Canada and the United States. And because most of the houses were built at about the same time in similar styles with identical materials, one could not distinguish houses owned by Protestant School Board members from those owned by factory workers - a factor which must have tended to equalize all the inhabitants. Another equalizing factor was the limited availability of products. Almost everyone shopped locally and this meant that most people were consuming the same type of goods. And virtually no differences in dress were observed; throughout the community people dressed simply and casually.

The actual amount of social integration between the vestigial middle class and the workers is not known but there was an unmistakable sense of community. Men returning from work stopped to chat with each other and called to various children bicycling to the groceries or playing ball in the street. Women were often seen gossiping with their neighbors or attending a brood of infants obviously too large to be all their own. And both sexes met in the evenings - the women, to bowl perhaps or just to get together; the men, usually to drink at local taverns. One could approach almost anyone in the street or anyone behind a counter to ask about this person or that and they would invariably know him or her by name and frequently they knew the whereabouts as well.

Whatever social problems this town had, it is certain they were shared by all the townfolk; if ever anything out of the ordinary happened, the whole town knew about it regardless of who he was or who his parents were. When, for example, Rob accidentally wrecked his brother's car (the gas pedal stuck as he was turning into Sport's driveway and the car rammed into the side of the house), not only did everyone at the dance make some comment about it but all day neighbors came to commiserate with the mothers of Rob and Sport and parents of other youths talked about it for days. It was much the same when boys got into trouble with the police or couples were having marital difficulties; the town was simply too small and the houses too close together for everyone not to know most of the private affairs of others. On the whole, gossip did not appear to be malicious but rather an expression of concern and sympathy. Undoubtedly there was some malice; Sport's initial difficulties are evidence of that; but for the most part if adults made condemning remarks, it was usually because they or their sense of righteousness had

been offended. And Eagle parents were equally disturbed as board members' parents by insults or acts of vandalism committed by local youth. The main point of all this is that social life amongst the bulk of the townspeople gave every appearance of being cohesive as well as having a genuine sense of community spirit and homogeneous style of life.

No doubt agency staff would disagree with the picture presented above. Highly committed to the eradication of juvenile delinquency and other social problems, they would emphasize the existence of these problems. Apart from the fact that they were pledged to combat social problems and therefore sought them out, their definition of various problems was extremely broad. Delinquency was defined as "any act whereby the property or comfort of an innocent person is thoughtlessly offended"¹ and although theft, property damage, and assault were given as examples, they tended to consider any "anti-social" act a problem. Moreover, they had to deal with numerous youths who were not even residents. For these reasons their stress on the extent of social problems is understandable but a rate of 139 police calls over a four month period during the shortlived "peak" of the delinquency wave in 1958 suggests that the problem was hardly acute.²

1. "Agency Progress Report 1961", p. 20.

2. Regrettably comparison of the number of offenses with other cities is not possible since the Canadian Census Report lists only those offenses and individuals which required a court hearing. "Children presenting a conduct problem who either were not brought to court or were dealt with by police, social agencies, schools, or youth serving agencies without referral to court are not included...". And nowhere in the report is there a listing of the total number of offenses committed. See Census Report, Juvenile Delinquency (Dominion Bureau of Statistics; Catalogue No. 85-202, 1961) p. 9

Similarly all agency reports stress the number of broken homes yet according to census statistics, the total number of divorces and separations for the entire population is under 10.¹ When confronted with these statistics Hudson said that many homes broken by divorce and separation were not reported, especially among the French. He added that the emphasis also referred to the number of men who spend their evenings at local taverns and go home only to sleep and breed. This behavior may be irresponsible and unChristian from a Christian, middle class point of view. It may also be conducive in some cases to serious problems within the family. But the fact remains that such behavior is typical of fathers of non-delinquents as well as delinquents and most of the youths in the community were not delinquent. However alien such behavior is to staunch middle class standards, by itself it cannot be defined sociologically as a social problem without defining the working class way of life as a problem. For above all, it is an integrated part of a way of life with a culture and stability of its own; it may be different from that of the middle class but sociologically it is not deviant. Moreover, it is probably not very different in effect from the wealthy upper class habit of spending evenings drinking at private clubs and lavish cocktail parties.

Whatever the moral attitude of the agency, it would surely attest to the cohesiveness and homogeneity of the working class within the community - homogeneity of occupation, income, style of life, and presumably education. This great homogeneity goes a long way toward explaining the very striking and significant similarity between the

¹. See Appendix E.

two groups' type of occupation and present income; the job goals and earnings they actually hoped to achieve, the occupations and incomes they considered ideal, their spending behavior and attitude toward money, their feeling of inadequate technical qualifications and self blame - all these highly correlated responses cannot be overemphasized. Equally significant is the fact that proposed earnings and ideal earnings as well as actual job goals and ideal job choice were generally consistent with each other, with that of their parents, and it is argued, with that of their own class.

With regard to earnings, most of the subjects were not content with their present wages - despite the size, but it is quite conceivable that they could eventually attain what they viewed as a satisfactory income - without changing their occupations. The income level which each group actually hoped to achieve was identical to that named by the other group and that defined by both groups as ideal and successful. And considering the closeness of their job goals with the present occupations of their fathers, it is most probable that their proposed earnings would be quite close to the incomes of their parents. Finally, if it can be accepted that an income of \$6000 is not a middle class income but an upper working class one, then it can be said that virtually none of the subjects actually desired or proposed to achieve middle class financial status; they wanted to increase their present earnings and rise financially within their class but not out of it.

The same consistency exists to a lesser extent with respect to occupation itself. Not only were most of them content with the jobs they had or were trained for but also they generally considered their

own occupation as acceptable and respectable; at least, they chose their present occupation or that for which they had been trained as their job goal. Where job goals differed from ideal job choice, the reasons they gave were not mainly financial or social ones. And although five out of seven in each group chose as ideal jobs which differed substantially from those of their fathers, choices were closely matched between the two groups. Moreover, only three in each group chose jobs for which they were quite unqualified and only two in each group chose as ideal jobs which, if realized, would take them out of their own financial class.

The main difference between the two groups was job qualifications. Board members were better qualified for the jobs they desired than Eagles but the difference was not a great one and Eagles had slightly more formal education than board members. In any case, both groups felt that the vocational training and experience they had was inadequate and both groups knew that this deficiency could be overcome.

From these facts it is argued that the subjects in both groups were not truly frustrated about their economic position. All the subjects were disturbed about their lack of job qualifications and all of them wanted to earn more money - even though they were very highly paid. But they were not frustrated in the sense that they were generally or deeply dissatisfied with their present types of work; they were not frustrated about their lack of technical training for they knew that it could be overcome with effort; and they were not frustrated about their economic and occupational goals because they believed they could eventually achieve these within the bounds of their chosen occupations. In short, they were not frustrated about anything in this sphere which they thought

could not somehow be overcome legitimately with effort and time; they felt neither despair nor powerlessness. Whatever frustrations they experienced, they were committed to the goal of economic improvement and the accepted means to achieve it. If there was an over-emphasis in this community or from their parents on financial success without a corresponding stress on acceptable means to attain it, the subjects did not perceive it or succumb to it. If there were in fact insufficient avenues to achieve the goals subjects set for themselves, or job discrimination, they were not aware of it.

CHAPTER XI

THE SELF AND INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT

SELF-CONCEPT

Many psychologists and sociologists argue that development of the self is more a product of one's experiences than a cause of it. If an individual has little self-respect, he acts differently than he would if he had great self-respect. But the fact that he has no respect for himself is caused by his life's experiences. Thus, the self grows and develops with experience but it does not directly or primarily determine experience. That is the view taken here. Questions in this section were designed to explore and confirm other facets of the subject's life as much as to understand the nature of his self-concept and the way in which it developed. Responses to the very first question, for example, suggest that choice of gang type had less to do with the attractions of gang life than prior experiences. Similarly, they indicate that gang membership tends to reinforce rather than change one's self-concept.

Before joining their first gang, five board members thought of themselves in generally satisfactory terms - as being average or okay. All five chose non-delinquent groups for their first gang. Two were unhappy with themselves; J.T. thought he lacked aims and Sport said, without divulging or understanding why, that he was not happy unless he came home bloody from a fight. Both chose semi-delinquent fighting gangs for their first gang.¹ In contrast, most Eagles viewed them-

¹. Actually, J.T. had belonged to two distinctly non-delinquent groups before he joined the big gang. The statement was made as it was because in his answer to this question as well as to questions about the gang he made a distinction between groups and gangs, groups being very loosely structured, non-delinquent collectivities, and gangs being more tightly structured, troublesome collectivities.

selves in negative terms.¹ Only two liked themselves, Dodger and Jocko. These two and Mac were the only three out of the seven whose first group choice was non-delinquent and only semi-delinquent respectively.

On the whole there had been no qualitative change of self-concept among board members though Rex and Red had come to hate their own stupidity for associating in the big gang as long as they did. And Sport reckoned that he had "gotten tired of gangs. Since last year after the Navy I can do without fighting." This sort of answer was typical among Eagle responses. Mac: I realize now I've made a mess of things. Irish: I just begun to think that I'd be a different person if I had passed grade school. F.J.: I still have lots of problems but I don't define myself as a troublemaker any more. And so on. Significantly Dodger and Jocko reported no substantial change of attitude.

When asked what qualities subjects liked in themselves, board members generally specified such virtues as honesty, responsibility, and understanding. T.J. said nothing. Rex and Sport named ability to handle girls and talent for sports respectively. On the whole subjects in this group maintained their attitudes. Eagle responses were quite different. Three (Leo, Shep, and Jocko) stated "nothing in particular". Three (Mac, F.J., and Irish) thought they liked best in themselves their ability to get on with others. Judging from their comments, this ability was restricted to peers. Mac, for example, added, "but then I

¹. Leo replied that before 12 he had thought of himself as being "pretty cool" or clever. While this would indicate that he had a positive self-concept, there is too much evidence (described elsewhere) to the contrary. He was therefore included in this category.

tell them off". Asked why, he replied, "I feel I have the right; I like blowing my top". Following that, he was asked what if others are hurt by it? "Yes, I think about that later", he claimed, "but after I have a few drinks, I don't care". Unlike Mac, Dodger liked best his capacity for self-control - "watching myself in what I say, minding my own business, and thinking before I do things". Of all the Eagles, only Irish had changed his attitude toward himself: "Now, who the hell cares, nothing".

Responses to the question about things subjects disliked in themselves were quite varied and therefore difficult to summarize. The three board members who referred to actual qualities within themselves had experienced no change. Mitch had always been disappointed by his "inability to see things as they really are - I look too much into the future, make plans for others without telling them, and then it doesn't work out". Red felt he had always lacked ambition and direction but he had not realized it until he began work. And J.T. had always disparaged his shyness. The remaining board members mentioned actions, rather than qualities. Of three, two referred to activities in which they participated while they associated with the big gang. Rex had hated telling "so many lies to so many girls" until he met Jill, then he stopped. And Crew wished he had not drank so much, done so many crazy things, or gotten into so many fights. Andy felt that there was nothing in particular that he especially disliked in himself though there had been a period, he added, when he had been depressed from overwork in school and had run away. Until he joined the Navy Sport had not thought much about qualities in himself that he disliked. Since he had joined, he had begun to regret things he used to do; "Now I damn myself for not gettin' a proper schoolin', fightin', lettin' my parents down about

radar school - I don't feel guilty for these things exactly but I do regret them".

In contrast, most Eagles named qualities. F.J. hated his lankiness despite the fact that he was quite well-proportioned. More than anything else Mac feared that his sarcasm and tendency to bully others had cost him friends but he also thought he drank too much. Shep deplored his stubbornness and lack of self discipline: "I know right from wrong but will do the opposite of what others tell me. I get away with a lot sometimes. I can do right but then I give up too easy instead of stayin' and fightin' - but I'm startin' to realize things". Leo's quick temper annoyed him the most especially with his girl friend for whom he cared deeply but also with his father whom he could "kill" for wanting to take him to a psychiatrist. Ever since he had immigrated, Irish had had little respect for himself: "I'm a rat sometimes when I swipe a car or swear at my old doll" (his mother). Dodger wished he had tried harder in school. And Jocko said there never had been anything in particular that he really disliked about himself.

Board members were most reluctant to say specifically what kind of people they would like to be. Five of them stated flatly that they had no ideals with regard to themselves but when questioned again three of the five named specific occupations. Whether this indicates a lack of ambition to improve oneself or some kind of philosophical realism is not known. Mitch's response was certainly simple enough; he wanted to be a good husband and father with a job able to support his family and have some left in the bank for emergencies. Rex had wanted "to get ahead but not work for it - be as good as the next guy"; but since he

left high school, "I don't really care if I measure up to others' standards". On the surface this might sound as though he had suddenly lost initiative but judging from his other responses and observation this statement more likely reflects a change from other-directedness to inner-directedness.

Eagles defined their ideals more readily though Jocko said that he had had none and F.J. answered superficially that his ideal was not to be lanky. The other responses were more revealing. Dodger had always desired most to be friendly. Mac said he had not thought much about it until recently but he wished "now, to be well-liked - able to fit in with all different types of people - bums, middle class, upper class". Up until a year before the project Shep had wanted "just to be normal, get along with other people". Since then he wanted to be an engineer and "dreamt" of what he "could do right: I want to be something but I need too much money and don't like to ask to be lent it". Similarly Irish, within the year prior to the project, had also wished to "be something". "I'm gettin' older, got a girl friend, started thinking of marriage and responsibilities - I can't be a laborer all my life". Leo insisted that he would rather be a racketeer than a clerk though he added, "I don't mind being a clerk. I could get married and have a normal life. But if I don't make it (his promotion) in the next few years I will be a racketeer". When asked how long he had felt this way, he responded, "since I started working about two years ago", but it must be pointed out that he had been in reform school the year before he began work.

Whatever class awareness, economic ambitions, and personal aims these responses reveal, it is clear from the time element stated by them,

that these ideals were more than subsequent to the start of delinquent activities. One is tempted to generalize that lack of ambition and direction rather than over-ambition was perhaps the more dominant feature of their pre-delinquent life. Being delinquent possibly generated such desires and purposes. Like the old proverb: when one is confused, one has to reach rock bottom in order to rise. If they resorted to delinquency as a reaction or possible solution to their problems, they may have discovered by virtue of that experience and status that it was no solution in the long run, that it was unacceptable to themselves and quite useless as a career.

In evaluating the various roles they played board members generally judged themselves more or less good sons, dates or boy friends, gang or group members, agency members (except during the period they associated with the big gang), and students (except during the latter years of formal education) though with respect to this last role three (Red, Crew, and Mitch) said they should have worked harder all the way through. Eagle responses were less positive. Four estimated that they had been good sons for helping around the house but bad ones for causing so much trouble. Mac and Jocko reckoned that they had been average and "not too bad" as sons. Irish was entirely negative in this respect. Leo was the only one who felt he had not been a good date or boy friend; he said he got too jealous. Similarly, only one (Irish) figured that he had not been a good gang member. All but F.J. admitted that they had not been good agency members; F.J. had broken no rules and was quite justified in his positive evaluation. F.J. was also the only one who thought he had been a fairly good student though Mac said he had been a good one when he tried. Thus, Eagles generally estimated that they had not been

good sons, agency members, or students.

The next series of questions was designed to explore the nature of the generalized other - who they thought of before they acted and what they thought, whose opinion of them mattered the most. Again responses of board members were more easily summarized than those of Eagles. On the whole board members tried to think of others before they acted especially if any harm might come to them. Mostly they thought of the other person in question but Mitch thought in addition of what his girl would think; Red, what his parents would think; and Andy, what the group would think. If the action in question was a troublemaking one against the law, all of them thought of getting caught first and then what their parents would think. If the action in question was something they knew their parents would disapprove of but the gang wanted them to do, they would generally do it unless it was very "big", harmful, or serious. If detected or fearing detection, all except Crew and Rex thought of family, friends, and neighbors - in that order; Crew thought of what was going to happen to himself first, then others. Rex said that he had tried not to do anything against the law (apart from drinking or fighting) since he had been beaten by his father early in his childhood. When asked if they had always thought or reacted in these ways, four said yes, generally speaking. Mitch reflected that he thought more of what girls would think of him in recent years and Red admitted that when he associated with the big gang he had been more afraid of being detected than what others thought of him. J.T. reminisced that during the war when his country was occupied by the Germans one took what one could get and did not think so much of others.

Eagles were somewhat more self-centered than board members. Only three of them tried generally to think of others before acting. Leo said he did not "give a about anyone", though as stated above, he admitted that this was not true; there were a few people he cared about and he often was goaded into doing things in order to "prove" himself. Irish thought of others if the action was good; otherwise, "you think only about yourself and whether you'll get caught". Mac and Shep often acted just to please themselves. When they thought of others, mostly they thought of the other person in question but Dodger thought only of what his parents would think and F.J. was mainly concerned about what his friends would think. If the action was against the law, nearly all of them thought only of being detected and not at all of what others would think of them or how they might be affected by it, though three said they thought of others after they were detected. Shep was different, he worried mainly about what others thought of him. If the action was one they knew their parents disapproved of but the gang wanted them to do, most of them would not do it if their parents would be very hurt by it. F.J. thought he would do it in any case. And Irish just quipped that his parents did not care what happened to him. If they were detected or feared detection, they thought only of what was going to happen to them though two, Dodger and F.J., thought of their parents after they knew what was going to happen. On the whole there had been no substantial change in their reactions.

When asked what they would change about their lives, if they could change anything they wanted to, ironically neither board members nor Eagles mentioned things that they had said they disliked about themselves individually. Of the board members Red would have studied harder, and

Rex would have drank less. Sport and Crew would have finished school, done less fighting, and not associated with the big gang. J.T. regretted the trouble he had had with the police. The remaining two, Mitch and Andy, would not change their lives at all. Eagles would change more things. Mac would have saved more money and finished school as would Shep who in addition would like to have been without all his family troubles. Jocko wished he had not started drinking or smoking. Dodger would travel. Leo would like to have been more husky and not have been controlled so much by his family. And F.J. wished he could relive all his life so that he could have "all that fun over again".

Actual changes or stages in their lives for board members were largely defined on the basis of gang membership though three (Mitch, J.T., and Sport) saw no distinct stages but rather changes too gradual to define. Of those who gave a definition of stages Red defined his thus: Through grade school he stayed at home a lot to be with his family. After that he associated with the big gang, stayed away from home, and took nothing seriously other than what (he) wanted to do. Since he joined the Navy in the summer of '58, he changed the way he thought about himself and others, learned to accept himself for what he was, and defeated his problems. This lead him to break away from the big gang and take things more seriously especially regarding religion and school.

Working hard through school was Andy's first stage. Once out of school he began work and his association with the big gang. Though his faction of the big gang and his activities within it were hardly delinquent, he regretted the amount of drinking he did and joined the

agency. According to Crew, he was more or less the same until a year before the project. At that time he began "hangin' around with an older group from work and calmed down".

Rex figured that the death of his father changed his life; though he belonged to a wholesome camping group he was required to stay home more often and take on more responsibilities. When he immigrated to Canada he was lonely and homesick. At this point he became involved with a group of French "hoodlums". He felt so much like a "bum" as a result of this association that he left it after a month. Through high school, "everything was great; I dated a lot, played a lot of sports, had my freedom, joined the agency and felt proud of myself". At 14 he met Roy and associated with the big gang even though he hated himself for "being so bad" - drinking, fighting, dating tramps. After he met Jill, he started to plan for the future and "act more seriously".

Eagles defined stages in their lives largely on the basis of their delinquency. Irish felt that when he came to Canada he changed from "good to bad". He was "in the process of another" - presumably from all he said elsewhere, back to good. Before 14, Leo was "always hurt inside; I did what I was told but was scared of everyone". After he had run away successfully at 14, 15 was a big year. (That was the year he was eventually sent to reform school.) "Now I don't care". This was the point where he was asked if he really did not care about anyone and he admitted this was not true.

F.J. reckoned his delinquency started when he was seven; he heard of some "big guys in the community and at school gettin' into trouble" and this attracted him. From 10 - 13, "I used to be pretty bad, always

thought of gettin' into trouble, made myself worse". At 14 he got "really, really shy with girls; that was when I started changin', meetin' other guys not like us (non-delinquent) but the gang was still my buddies and I couldn't leave right off". "Now I'm not shy - willpower." Shep did not define any stages when asked this question but spoke of his father. "I've always hated my father's guts but in the last two months, I've begun to feel sorry for him, wonderin' if I really gave him a chance, if some of it wasn't my fault. Also I've started to realize I'll never get anywhere for drinkin'."

Mac's definition of stages was as follows: First there was that early stage of delinquency, breaking windows and getting into "a little trouble". Then he began to like girls and became a "big wheel" at school. Between school and the start of the project he defined himself as having "been around, seen how people acted". "Now I'm confused; there are so many decisions to make and I could make a bad mistake." The other two, Dodger and Jocko, saw no definite stages or periods in their lives.

All board members saw themselves married and settled down in ten years' time as did most Eagles. Only F.J. was considering bachelorhood at that age. And Leo wished he would be dead by 30 - in his view there would be nothing else to live for after that.

In sum, those who thought of themselves in generally dissatisfactory terms chose delinquent groups for their first gang. Obversely, those who were generally satisfied with themselves chose non-delinquent groups first; when those in this latter category subsequently joined delinquent gangs or associated with the big gang, they tended to become dissatisfied with

themselves and remained that way until they broke away from those groups. Subjects role evaluation and responses to the questions about things they liked and disliked in themselves revealed further the general negative outlook Eagles had toward themselves. Unlike board members Eagles evaluated most of their roles in derogatory terms, and either they found nothing to like in themselves or they fell back on their status in the gang, saying they got on well with their friends. Whereas board members either disliked temporary periods in their lives or qualities which were harmful only to themselves, Eagles tended to dislike qualities rather than periods and those qualities which they disliked were generally ones which hurt others, sarcasm, quick-temperedness, and so on. This suggests that Eagles had more cause for concern about themselves. But it also shows a genuine desire not to hurt others. And although board members' lack of personal ideals (as opposed to their occupational ones) prevents comparison between the two groups, Eagles' responses reflect a growing awareness of the unpleasant realities and long term effects of being a troublemaker as well as a desire to become constructive and improve themselves.

One might ask how Eagles could be so self-centered in their delinquent activities which obviously do hurt others yet at the same time say they do not want to hurt anyone. Part of the answer, it would seem, lies in the fact that they are truly self-centered in the deepest sense of the word. Most people who are deeply confused, ambivalent, and worried continuously about a variety of problems are self-centered because they are fighting with themselves and those who cause their problems or those whom they think cause them. The situation becomes even more complex when those who hurt them are the very ones they love

the most. As tension mounts it is bound to seek release. The search for adventure, thrills, excitement, and possibly status is a means of combatting these problems; it is an attempt to block out or reduce the pain caused by confusion and worry. Sometimes others are hurt deliberately in revenge for some particular action. But most of the time if others are hurt in the process of this search, it is incidental or unintentional because, being so involved with their own problems, they are unable temporarily to see their actions from another's point of view, they cannot for the moment think through the implications or effects for others of their actions, they act compulsively without thinking.

The fact that most of their offenses are committed under the influence of alcohol supports this interpretation. Essentially, Eagles are not cruel, spiteful, malicious, or sadistic people. Full of tension and pent up emotions they drink to forget and when they find that this is not possible, they attempt to manufacture thrills in ways which they would not do if sober. Plans are made hastily with excitement; or by suggestion from one, the others become immediately caught up with the idea. As the act is carried out, the blood rises, fear of being caught distracts other fears and makes the whole body alive to the moment. After it is over, detected or not, there is a sense of release. Then, they begin to think of others or rather the thoughts of others which have been made dormant by the activity, return. As they wonder about whom they have hurt and how badly, they make their excuses and justifications to themselves and others hoping that they will be believed, knowing secretly that they will not, that eventually they will have but another worry - until they drink again.

The ultimate unhappiness they caused themselves by their offenses may be seen throughout this section but particularly in the definitions they gave of the major periods or changes in their lives. Although board members based their definitions on group membership it was clear that they regretted most their association in the big gang and were most unhappy during that association. In defining changes in their lives Eagles were almost entirely concerned with their own delinquency; the realization of the futility of it all was just beginning to dawn on them.

CORRELATION

Having presented all the empirical material, it is now possible to try and evaluate the significance of outstanding events and relationships. On the assumption that delinquency is a response to problems, special attention has been paid to any events or relationships which might have been problematic to subjects. Problems were defined as anything which appeared through interviewing and observation to disturb them. In these latter cases reasons for believing that such a disturbance existed were given. Direct questions about any particular sphere of their lives were asked in different ways to insure that such a problem was not overlooked due to the wording of any given question and to provide as comprehensive a view of the problem as possible. In addition, the importance which subjects placed on their own problems was determined by observing the emotional intensity they exhibited in discussing their problems inside and outside interviews as well as the length of time devoted to discussing them and the number of times they discussed them. By reviewing the emphasis which subjects placed on

problems in these ways and by correlating the sequence of these problems with delinquency or association with the big gang, it is hoped that the significance of them may be understood.

Considering all observation and interviewing what problems did subjects emphasize the most? As a group (during group meetings) the topics discussed most intently, most often, and the longest amount of time amongst board members were the agency, girls, religion, and their associations in the big gang - in that order. Problems related to the agency were entirely concerned with the running of the program: ways to improve it, evaluation of each individual's effectiveness in his particular official capacity, allotment of new duties, and the control over the program by the Protestant School Board. Although some criticisms were made of agency policy in the past, virtually no mention was made of personal problems related to the agency before they became officials which in every case was after they had broken away from the big gang. Problems about girls were constantly being discussed: how to convince Sheila's mother that Sheila should be allowed to stay out late or drive in the car, should so and so ask a certain girl to go steady, how to get Jill to stop nagging about getting married, what should be done about Jean's seeing another boy behind her steady's back, how to attract this girl or that, and so on. On the whole no one except J.T. spoke of qualities within themselves which they considered a serious hindrance to success with girls. Apart from this one exception such problems were, it would appear, highly temporary and normal - hardly capable, except under extraordinary circumstances, of being a major factor in offensive activities.

Except in interviews where subjects devoted nearly as much time to discussing religion as to past family problems, religion was discussed much less frequently and perhaps least in amount of time but it was always the one topic about which everyone became heated and intense. What disturbed nearly all of them was their own inability to believe in God. In most cases this disturbance began just before they joined the big gang, though many of them did not stop going to church until after they joined it. Board members' association in the big gang disturbed them not only after they broke away but also throughout their membership. Though they would engage in illicit activities, this disturbed them, because even while they did it, they believed it was wrong.

Apart from such impersonal topics as popular music and sports, it was not until the last few weeks of the project that Eagles discussed much of anything except their own delinquent activities, their relations with the police, their families, and boredom. Of these, delinquent activities were easily the most frequent subject of conversation and one they could discuss endlessly. How much a problem it was in the first stages of the project was not readily apparent for each time they began reminiscing there was wild laughter and excitement as though they were actually proud of their offenses. To some extent this was true; they were genuinely pleased and amused with many of their stunts. But after a time it was discovered that often they laughed and made jokes about things which had in fact been quite painful to them or things for which they were earnestly sorry. On one occasion, for example, they were reminiscing about the slaughterhouse incident in which several pigs were badly wounded; many of them were holding their sides they were laughing so uproariously. Afterwards one of them said that the wounding

of the animals had been an accident and that several of them had been so horrified by the gory sight that they became ill. Other times they vacillated between nervous laughter and anger as when Mac was reiterating the tale about hitting his father. On such occasions laughter was really a facade hiding guilt, pain, and sorrow. Thus, even before they began to question seriously toward the end the utility of being a troublemaker, even before their guilt complexes, ambivalence, and worries about their delinquency came out in the interviews, there was strong evidence that being delinquent was in fact quite a problem to them.

Much less problematic were their relations with the police though they talked about them incessantly in conjunction with discussing their delinquent activities. Being detected by the police was always a potential problem because apprehension just might have serious consequences. Those who had been in reform school could testify to that and the two who were still on probation were deeply worried about detection. Also, toward the end, fear of having a criminal record was becoming a problem to the older ones. But fearing detection was largely manufactured and superficial; manufacturing fear is part of being delinquent - to explain its production is to explain delinquency.

Until the end of the project family problems were not discussed for long periods of time; it was the frequency and intensity of the remarks that made them noticeable. And if anyone was in a particularly depressed mood, more often than not it was the result of some recent quarrel with his family. It was much the same with boredom; they did not discuss it at length but they were constantly heard to make such bitter remarks as, "I wish to hell there was something to do around this goddamn place" or

"Where the hell can we go - nowhere".

Toward the end of the project family problems were considered at great length inside and outside interviews as was their lack of education; how they needed more training for better jobs and which was the best way to go about getting it - night school, the Navy, a trade course? Underlying all these problems there was always the nagging doubt about what was going to happen to them in the future. It was not just a question of whether or not troublemaking was a worthwhile activity but rather an emergent desire to "do something" and "be somebody", to improve themselves generally, to find meaning in life.

Correlation of individual development amongst board members is as follows:

Mitch's biggest problem until he was 15 was his brother Doug whom he hated for his negative malicious attitude toward everyone. This feeling towards his brother began at 11. At 14, he failed the eighth grade, through general lack of interest in subjects. Apart from these two problems, Mitch was fairly satisfied with life. He was not displeased with himself; he got on well with girls, he loved his parents and felt they loved him; and he had few worries regarding the agency, the church or religion, choosing an occupation, or money. At 15 Doug told him "out of spite" that their mother had been divorced when Mitch was too young to remember. Shortly after that he joined the big gang. According to him the effect of this discovery lasted from 15 to 17; he was in the gang only one year. The exact correlation of Mitch's family problem with his association in the big gang leaves little doubt as to the predominant factor which led him to join it. It is possible also

that his failing the year before affected his self-concept negatively and might therefore have been an additional factor, though he did say in the interview that he had always been more or less satisfied with himself.

Before he was 12 Red had few problems. He loved his parents and they loved him; he got on with his sister and friends, and was doing well in school. His father had been drinking heavily for some years but it was not until he was 12 that it began to bother him; at that time the man began to stay away from home at night. Despite his worries, he spent a fair amount of time at home and got on with his parents until he was 14 or, in his words, "through the eighth grade". After that, "I figured he wasn't interested in my affairs, so I did what I pleased". That summer Red joined the big gang and failed the ninth grade. During his association he often "disobeyed his father on purpose and deliberately got into trouble with the police". This period of association was the only period that he had a negative self-concept. Clearly this subject's violations against the law were purely a reaction against a father for whom he had lost respect and from whom he perceived a lack of love and interest.

J.T.'s life was considerably more complicated. Living in Norway throughout the war and its aftermath must have been a most disruptive experience and he was more than glad to immigrate^{at}/~~11~~^{11½}. Because of the war he had only attended school for four years and was somewhat backward in education even before he immigrated. And because of the language difference he had to start from scratch in Canada. To make matters worse his father moved several times to seek better employ-

ment in his trade, construction work. The result was that by the time J.T. settled in East End he was 19 and had only passed the fifth grade. Shortly after he arrived he began to date a certain girl which was the first time he had ever actually dated; prior to that he had always gone out with girls only in groups. Eventually they went steady but broke up within five months; "I don't even know why", he explained, "but I could have kicked myself for it". Immediately afterwards he joined the "Inebriates" and within a year of his arrival at East End, had gained over 50 pounds. With such a life story it was little wonder that he was an atheist long before he reached adolescence; about the only happiness he ever knew was through his family whom he had always loved and respected. It would seem, then, that J.T.'s delinquency was unquestionably the result of anomie arising from the constant disruption of social relations and cultural ties. Relations with his friends and extended family as well as his school were disrupted by the war, immigration, and the geographical mobility of his family. In addition immigration disrupted his nationality and language. The breakup of his relationship with that girl was the final blow.

Until the ninth grade Andy's two major problems were his sister with whom he had always clashed and himself. Up to then, he had done well in school. Moreover, he had no financial worries, loved the rest of his family, and although dissatisfied with points in his religious doctrine as the result of differences in school and church training, he attended church regularly and believed firmly in Christian values.

The key to understanding Andy lies in his answer to the question about what he thought of himself before he joined his first gang. He

had replied, "Average - I think I should live up to the standards of my friends and elders. I don't think I'm any greater but I hope to achieve a better position". Then he added, "I've always thought that but when I was in school, I didn't realize it and life wasn't easy". What he was referring to when he said "better position" was not a better job or income than his elders for he wanted to be the same thing as his father, a spray painter (though he did mention elsewhere that he hoped eventually that they could have their own garage). Rather he was referring to his desire to help others. He had always wanted to do some kind of part-time welfare work and had even toyed with the idea of being a missionary. This desire had apparently lost him many friends; not only did he have a reputation for always thinking he knew what was best for everyone but also many considered him a "goody-goody". In this connection it will be recalled that Andy did not belong to any group until he was 14. What had happened, it appears, was that Andy did think he was somehow greater or superior in those days. And failing the ninth grade as a result of his clash with a certain teacher was obviously a great blow to him, even after he returned from having run away; it was shortly afterwards that he joined the big gang. This sense of superiority which caused him to lose friends including his sister and feel particularly upset after his failure at school is the only sign of disturbance or frustration found in this case throughout observation and interviewing.

The first group that Sport ever joined was the Tigers, a semi-delinquent fighting gang. He was aged eight at the time and had just immigrated the year before from Barbados. More important, before leaving their native country, his father had re-married after having

been divorced for three years when the boy was only four, old enough to perceive marital difficulties and be profoundly upset by them but too young to understand. To complicate matters, the boy did not like his new stepmother and his older brothers, according to him, received more attention. These family matters, combined with the turmoil of immigration, must have been deeply disturbing and could easily be sufficient to warrant involvement with such a gang for three years until he changed schools and found a group of boys who were decidedly non-delinquent. This second group he enjoyed more than any other and was particularly sorry when it broke up a year later through its members moving away. The next four years he did not belong to any group. In 1956 he joined the Navy for two years. When he returned he discovered that his father had been maltreating his mother and began to resent the man. That year he joined the big gang.

How much racial discrimination had to do with joining either gang is not ~~known~~ for certain. Sport never once spoke of it throughout the entire project but Hudson had stated that the boy had had considerable trouble in becoming accepted during the first four years of his residence there. This means that the peak of prejudice correlates with membership in that first semi-delinquent group. On the other hand, Sport had said in the interview section on the self that he had not been happy without fighting until a year before the project. Presuming that such constant fighting was at least partly the result of racial consciousness, then it would seem that it had little to do with joining the Tigers or the big gang. In other words, although the peak of prejudice correlates with membership in Tigers, racial consciousness was a constant factor and involvement with delinquent groups was not; between membership in the

Tigers and joining the big gang there were six years of fighting perhaps but not delinquent activity. No other factor except family problems correlates with membership in either group. Sport had no problems in school or with the agency. His father was earning enough money to help his oldest son purchase a car of his own and Sport himself was earning \$90 a week before he joined the big gang. And although he had been ambivalent about religion, he did not seem particularly disturbed by it. Family problems correlated exactly with membership in both groups.

Rex also associated with two different delinquent groups. The first, however, can be more or less discounted as he was only in it for a month shortly after he arrived in Canada at the age of 12. He broke away as soon as he realized what kind of activities the group participated in. After that he enjoyed membership in an agency group for nearly three years. At 14, he was deeply disturbed by his eldest sister's marriage to a Negro. The following year he began associating with an older man who introduced him to the big gang, and also failed the eighth grade. Although retarded a few years in grade progression due to an initial language difficulty, his grades had been average ever since he immigrated and this failure was clearly the result of his association in the big gang, which also caused him considerable dissatisfaction with his religion. He could not reconcile his sexual, drinking, and fighting activities with his beliefs; until that association he had considered being a priest but discovered that he liked unpriestly behavior too much.

Although Rex's activities in the big gang were limited to the above, this association represented an enormous change. After his father died the household responsibilities that he had to take on caused him to lead

a quiet, serious life. His eldest brother's refusal to emigrate with the rest of the family not only meant additional duties but deeply disturbed Rex; he hated his brother ever since and became quite emotional whilst speaking of him in the interview. Also there is some evidence that Rex perceived differential affection from his mother. When asked if he felt he was loved as much as his other siblings, he said he discovered recently that his mother had loved him more than his sister. His sister's marriage, apart from his feelings about it, meant that he had to take on even more responsibilities, this time financial; he began working during the summer to compensate for the loss of income from his sister. With his own and his other two sisters' as well as his mother's income, there were no serious financial worries. But considering how close Rex was to his mother, the fact that she was so deeply upset by these three disruptive events - the death of her husband, the unhappy parting with her eldest son, and the dreaded marriage of her daughter - the pressure on Rex must have been fantastic and it is small wonder that his reaction against all these family problems was so restrained.

Crew's involvement with the big gang is difficult to understand. He had done fairly well in school until the sixth grade which he failed due to a broken leg and proceeded to make average grades until he left school after the eighth grade so that he could go to trade school. The only incident at school which disturbed him was the remark made by his teacher during his final year about all the boys from East End standing up so that he could see all the "bums". He was generally satisfied with his religion and the feeling of disapproval he perceived from the congregation arose as a result of his transgressions. He had always had a

fairly good opinion of himself and been popular with girls though there was that one "high class girl" who would not date him, which according to him had not bothered him at the time. His family he loved and felt they loved him equally as much as his siblings. Crew had two links with the big gang, his brother and a man named Ray whom he had met at work. Ray was considerably older than Crew but they had in common their intense interest in cars. Moreover, Ray had one, a sports model, and was a good teacher; he taught Crew as much about racing as he did about cars. Unfortunately the man was a bit of a juvenile, being a member of the big gang at his age, drinking, and racing around with lots of women. It was through his association with this man that he began frequenting the same bars as the big gang, drinking heavily, and carousing around involving himself in fights and crazy stunts for a year until he realized that he was being associated with the big gang by others. Thus in Crew's case association with the big gang seems to have been exclusively the result of differential identification.

The correlation of individual development amongst Eagles is as follows:-

Mac's family problems started at seven when his father lost his business. At that time his father started drinking and marital difficulties developed. When Mac was 11 his parents were separated. At twelve he dropped out of the Guards because they would not accept Rob, joined the Eagles, and through misconduct lost his scholarship for the eighth grade; the next year he dropped out before exams. Until that time he had had no substantial problems with girls, the agency, his schooling, his religion, or the church. And although he felt before

he joined the Eagles that his father was wasting the money he earned, he stressed that he had always been well provided for in terms of food, clothes, and pocket money. The lack of qualifications for his own occupational and financial plans, he did not feel until after he left school in the ninth grade. When he began to be sarcastic and bully his friends is not known for certain but Mitch said that he had been quite popular with the Guards before he left it so it may be presumed that this trait developed subsequently. Thus, Mac's joining the Eagles was primarily a reaction against family problems, though his friendship with Rob was undoubtedly a factor; apart from any appreciation for Rob's prowess in delinquent feats, Rob had unquestionable charismatic power and they both shared their family problems.

Although Rob was not interviewed, he discussed at length his motives for delinquency and all the evidence obtained in this connection supports his own analysis. According to him, he had never had any problems regarding girls, money, the agency, or religion. His main problem was his family. His family's constant comparison with his older brothers lead him to feel that he lacked an identity of his own. Since his parents would not accept him for what he was, he sought to establish identity by being delinquent.

It was much the same with Mitch's brother, Doug; only in this case Doug was the eldest and such endless unfavorable comparison must have been even more painful. Also, when their mother was divorced, Mitch at two was not old enough to know about it or feel any resentment but Doug at five was. And when the family immigrated Mitch at five was not old enough to have started school but Doug at eight had already begun school

in Great Britain and had established roots there.

Dodger, perhaps the least delinquent of the Eagles, had the least amount of family problems. Rather, most of his problems were related to his education. Coming from Great Britain at about six, he had little difficulty with regard to language or grade credits. It all started at 10 when he had a mastoid operation and was out of school for a year and a half. Because the school refused to admit him to the grade of his age group, he was badly disappointed and did not want to return at all but his father "forced" him which made him very angry. Perhaps he would still have been able to finish that year if it had not been for his difficulty with a certain subject and subsequent lack of help from his teacher. At any rate he left before the year was out which undoubtedly worsened relations with his father and possibly explains why the man refused to give him a bicycle until he was 16. Again the boy was disappointed. After he left school and started work he began to feel that he lacked education and qualifications. That same year he joined the Eagles.

How much his family had to do with his joining the Eagles is difficult to determine. When asked in the interview about family problems, the only one he mentioned was his disappointment over the bicycle for the promise was unfulfilled and after he had saved money of his own to buy a motorcycle, his father refused to sign the license which caused Dodger to run away for a few days, just prior to the project. He indicated that this was the main source for his feeling that his father did not understand him but the bitterness in his response when questioned about his parents' ideas regarding his school suggests that

the clash arose initially over the question of his schooling, and was greatly aggravated by the denial to give the boy a bicycle.

Up until the year that he failed, he had been average in school, gotten on well with a non-delinquent group, girls, and the agency. He had never found any meaning or satisfaction in his religion and the subject seemed quite irrelevant to his life. Also he had never had any financial worries or serious worries about himself. Thus, it would seem that the educational disruption caused by his operation and the subsequent difficulty with this one subject and teacher combined with the two major clashes with his father and the feeling often of insecurity about his career after he left school were the outstanding points in the sequence of events which lead Dodger to join the Eagles. It would also seem that Dodger's delinquency was the most accidental or least socially structured case of all.

Like Dodger, Shep's father forced him to attend school; he was not allowed to leave until he was 16. He never had liked school or done particularly well in it so that he resented this insistence enormously. But that was the least of his family problems. They started when he was about seven as the result of several factors. First, and most important, he was constantly compared to his older brother who was studious and hardworking. Second, his father made enough to support his family but he had a college education and felt that he was capable of a much better job than the one he had as a salesman. Eventually, the man began to drink and gamble his money, consequently marital difficulties arose. Throughout this period Shep hated his father but did not rebel until he was 13 when the family moved to a new neighborhood

and Shep became involved in the activities of a group of older, confirmed delinquents. From them he learned to look at life from an entirely self-centred point of view, taking what he wanted without regard for others. Because his drinking became apparent, his father forced him to disassociate himself from the group, but in secret he joined another group of delinquents, and when it broke up, the Eagles.

Apart from Shep's dislike of school which may have been caused by his father's comparison to his older brother, Shep's family problems were about the only ones he had before he became delinquent. His problem about certain girls not dating him definitely arose after his association with the first delinquent group and was most probably a result of it. Similarly, he never had any problem with the agency until after that association. And he had no problems concerning his religion. The financial difficulties he felt prior to his delinquency, he blamed on his father's drink and gambling, and was therefore a family problem.

Leo's confusion about his own problems made it clear that he was a deeply disturbed person but impeded understanding. Moreover, there was a lot that Leo did not disclose such as the fact that he had been in reform school and the particular action on his father's part that he resented more than any other. But in reviewing Leo's various questionnaire responses certain statements reappear several times. From these statements and facts gleaned elsewhere his life story appears to run more or less as follows. Up until the age of 11 he was a highly obedient, studious, and hardworking boy. He had no problem concerning pre-adolescent agency groups, girls, religion, or money. Although the only family problems he ever discussed anywhere were those which arose as

a result of his delinquency, there is much evidence that he was disturbed before that. There were several statements about always being scared of his father and always hating himself because of his fears. Then, too, there was that story about deliberately stabbing a boy when he was eight and lying to everyone afterwards that it was an accident. While it is possible that the statements were exaggerations and the story a lie, Leo was too deeply disturbed at the time of the project to believe that these disturbances had developed suddenly within a few years. Finally, there was Rob's statement to the effect that Leo's father had demanded too much of him.

Leo became involved with the Eagles the summer that he was 11 shortly after the group was formed. The first year or so of its existence the group's activities were daring and adventurous to say the least but as most of the time they spent together was at the quarry during the summer and a shack in the winter, they were not yet seriously delinquent. During and after this period Mac and Rob especially used to encourage Leo into doing all sorts of things - hopping trains, catching and riding stray horses, and the like - which they thought he lacked the courage to do. In order to prove himself he did them. Leo knew his father would disapprove strongly of these activities had he known about them. And it is believed that participation in such activities to prove himself to himself and his friends caused or aggravated a really deep-seated fear of the man's disapproval, so much so that he became "scared every time he saw him".

When Leo was 12 he had two problems that he had never had before. In East End he had been quite happy in a very small class where he re-

ceived much individual attention from his teachers and made fairly high grades. Graduation into a City high school meant not only that his age group was suddenly shifted from being a senior group to the most junior one but more important, the classes were quite large and he no longer received such attention. Second, he had never belonged to a cohesive, time demanding group before. Whether these two difficulties caused him to do badly in his subjects and made him hate his teachers or whether hatred for his teachers was purely the result of a perceived lack of attention on their part is not known. In any case he failed that year and subsequently became fully involved with the Eagles and even began to challenge Rob's title for being the most destructive delinquent of the group.

On the surface it might appear that his problems in school were the main factor in his leading the gang to be a fully delinquent group. However, it is believed that his family's ambitions for him were the determining factor for this leadership as well as the initial joining. His parents were among the few of subjects in both groups who demanded much from his school work and emphasized going to college. Second, Leo was the only subject to say that his parents wanted him "to be somebody". Third, Leo was the only subject who ever even considered seriously crime as a profession. That the type criminal he chose as ideal (a racketeer) was one who typically is well-known as a personality with great power amongst the criminal world and who makes much money is most revealing. More revealing was his insistence that he would definitely try to be one if he failed in his present occupation. Fourth, Leo was among the few whose legitimate ideal job choice was totally out of reach - that of mayor; "You're somebody in that position", he said.

"But I'd be nice - I'd go talk to people and help them and get them to respect me." Finally, he was the only one who did not want his failures at delinquency known; not only did he "neglect" to report that he had been in reform school but also there was the fact that he was always trying to prove he was not a coward and exaggerating the extent of damage done in any act of delinquency.

All of this suggests that Leo had some kind of deep-seated inferiority complex, resulting largely from a family situation - possibly intense sibling jealousy which would account for his beating his sister, but most likely gross overambitiousness on his father's part which would account for why he never actually explained his hatred for the man; to do so would have been to admit failure whereas sibling jealousy would not necessarily indicate such failure. Moreover, sibling jealousy by itself would hardly be sufficient to warrant such a deep-seated inferiority complex. For all these reasons it is argued that Leo's delinquency was primarily the result of an over-emphasis by his father on success with a corresponding over-emphasis on obedience and law-abiding behavior. Once Leo made contact with the few boys who were about to become the Eagles that summer after his graduation from the seventh grade, this over-emphasis on success made him desire intensely to be successful in that group. It just happened that success in this particular group was based on daring. But once even slightly involved, it was his first group and he had to be successful and prove himself, temporarily throwing to the wind as it were his regard for law-abiding behavior. Secrecy of these activities enabled him to appear to his parents the obedient child he had always been but such secrecy and participation must have caused many guilt feelings and could have been

an additional factor in his failure the next school year. As stated previously that failure was the final blow, which caused him to react so violently that he went on with Rob to lead the group into becoming fully delinquent.

The case of Irish was more clear-cut. Although he had been arrested once in Great Britain for stealing a bicycle, he was essentially a non-delinquent. He thought of himself as good, had done very well in school, and had no problems regarding money, girls, friends or religion. About the only problem he had at that time was a family one; he was always being compared unfavorably to his younger siblings who were more studious and less adventurous than he. His feelings were so strong that he often used to stay away from home to avoid his family. When he immigrated at the age of 13, he himself was adversely affected by the move and went on to do quite well in the ninth grade that first year. But his father was disrupted occupationally by the move; he was only able to find work at the time which neither he nor Irish believed had justified their emigration since they had moved in order to improve their financial status. No doubt Irish, too, had been promised things which had not been fulfilled. Possibly because the man blamed himself, or possibly because he already resented the man, Irish blamed his father and within a year of their immigration had joined a highly delinquent group in which he remained until he was sent to reform school two years later. This caused the family to move near East End where he met the Eagles after his release.

His difficulties in the tenth grade were a result of schedule mismanagement, taking too many subjects, and possibly his membership in

the delinquent gang. At any rate, these difficulties arose after he had joined the gang. Similarly, his own desire not to be a "laborer all (his) life" seemed to have been a product of delinquency. Although he did resent his father's job as a steel worker before he joined the gang, he resented it because it represented an occupational failure and he hated his father's weakness for accepting a position which the man himself did not desire as a permanent occupation. Moreover, Irish had not had any vocational training as had most of the other subjects and this combined with his stay in reform school prevented him from obtaining employment other than unskilled labor. For these reasons it is believed that his resentment of his parents particularly his father was the primary factor in his delinquency and that the resentment over his father's occupational difficulties, combined with having been a delinquent, dropped out of school, and been unable to find employment other than unskilled labor then caused him to desire a better economic life for himself.

F.J.'s delinquency began when he was seven so it is doubtful that problems with girls, religion, education, his father's occupation, or money had anything to do with it. He explains that he deliberately became involved with a delinquent group because he wanted to make trouble and was attracted to the excitement of such a life. His only problem at that time was his family. He had always been compared unfavorably to an older brother whose delinquency was much worse than his own but was entirely unknown to their parents until later years. The group of delinquents he joined was one of his own age group, not his brother's; therefore it is unlikely that his brother introduced him to delinquency but it is entirely possible that he was trying to emulate

his brother.

Finally, there is Jocko's case. He and his brother each failed two grades during grammar school and both of them hated school the entire time they went. This suggests that both of them were what teachers often call "problem children" at a very early age. If they were problem children in terms of education, it was not because of their class for as has been stated previously virtually all children in the area were from the same class. If their almost complete lack of ambition and dimness of mind observed throughout the project are any indication, their difficulties in school were more likely the result of these qualities. Further evidence for this complacency may be found in Jocko's response to questions concerning the self; not only did he lack personal ideals but also he never found any quality in himself that he disliked. Although Ben dropped out of the project before the last interviewing, neither of them seemed to have any other problems with respect to girls, money, the agency, or their future careers. What precipitated Jocko's joining a delinquent group came out in the major interview. At least his father's drinking and Jocko's disrespect of the man correlated exactly with the start of his delinquency.

CONCLUSIONS

In Part I the theories of Sutherland, Merton, Cohen, and others were presented and evaluated. On the basis of those evaluations certain hypotheses were made and several lines of inquiry were demarcated. The means of exploring all these questions were described in Part II. Part III contains all the empirical data and its analysis. Although a complete understanding of the community and the subjects was obviously impossible, it is felt that the material presented in Part III is adequate for the purposes of this research.

To be sure, there are several large gaps in the knowledge. First, the use of the word "delinquency" was deliberately avoided because it was felt that if the subjects had any idea that the study was concerned specifically with delinquency, it would have biased their behavior and responses. Consequently, the exact frequency and extent of subjects' delinquency is not fully known. On the other hand, it is doubtful that direct questioning in this respect would have yielded any more precise results for delinquency is like anything else that has become a habit; one takes it for granted and explicit estimations about its nature cannot be made. Second, the use of the word "class" was also avoided for similar reasons. Had subjects guessed that the investigation began as an inquiry into the relationship between their activities and class, it would have affected their behavior. But more important, even a single use of the word might have induced an awareness not previously there. Therefore questions about class were asked indirectly. Third, there are some gaps in individual histories. Occasionally a subject gave a date or answer which after analysis was discovered to be incorrect. Sometimes their memories failed them and they were a bit vague. One or two, notably, Shep and Leo, were deeply confused so that their answers

were obscure or contradictory on several points. Then, too, many of the subjects were in the process of changing so that some statements made early in the project conflicted with others. And last, there were some instances where a follow-up should have been made but was not. This was mainly because the need was not realized until analysis was made after the project, but also because a follow-up at that point might have caused a loss of rapport, especially regarding the Eagles who were restless and highly sensitive about certain subjects.

Except in the case of Leo, these gaps were either unimportant or they were able to be partially filled by cross-analysis and correlation or by information obtained elsewhere. Wherever this has been necessary, it has been noted in the presentation. The remaining gaps are regrettable but it is felt that they have not been sufficiently large to impede understanding. It is also believed that indirect questioning with regard to class and delinquency was generally successful. Finally, most of the data supplied by subjects was confirmed in essence by adults who had known them intimately, namely Hudson and Sanders.

THE NATURE OF DELINQUENCY

From all the observation and interviewing it was discovered that board members had been involved with delinquent gangs. In four out of the seven cases, this involvement was so temporary and superficial that it could be better described as wild and mischievous behavior rather than delinquent or even really offensive; in all four of these cases (Mitch, Rex, Crew, and Andy) their involvement was truly an association. The other three cases were more serious but one (Red) had never been arrested;

one (Sport) had been arrested only twice, both times for fighting; and the third (J.T.) had been arrested only twice. J.T. was also the only board member against whom official action beyond arrest had been taken; both times the judgment was based on association with the offenders and the offense after it had been committed, not guilt in the commission of the offense. Assuming that few healthy, adventurous, and curious youths are wholly law-abiding citizens, it was decided that the members of this group had at the worst, transgressed and violated the law but in such a limited way that sociologically as well as legally, they could be considered non-delinquents. In order to add perspective to the study, however, careful attention was paid to factors which led to their association with delinquent and semi-delinquent groups.

Analysis of Eagles' adventurous activities and police contact revealed that they were unquestionably delinquent. But their delinquency was a very special kind; they were troublemakers. To them, this was not the same thing as being delinquent. They wanted to make enough trouble to create attention and excitement but not so much that might seriously endanger health and owned property or become seriously involved with the police. Consequently they limited their range of offense and choice of targets for attack, as well as made an active effort to remain uninvolved with the big gang as it was "too bad". They hoped others would think of them as troublemakers not delinquents, and they developed certain qualities, such as toughness in order to give this impression but discouraged others such as authoritarianism so that they could not be led deeper into delinquency than they wished to go. And last, they viewed troublemaking as a temporary activity to be given up when they reached adult status. Thus, troublemaking was a

highly limited form of delinquency; limited in concept, in attitude, and in behavior. In fact, its activities were so limited that in contrast to other types of delinquency, it did not need the support of a criminal subculture.

How does troublemaking as a style of delinquent life compare with the values, goals, and activities described as typically delinquent by Cohen, Miller, Bloch and Niederhoffer, Sykes and Matza, and others? Were the activities of Eagles typically characterized by maliciousness, negativism, non-utilitarianism, versatility, group autonomy, and short-run hedonism as Cohen argues? Superficially, troublemakers were malicious in that they delighted in the defiance of taboos and sometimes enjoyed the discomfort of others, but beneath that facade of laughter and boasting, they usually felt sorry and guilty; in fact, the worse the offense, the harder they tried to shield their innermost feelings by appearing not to care. If Eagles were negative, defining their delinquent norms by "turning upside down" the norms of the larger society, it was in a limited way. Not only did they limit the scope of legitimate norms they offended but also whatever norms Eagles managed to offend, it was not precisely or even primarily because they were the norms of the dominant society as Cohen suggests; rather it was because they sought adventure, thrills, and excitement. Although Eagles did use some of the objects they stole, they were essentially non-utilitarian in that they did not steal for profit or gain. However, there was more to their stealing and vandalism than doing it sheerly "for the hell of it", to use Cohen's expression. Participation in such acts was a means of achieving status both inside and outside the group and in this sense was utilitarian, and the excitement these activities caused had a very

definite purpose. Furthermore, the effort they made to limit their activities suggests a decidedly utilitarian orientation.

Eagles were versatile but their behavior could not really be described as autonomous or "highly intolerant of any outside effort to regulate their activities". To be delinquent is to defy regulation by definition but Eagles' acceptance and obedience without opposition of certain family requests, police demands, and most agency rules shows that they they were quite willing to be regulated when they felt like it. Similarly Eagles were quite hedonistic in that they were self-centred but they were more than capable of long-term planning. Thus, only one of Cohen's six characteristics (versatility) could be applied without qualification to the activities of the Eagles; the other five could be applied but purely in a superficial way. Cohen appears to have looked only at the statements of delinquents; even more delinquent groups than the Eagles must have had such inner feelings.¹

Miller's analysis is more applicable. Most of the values or focal concerns that he maintains are typical of working class, delinquent gangs could be applied to the Eagles. They did believe in fate or luck. Many of them viewed their own delinquency as a gamble with the attitude: If I get caught, bad luck; if not, I was lucky. The extent they sought excitement and trouble has already been discussed above. Also they did want to be tough and smart or cunning. And they did want to be autonomous in the sense that Miller suggests - independent, thinking and acting on

1. Cohen admits to the existence of these feelings but not with regard to these six characteristics; he discusses them as though they were straightforward facts.

their own judgment. Although Eagles did have such values or concerns as Miller argues, his theory that these values and therefore delinquency are generated by lower class culture is not applicable here for reasons described before.

The analysis of Bloch and Niederhoffer applies to the Eagles in several important ways. In contrast to the authors' thesis that delinquents wish only to show the symbolic evidences of manhood, Eagles did take on or desire the actual responsibilities of manhood, such as getting a job and hoping eventually for marriage. On the other hand, they did act quite irresponsibly in other ways (drinking, gambling, etc.) and they did take on the values of soldiers (bravery in the face of danger, refusal to divulge incriminating information at great expense to themselves, and so on). More significant, Eagles' style of life could be described accurately as a "culture developed spontaneously to fill the gap between childhood and adult status", although for different reasons than those submitted by Bloch and Niederhoffer. One of the most important features of their style of life was the fact that they actually did view troublemaking as a temporary activity and not a stage in a delinquent career. In this instance, then, the view of Bloch and Niederhoffer, based on the tradition of Thrasher and Miller, is accepted in place of the idea that delinquency is typically a preliminary stage to a criminal career held by Shaw, Sutherland, Cloward, and Ohlin. Eagles deliberately avoided contact and identification with criminal elements, and thought Leo confused for considering being a racketeer. Why they viewed their involvement as a temporary one is discussed in the final section.

Another notable feature of the Eagles was the fact that they did not disdain work and they were not continually looking for ways to make a "big score" as suggested by Sykes and Matza. They sought to make a "big bang" perhaps, by some ingenious delinquent feat but not by acquiring quickly large sums of money. By such a commotion they could manufacture excitement and release their aggressions. In this respect the description of Sykes and Matza does apply. But perhaps the most outstanding feature of all was the extent of Eagles' commitment to legitimate cultural goals and values.

In terms of the individual Eagles (apart from their trouble-making activities) were as committed to legitimate social values as board members. Eagles as well as board members accepted equally the value of family life and respected marriage as an institution. That is, like many youths in North America, they had participated in pre-marital sexual relations but they maintained a double standard of morality; generally neither group participated in such relations with girls whom they respected and cared for. And if any group was more moral in this way, it was the Eagles. Also they all saw themselves as being married within 10 years and wanted to make good husbands and fathers.

With regard to other cultural goals both groups accepted the value of education as an end in itself and the only means, barring vocational experience, of improving themselves occupationally and financially. This acceptance was shown in the Eagles' behavior especially. Most board members left school in order to begin work and took trade courses after they had begun work whereas most Eagles went directly into trade

schools. Although this action was temporary in most instances most of them were hoping at the time of the project to further their education and vocational training in the near future and it is known that at least one of them did. Both groups accepted in theory Christian values and although Eagles were not Christian by virtue of their troublemaking activities, it was they, not the largely Protestant junior board, who accepted the theory of their doctrine. Both groups accepted agency rules, board members more so than Eagles it is true; but because of their desire to attend the dances Eagles broke only a few of the rules. In fact, the noteworthy feature of their behavior at the agency was not the amount of rules they broke but the number they obeyed. Both groups accepted equally the idea of economic improvement by legitimate methods.

Most important, members of both groups were well aware of the meaning of right and wrong at an early age. All subjects accepted the theory behind the law; and with the exception of drinking and fighting, they accepted the judgments on their actions made by the law and the larger society. When they committed an offense other than drinking or fighting, they ultimately judged themselves by legal and majority standards. This respect for official and social judgments was observed in the way they accepted punishment. Unless they felt the penalty was grossly unfair, they usually admitted the rightfulness of it after the initial shouting and grumbling about being unjust and mean.

In view of this commitment to legitimate cultural goals and values, Eagles seemed to be neither rebels nor innovators as defined by Merton. They certainly did not wish to change the social order and they did not reject institutionalized means, at least not in the sense that Merton

meant; all except one had every intention of achieving their economic and occupational goals by legitimate methods. They were, however, innovators in another sense. All of them had problems for which they sought a solution. It is argued that they experimented in delinquency as a means of solving their problems and in this sense rejected institutionalized means. To assess those problems is to understand their delinquency.

THE ORIGINS OF DELINQUENCY

From the data presented throughout Part III, the various emphases placed on certain topics in interviewing and observation, and the final correlation of individual development, the conclusions are clear. Family problems overwhelmingly outweigh any others in both groups. Like the delinquents in the investigation of Healy and Bronner (New Light on Delinquency) involvement in delinquency was primarily a reaction to frustrated relationships within the home. Board members' period of association with the big gang and other delinquent groups not only correlated almost exactly with family problems in the cases of Mitch, Red, Rex, and Sport but also in three out of those four it was virtually the only problem they had; Sport's race, it is presumed, was also a major problem to him. Moreover, Sport who had the most intense and longest family problem, associated with delinquent groups the longest and Red whose family problem began later in life but was perhaps equally intense, was the most seriously delinquent of the group and associated with the big gang longer than anyone else except Sport. The other three had entirely different problems: Andy's most mild and temporary association with the big gang was a reaction against having failed in school

which so affected him because he had had a well-ingrained sense of superiority. Crew's almost equally mild and temporary association with the big gang was primarily the result of an attraction to an older member though there is some possibility that his brother's activities in that gang may have influenced him. J.T., the most seriously involved offender next to Sport and Red, was reacting in a state of anomie against a whole series of disrupted relationships and activities starting with the war and ending in a break-up with a girl.

All the Eagles as well as Rob and Doug were beset by family problems far more than any others. The climax of family problems correlated exactly with joining delinquent groups in all cases and in all but four of the total nine cases, family problems were the only major ones prior to delinquency. School problems were additionally important in four cases: Dodger and Leo had outstanding and specific problems; Shep and Jocko had general, nagging ones.

These family problems it must be noted, were not diverse. In almost every case they were of one or two types. All of them were the result of differential love and treatment from their parents (especially their fathers) and/or perception of something radically wrong with their fathers. Of the board members who had serious family problems Rex was the only one whose problems were not primarily the result of either difficulty; his problem was that he was too heavily burdened by the weight of family responsibility and shock over the actions of two of his siblings as well as the death of his father. The other three suffered from one or both type problem. Mitch was shocked by the discovery that his father was in fact his stepfather; Red deplored his father's drinking; and

Sport had perceived both differential treatment and serious defects in his father, namely cruelty to his mother.

It was the same with the delinquents Rob, Doug, Shep, Irish, and F.J. All perceived gross differential love and treatment from their fathers; all had suffered constant unfavorable comparisons to their siblings - in three cases an older brother, in one case a younger brother, and in one case a younger brother and sister. Like Jocko, Mac and Shep hated their fathers' drinking as a thing in itself; but unlike Jocko, Mac and Shep resented enormously what their fathers did when drunk - maltreat their mothers. Also Mac and Shep shared with Irish a feeling that their fathers through their own errors, had failed economically and/or occupationally. Leo, it is believed, was reacting against an overemphasis on success with a corresponding overemphasis on obedience. And Dodger, having clashed with his father over his school and been disappointed by the man for other reasons, felt deeply that his father did not understand him. Thus, in seven out of nine cases they suffered a perception of differential treatment by their fathers and/or serious inadequacies in them.

Problems in school were definitely secondary or minor compared to family problems in two of the four cases where educational difficulties were a factor. Shep and Jocko hated school, it was true, but Shep it is believed, hated it mainly because he was always being compared to his brother and Jocko was not at all perturbed by his failures in grammar school; he had no ambitions in school and was genuinely quite eager to attend trade school. Although Leo's failure in the eighth grade was a major factor in his full involvement with the Eagles, he would not have

been so affected by it had he not had family problems. Dodger, was the only case where school problems, arising from physical ones (his operation), could be said to be a major factor on its own, apart from family problems.

Since so many subjects were Catholic or immigrants in a predominantly Protestant and largely non-immigrant community, what effect did these two factors have on them? If either factor was a causative one, it was only in a very minor and general way, except in two cases: J.T., whose immigration retarded his education as well as disrupted his life and Irish, where immigration disrupted his father's occupation, and therefore affected him negatively as a result. Rex also was somewhat disrupted educationally by his family's immigration but that was the least of his problems. And the fact that he was a marginal figure did not seem to have any effect on him or the others. With regard to religion, it was discovered that Protestants, not Catholics, were disturbed by their religion; the universality of Catholicism presumably compensated for marginality within the community.

Similarly, class consciousness or conflict and overemphasis on success without a corresponding emphasis on the legitimate means to achieve it were negligible. All subjects were undoubtedly aware of class differences but on the whole this awareness did not seem to affect them prior to delinquency. They always judged others on the basis of their actions, associations, and personality and generally they perceived themselves judged by others in the same way. Perception of acceptance in church, agency, and non-delinquent groups before membership in delinquent groups attests to that. There was some bitterness in Mac, Crew, Leo, and Shep about allegedly "high class" girls not dating them, but in

nearly all these cases not only was the concept of class a very impure one but such feelings arose long after membership in delinquent groups. There was also some element of class conflict with regard to the Protestant School Board. Subjects did feel rightly that the Board was a conflicting body and resented its control over the agency, therefore themselves. But this affected junior board members more than Eagles; most of the Eagles were not eligible for membership in the agency's program for teenagers - the one the School Board was concerned about - until after they became delinquent. Moreover, the body, as a representation of its class, was so small and ineffective or irrelevant in their school life, that it hardly constituted a problem in this sphere of their lives. In fact, the man who was principal during the time that most of them were in school left because his policy conflicted with that of the Board which believed that he sympathized too much with student problems and was too lax in his disciplinary measures.

Regarding overemphasis on socio-economic success, it was found that while most subjects wanted to improve their economic status, they did not desire to change substantially their class position. Any frustrations they felt in the attempt to achieve their economic and occupational plans arose in nearly all cases after membership in delinquent groups. The general respect for and emphasis on law-abiding behavior from subjects' parents and within the community generally was apparent throughout the project. In no case did parents encourage their children to be delinquent and there seemed to be little difference in occasions for parental punishment or the nature of penalty given. Parents in both groups were more than distressed about their sons' delinquencies and there was only the one case where a delinquent and criminal career was

seriously being considered as a means of achieving economic or occupational success. It is most probable that such considerations did not arise through any lack of emphasis on law-abiding behavior; quite the contrary, in this case there was an over-emphasis on obedience and abiding by the law. It would seem, then, that neither the theories of Merton or Cohen are applicable in this project.

There was no question of differential access to illegitimate opportunity structures as Cloward and Ohlin would suggest. The adult community, apart from the predominantly French police and one or two groups of racketeers, was generally a law-abiding one. To be sure the big gang's delinquent ringleaders had contacts who would buy their stolen goods but most of those leaders were not from East End and the gang debauched mainly in other areas, especially after the police clamped down on their activities in East End.

Finally, there was no question of differential association as Sutherland defined it, though there were several cases (Crew, F.J., and Rex) where identification with a particular person or group of persons strongly influenced association or membership in delinquent groups. The big gang's activities were unquestionably attractive to board members but association with it occurred in every case only after crises in the home and elsewhere and it is most doubtful that board members would have been attracted had it not been for those crises. The big gang obviously set a bad example for Eagles but their lack of amalgamation with it was hardly caused by a refusal on the part of the big gang; Eagles did not want to be associated with it.

EVOLUTION AND PERSISTENCE

The Eagles were a gang and style of life developed spontaneously as a means of combatting life's blows, "a means of finding the recognition, status, and security"¹ that they failed to receive within their families. In the beginning they probably did blame their families for the suffering caused by differential treatment and inadequacies on their fathers' part. Sharing these problems and having similar resentments against their families was unquestionably the greatest single common denominator of the group and no doubt accounts for why the solution was a collective one rather than an individual one. In this sense, the analysis of Cloward and Ohlin applies. But ultimately they blamed themselves for their failures or problems in other spheres of their lives - education, girls, the agency, religion, the church, the police, their jobs, and their own delinquency. Also, they did not solve the problem of guilt in advance as the authors suggest by withdrawing sentiments supporting specific official norms. In truth they never actually solved that problem. Even at the peak of their delinquency they felt the validity of judgments made upon them by the police, their families, and others. They did attempt on the surface to minimize the impact of such judgments by using various techniques of neutralization as defined by Sykes and Matza. But these were successful only temporarily; invariably, the sense of guilt or regret eventually returned and pressed for recognition.

What determined the range of offense was not opportunity but local

1. See presentation of Bloch and Niederhoffer, p. 76, (Chapter IV).

police practices and a moral code of their own. Nearly all of their offenses were within the boundary of activities generally tolerated by the police. And in view of the fact that policemen sold much of the liquor which they drank prior to committing an offense, one could argue that there was a symbiotic relationship between them and the police. Apart from fear of serious legal consequences, Eagles' range offense was limited by their own sense of right and wrong; to them it was all right to cause trouble but the habitual commission of such serious offenses as car theft or drug addiction was not only wrong in itself but a sign of sickness. Eagles did not offend people, property, or institutions that they respected. Essentially they were not cruel or sadistic people.

Their involvement in delinquency was an experiment. They were confused, insecure boys who suffered from acute family problems. Because they suffered from family problems specifically, they knew that they could escape them eventually by legitimate means when they became men and were financially able to support themselves. Meanwhile they were still dependents and had to live within the situation which caused them so much pain. In their impatience to escape this suffering, they dropped out of school to hasten financial independence. They also sought to manufacture excitement in the hope that it would negate, if only for the moment, their suffering and release the tension caused by worry and doubt. In their search they went as far as their moral commitments would allow them. And when they discovered that those commitments were too strong, that they were only hurting themselves and adding to their own problems, they began to realize that it was no solution, not even a temporary one until they became men. Fortunately

for them and for society their experiment was failing.

It is believed that other writers have not uncovered this special type of delinquency - troublemaking - because most of their research has been conducted in the heart of huge metropolitan complexes, where large numbers of immigrants, unemployed, and poverty stricken people are concentrated in racially mixed areas; where social, physical, and economic problems are varied and acute; where well-developed contra-cultures exist alongside conventional ones. Moreover, most researchers have chosen for statistical purposes relatively large groups sometimes numbering in the thousands and therefore could not afford to be historical, comprehensive, and comparative. The community in this project was a small, well-defined one within a suburban area and the two groups selected were statistically quite small. But because of that smallness it was possible to combine these three methods to present a comparative and fairly comprehensive picture of subjects' characteristics, values, thoughts, and behavior as well as the background which produced them, and to delve beyond the surface statements and appearances given by them.

To what extent can the results of this project be applied elsewhere? Certainly it has no statistical weight. But it would seem that neither the community, the problems of adjustment to which delinquency was a response, nor the nature and evolution of that response are peculiar. Whatever the particular setting, class, or culture, the problems Eagles suffered are hardly unique and their response to those problems is understandable.

APPENDIX A

Preliminary Questionnaire Schedule*

(For interviews with Community Leaders)

- * All the questionnaire schedules contained in the various appendices are only outlines. In the actual interviews, respondents were questioned as informally as possible, using less technical language than is indicated by the outlines. Also all non-factual questions were open-end.

I. General Background of respondent

A. Demographic information

1. Name and address
2. Sex and date of birth
3. Marital status
4. Ethnic origin

B. Education

1. Number of years
2. Diplomas and degrees

C. Occupation

D. Information about East End

1. Date of arrival and number of years there
2. Reasons for choosing East End
3. Where relevant, reasons for leaving it

II. Background of institution which respondent represented or was representing

A. History

1. Development of physical facilities for institutional use
 - a: what facilities were available when respondent arrived
 - b: what facilities had been added since his arrival
2. Development of institution's role in the community
 - a: as representative of an institution, what does the respondent consider to be his role in the community
 - b: what goals did the respondent strive for and
 - c: what steps did he take to realize these goals
 - d: what does he think he has contributed to the

social welfare of the community in terms of programs, advice, money, and other aid

B. Relationship of respondent's institution to other English speaking institutions within the community

1. The church and/or church-sponsored groups
2. The school and/or school-sponsored groups
3. The police
4. The social agency and/or agency sponsored groups

III. Respondent's view of the community

A. As a place to live

1. What does it offer
2. What are its drawbacks

B. In terms of its social problems

1. What are they
2. Why they exist
3. What can and should be done about them

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire Schedule 1 - Pilot Study

(For interviews with all subjects)

I. General background

- A. Name, age, address, and telephone number
- B. Years in the area and previous addresses (reasons for change where relevant)

C. Education

- 1. Number of years
- 2. Level of grades passed successfully and year(s) of failure where relevant
- 3. Subject grades in general
- 4. Reason for leaving

D. Religion

- 1. Denomination
- 2. General acceptance
- 3. Extent of practise

E. Family

- 1. Number living in house
- 2. Breakdown into parents, spouses, and foster children
- 3. Ages of family members
- 4. Marital status of parents
- 5. In cases of divorce, separation, or death
 - a: date of occurrence
 - b: date of any subsequent change of status
 - c: extent of contact with original parent
- 6. Origin and occupation of parents

F. Occupational history of subject

- 1. Name and location of firm
- 2. Type of work

3. Date of employment
4. Pay
5. Reason for leaving
6. General attitude toward job

II. In-group relationships

- A. Rank order of qualities. Each respondent was asked to rank the following qualities according to whether he felt it was a very important quality to have in a friend, a good quality, a quality which was acceptable, or one which was not important at all.

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Intelligence | 8. Leadership |
| 2. Responsibility | 9. Loyalty |
| 3. Sense of humor | 10. Good looks |
| 4. Generosity | 11. Money |
| 5. Courage (of heart) | 12. Experience with girls |
| 6. Physical nerve (or "Guts") | 13. Dependability |
| 7. Personality | 14. Friendliness |

- B. Rank order of members. Qualities which received the highest rank were chosen to form a list by which the respondent should name the persons he thought most and least possessed that quality. With regard to the high ranking quality of intelligence, for example, the respondent was asked to name that member of his group which he thought was most intelligent and the one he thought was least intelligent.

- C. Tests for closeness. Each respondent was asked

1. Whom he would most and least rather be with
2. Whom he trusted the most and the least
3. Whom he considered the most and least loyal to him
4. Whom he considered to be his closest and least close friend

III. Out-group relationships

- A. Estimate of time spent with the other subject group as well as the big gang
- B. Listing of activities engaged in with the other subject group and the big gang

- C. Attitude toward each of the other groups
 - D. The individual's view of the other group's view of him as an individual and of his group
- IV. Regular activities (nature and estimate of frequency) and social interaction. Each respondent was asked to estimate how much time he devoted to the following activities and to name (when relevant) the person or persons with whom he usually engaged in the activity. Where the activity was a general category such as reading, the respondent was asked to describe the specific nature of his participation.
- A. Occupation
 - 1. Time devoted
 - 2. Amount of social interaction with work associates
 - B. School, homework, and/or vocational training (time devoted)
 - C. Entertainment
 - 1. Nature (description of types)
 - 2. Frequency and time devoted
 - 3. Social interaction
 - D. Sports
 - 1. Nature (team and individual types)
 - 2. Time devoted
 - 3. Social interaction
 - E. Family activities
 - 1. Nature (description of types)
 - 2. Frequency of participation and time devoted
 - F. Hobbies
 - 1. Nature (description of special interests)
 - 2. Frequency of pursuance and time devoted
 - 3. Social interaction
 - G. Reading
 - 1. Nature (description of reading selection)

2. Frequency and time devoted

- V. Irregular, "Adventurous" Activities. To avoid direct use of the word "delinquent" or "deviant" each respondent was asked to describe the nature and frequency of those planned and spontaneous activities, events, or stunts in which he participated for adventure, excitement or "kicks". In contrast to other parts of the interview, techniques used in this section were open-end, non-directive, and supportive.
- VI. Attitudes toward the study. Each respondent was asked to describe how he felt about the project and his participation in it.
- VII. Post interview comments. Any comments respondents made after the interview were noted.

APPENDIX C

Questionnaire Schedule 2 - Group History

(For interviews with the two Group Leaders)

I. History of group membership

A. Regarding present membership for each individual

1. Name and age joined
2. Year joined
3. Means of introduction

B. Regarding past members who dropped out

1. Names and ages joined
2. Year joined
3. Means of introduction
4. Reasons for leaving or expulsion

C. Regarding prospective members who failed to achieve full membership

1. Names and ages
2. Year membership was attempted
3. Means of introduction
4. Reasons for failure

II. History of group

A. Significant structural events - any event which substantially altered the composition or leadership of the group

1. Nature of event (description)
2. Date of occurrence and explanation
3. Significance and result

B. Significant attitudinal or behavioral events - any event which substantially altered the attitudes or behavior of the group

1. Nature of event (description)
2. Date of occurrence and explanation
3. Significance and result.

GANG MEMBERSHIP - for every gang

A. Actual relationship

1. When did you join the gang?
2. How many were in the gang?
3. What types of activities were there?
4. How did the individual become a member?
5. Were there any problems shared among the members?
6. What other gangs were around the area at the time that you did not join and why?
7. Reason for the change?

B. Conceptions

1. Did the gang have any ideas about the kind of person you should be?
2. Did the gang have any informal rules about
 - a: the kind of things you should do?
 - b: the way you should act?
3. What do you think they thought of you?

C. Expectations

1. What did you expect to get out of being a gang member?
2. Did the gang live up to these expectations?
3. Is there anything you think the gang should have done for you and did not?
4. Is there anything about the gang or your relationship to it that you would like to have changed?
5. If so, why didn't you?

D. Future - what are your future plans with respect to gang membership?

POLICE

A. Actual Relationship

1. When was the first time that you came into contact with the police?
2. What for?
3. Approximately how many times have you been chased and not caught by the police?
4. What for in general?
5. Approximately how many times have you been caught by the police?
 - a: when?
 - b: what for:
6. What happened when you were caught?
7. What effect did it have on you?
8. How many times have you done things against the law and gotten away with it without being chased or caught and what for?
9. What do you think of the police?
10. Why?
11. Have you always thought this?
 - a: if not, when?
 - b: what?
 - c: why the change?

B. Conception

1. At what age were you aware of what was against the law?
2. What did you think about it at the time?
3. Have your thoughts on the subject changed?
 - a: if so, when?
 - b: in what way?
 - c: why?

4. What do you think the police think of you?

5. Does that matter to you?

6. Have they always thought that?

a: if not, when?

b: in what way?

c: why?

7. Do you think that their judgment was fair?

a: if not, when?

b: why?

C. Expectations

1. How much of the law do you actually expect to be enforced?

2. Did you ever think differently?

3. Why?

4. Were your expectations of what will be enforced any different?

a: when?

b: in what way?

c: why?

5. What kind of person do you think a policeman should be?

6. Do the East End police live up to this?

D. Differential access

1. Do you ever think that they picked on you unfairly?

a: if so, when?

b: in what way?

c: why?

2. Have you ever felt differently? That is, did you at some later date change your feelings?

a: if so, when?

b: in what way?

APPENDIX D

Questionnaire Schedule 3 - Major
(For interviews with all subjects)

c: why?

FAMILY

A. Actual relationship

1. Have you ever had any problem concerning your family?
 - a: when?
 - b: what?
2. How much time did you spend with your family?
3. Has this ever changed?
 - a: when?
 - b: how?
 - c: why?
4. How often did you discuss problems with them?
5. What were they?
6. Has this ever changed?
 - a: when?
 - b: how?
 - c: why?
7. What sort of activities did you have with your family?
8. Has this ever changed?
 - a: when?
 - b: how?
 - c: why?
9. What sort of things were you rewarded for?
10. What kind of rewards were they?
11. What sort of things were you punished for?
12. What kind of punishments were they?
13. Did you think these rewards and punishments fair at the time?

14. What do you think of them now and why?
15. What kinds of rewards and punishments do you receive now?
16. What do you think of them and why?

B. Sentiments

1. Did you love both your parents equally?
2. If not, why?
3. Did you respect both your parents equally?
4. If not, why?
5. Did you get along with both parents equally?
6. If not, why?
7. Did you think that they were just and fair?
8. Has any of this changed?
 - a: when?
 - b: how?
 - c: why?

C. Conception

1. What ideas did your parents have with respect to your
 - a: school?
 - b: church and religion?
 - c: friends?
 - d: job?
2. To what extent did they get you to conform to these ideas?
3. What did you think of these ideas?
4. Were your thoughts ever any different?
 - a: when?
 - b: in what way?
 - c: why?

5. Did you feel that your parents' ideas were different from others in the community?

a: if so, in what way?

b: did it make any difference to you that they were?

6. What did you think your parents thought of you?

D. Expectations

1. What did you expect from your parents?

2. Have these expectations ever changed?

a: when?

b: in what way?

c: why?

3. Do you think that they lived up to your expectations?

4. Is there anything you think your parents should have done for you and didn't?

a: what?

b: why?

E. Differential access

1. Did you feel that your parents love you?

2. Equal to other members of the family?

3. If not, why?

a: what effect did this have on you?

b: do you feel that they were justified?

4. Did you feel that they tried to understand and support you when you had problems?

5. If not,

a: when?

b: in what way?

c: why?

d: did you really give them a chance?

6. Were any of these things any different?

- a: when?
- b: in what way?
- c: why?

F. Briefly, how would you describe your parents?

GIRLS

A. Actual relationship

1. When did you first start going out with girls?
2. What kind of girls do you usually go out with?
3. Have you ever gone steady?
 - a: if so, when?
 - b: for how long?
 - c: why the break?
4. When was the first time you had sexual intercourse?
5. Why?
6. When you have sexual relationships with girls, how often is it because you care for her?
7. How often because of sex alone?
8. Do you classify girls in any way?

B. Conception

1. What ideas have your family had on the subject of girls as to
 - a: how to treat them?
 - b: sex?
 - c: what kind of girl you should care for?
2. What did you think of your family's ideas?
3. Why?
4. What do you think girls think of you?

5. Have you ever thought differently?

a: when?

b: in what way?

c: why?

C. Expectations

1. What do you expect to get out of your relationship with girls?

2. Have you ever expected anything more or less?

a: when?

b: in what way?

c: why?

3. Have they lived up to your expectations?

a: if not, in what way?

b: why (placement of blame)?

D. Differential access

1. Was there ever any type of girl who you would not go out with?

a: what kind?

b: and why?

2. Were there ever any types of girl who would not go out with you?

a: what kind?

b: why?

E. Future plans?

EDUCATION

A. Actual Relationship

1. Reason for leaving school?

2. What did you think of school before you left?

3. What were things about school that satisfied you, that you liked?
4. What were things about school that you disliked, that you considered a problem?

B. Conception

1. What did you think was the purpose of school while you were there?
2. Have you changed your mind about it?
 - a: if so, when?
 - b: in what way?
 - c: why?
3. What do you think your teachers thought of you?
4. Do you feel that they were correct in their judgment?

C. Expectations

1. What did you expect to get out of school at the time?
2. Has this expectation changed since you left?
 - a: when?
 - b: why?
3. Is there anything you think the school should have done for you and didn't?
4. Is there anything you think you could have gotten out of school and didn't?
5. Where do you place the blame?

D. Differential access

1. Did you ever receive any kind of special attention in school?
 - a: when?
 - b: how?
2. Do you think your teachers or the school ever discriminated against you?
 - a: when?

b: why?

c: was it justified?

E. Future - Do you have any future plans concerning school?

RELIGION

A. Actual relationship

1. How often did you go to church and/or Sunday School?
2. Who did you go with?
3. Why did you go?
4. Did you ever say your prayers?
5. Why?
6. What social programs were available for your age group?
7. How often did you use them and why?
8. When did you stop going and why?

B. Thoughts

1. What did you think of the church during the time that you went?
2. Did you think about religion much at that time? If so, what?
3. What satisfactions did you get out of church for this period?
4. Out of religion?
5. What problems did you have about the church at that time?
6. Religion?
7. Have your thoughts about religion or the church changed?

a: when?

b: in what way?

c: why?

8. Have your satisfactions or problems about religion or the church changed since then?

a: when?

b: in what way?

c: why?

C. Conception

1. Did you ever have any ideas about what kind of person the church wanted you to be?

2. Have they changed?

a: when?

b: in what way?

c: how?

3. Why do you think it wanted you to be like that?

4. What was supposed to happen to you if you were not like that?

5. Did you agree with all that?

6. Why?

7. Have your ideas on the subject always been like that?

a: if not, when?

b: in what way?

c: why?

8. To what extent did you try to live up to this?

9. What sort of person did you think the church thought of you then?

10. Was this a fair judgment?

11. Do you think this view has changed?

a: if so, when?

b: how?

c: why?

D. Expectations

1. Did you ever expect to get anything out of religion?

a: when?

b: what?

2. Have these expectations ever changed?

a: when?

b: in what way?

3. Were your expectations fulfilled?

4. Is there anything you think you should have gotten out of religion and didn't?

a: what?

b: why or blame?

E. Differential access

1. Did you ever feel that the church was giving you any special attention?

a: if so, when?

b: in what way?

2. Did you ever feel that the church members were in any way discouraging you from attending church?

a: in what way?

b: when?

c: reason?

d: effect on you?

F. Future - What future plans do you have with respect to religion and church attendance?

THE SOCIAL AGENCY AND OTHER SOCIAL GROUPS

A. Actual relationship (apart from the agency)

1. What programs have you participated in?

2. What satisfactions did you get out of the program?

3. What problems did you have with the program?

4. Have there been any changes in your satisfactions or problems with respect to these programs?

a: if so, when?

b: how?

B. Conceptions

1. What kind of person do you think the people who ran those programs wanted you to be?
2. What did you think of those ideas then?
3. Do you still think that now?
 - a: if not, when was the change?
 - b: in what way?
 - c: why?
4. Did you accept these rules by keeping to them?
5. If not, why not?
6. Have you always accepted them (or not accepted them)?
 - a: if not, when?
 - b: in what way?
 - c: why?
7. What do you think they thought of you?
 - a: was this fair?
 - b: what did it mean to you?
8. Have you always thought that?
 - a: if not, when did you think differently?
 - b: in what way?
 - c: why?

C. Expectations

1. What did you expect these programs to do for you?
2. Have you ever had any different expectations?

a: when?

b: what?

3. Do you feel that there is anything that these programs should have done for you and didn't?
4. Whose fault was this?
5. Do you feel that in general these programs lived up to your expectations?

D. Differential access

1. Did they ever single you out for any special attention?
a: when?
b: what for?
2. Did you ever feel that any of these groups picked on you unfairly?
a: when?
b: what for?

E. Future plans?

ECONOMIC POSITION

A. Money

1. Have you ever saved money?
a: if so, when?
b: for what?
2. What do you spend your money on?
3. Was it ever any different?
a: when?
b: in what way?
c: why?
4. If you had a lot more now what would you do with it?

5. If you had had more money from the beginning, what would you have done with it?

B. Goals

1. How much do you eventually hope to make?
2. What do you plan to do with it?
3. What do you consider a really good salary?
4. What kind of job do you hope to have?
5. If you could have any kind of job you wanted, what would you choose?
6. Why?
7. (If different from the answer to question 4) Why can't you change?

C. Differential access

1. Have you ever felt that you lacked the qualifications for the kind of job you want?
 - a: what?
 - b: when did you begin to feel this?
 - c: what can you do about it?
 - d: what are you doing about it?
 - d: who do you blame for this situation?

THE SELF

A. Self-conception

1. What did you think of yourself before you joined the first gang?
2. Has your self-conception changed any since then?
 - a: if so, when?
 - b: how?
 - c: why?
3. Were there certain things that you particularly liked in yourself?

4. Have you always thought that?
 - a: if not, when did you change?
 - b: in what way?
 - c: why?
5. Were there ever certain things in yourself that you disliked?
6. Was this ever any different?
 - a: if so, when?
 - b: how?
 - c: why?
7. Did you think about what kind of person you wanted to be?
8. Have you ever wanted to be anything else?
 - a: if so, what?
 - b: when?
 - c: why?
 - d: what could you have done to change things?
9. Do you think you have been
 - a: a good son? in what way? a bad son - in what way?
 - b: a good date or boy friend - in what way? a bad date - in what way?
 - c: a good gang member - in what way? a bad member - in what way?
 - d: a good Y member - in what way? a bad member - in what way?
 - e: a good schoolboy - in what way? a bad schoolboy - in what way?
10. Have you always been these things?
 - a: if not, what changes?
 - b: when?

11. If you could live your life over again what would you change?
12. If you had to define your life in stages how would you do it and why, or what major changes do you see in yourself?

B. Role-taking

1. If you have to make a big decision do you think of other people before doing it?
2. Who do you think of and why?
3. What do you think?
4. Do you ever think of what others will think of you?
5. If you are going to do something that you know your parents won't like but the gang wants you to do, what do you do?
6. Why?
7. If you get caught, or if you fear getting caught, what do you think about?
8. Have you always thought in the above ways?
 - a: if not, when?
 - b: in what way?
 - c: why?

C. Future - how do you see yourself in 10 years from now?

APPENDIX E

Census Data

1. Population by age and sex
2. Population by marital status and sex
3. Households by number of persons
4. Families by number of children 24 years
and under at home
5. Population by specified religious
denominations
6. Population by official language and mother
tongue
7. Population by birthplace
8. Population by specified ethnic groups, 1941
9. Population by specified ethnic groups, 1961
10. Population by occupation, 1951
11. Population by occupation, 1961.

1. Population by age (0-34) and sex

Age Group	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-34
Total	776	757	799	541	425	770
Male	383	387	411	285	223	307
Female	393	370	388	256	202	383

Volume 1, Part 2; Catalogue 92542; Bulletin 1.2-1; Table 24.

2. Population by marital status and sex

Class	Total	Single			Married	Widowed	Divc.
		Total	Under 15	15 & over			
Total	5884	3301	2332	969	2424	156	3
Male	2993	1736	1181	555	1210	46	1
Female	2891	1565	1151	414	1214	110	2

Volume 1, Part 2; Catalogue 92-544; Bulletin 1.2-3; Table 32.

3. Households by number of persons

Total	Households by number of persons										Average number of persons per household.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10+	
1330	66	194	241	264	221	153	71	56	36	28	4.4

Volume 2, Part 1; Catalogue 93-515; Bulletin 2.1-5; Table 4.

4. Families by number of children 24 years and under at home

Total	0	Families by number of children							Children in families	Average No. of children per family
		1	2	3	4	5	6-8	9+		
1258	222	253	272	218	131	64	88	10	2966	2.4

Volume 2, Part 1; Catalogue 93-516; Bulletin 21-7; Table 51.

5. Population by specified religious denominations

Total	Anglican Church of Canada	Baptist	Greek Ortho- dox	Jewish	Luther- an	Pente- costal	Presby- terian	Roman Catho- lic	United Church of Canada	Others
5884	365	7	3	1	10	12	47	5091	345	3

Volume 1, Part 2; Catalogue 92-546; Bulletin 1.2-6; Table 46.

6. Population by official language and mother tongue

Total	English only	Official Language			Mother Tongue		
		French only	English & French	Neither English nor French	English	French	Other
5884	839	2964	2053	28	1183	4558	143

Volume 1, Part 2; Catalogue 92-549; Bulletin 1.2-9; Table 70, p. 2.

7. Population by birthplace

Total	Born in Canada	Born outside Canada
5884	5494	390

Volume 1, Part 2; Catalogue 92-547; Bulletin 1.2-7; Table 55, p. 1.

8. Population by specified ethnic groups, 1941

Total	British Isles	French	German	Italian	Jewish	Scandinavian	Netherlands	Polish	Russian
2355	387	1898	3	26	-	4	3	4	-
						Ukrainian	Other Europeans	Asiatic	Others
						12	8	-	-

Volume II; Part 2; Table 32.

9. Population by specified ethnic groups, 1961

Total	British Isles	French	German	Italian	Jewish	Scandinavian	Netherlands	Polish	Russian
5884	1080	4529	12	140	1	23	13	12	1
						Ukrainian	Other Europeans	Asiatic	Others
						9	49	9	6

Volume I; Part 2; Catalogue 92-545; Bulletin 1.2-5; Table 39.

10. Population by occupation, 14 years
of age and over, 1951.

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
All occupations	1525	1236	289
Proprietary & Administration	62	56	6
Professional	81	57	24
Clerical	213	123	90
Agricultural	5	5	-
Manufacturing	492	408	84
Construction	113	113	-
Transportation, Commu- nication	200	106	94
Commercial & Financial	58	35	23
Service	137	105	32
Laborers	174	165	9

Volume VIIV Labor Force "Occupations and Industries";
Table 9.

11. Population by occupation, 14 years
of age and over, 1961.

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
All occupations	1848	1463	385
Managerial	96	88	8
Professional & Technical	134	91	43
Clerical	243	124	119
Sales	64	45	19
Service & Recreation	212	145	67
Transport & Communication	145	134	11
Farmers & Farmworkers	5	5	-
Miners, quarrymen and related workers	6	6	-
Craftsmen, production process and related workers	707	633	74
Laborers	207	171	36
Not stated	29	21	8

Volume 3, Part 1; Catalogue 94-508; Bulletin 3.1-8.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Bandura, Albert, and Walters, Richard H.; "Dependency Conflicts in Aggressive Delinquents," Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 19: 52-66.

Barron, Milton; The Juvenile in a Delinquent Society, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1954).

Bernstein, Walter; "The Cherubs Are Rumbling," The New Yorker, September 21, 1957.

Bloch, Herbert, and Neiderhoffer, Arthur; The Gang, (New York: The Philosophical Library, 1958).

Blumer, Herbert; "The Field of Collective Behavior," Principles of Sociology, Alfred M. Lee ed., (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1951), pp. 170-216.

Bohlke, Robert; "Social Mobility, Stratification Inconsistency, and Middle-Class Delinquency," Social Problems, 1961, 8: 351-364.

Browning, Charles; "Differential Impact of Family Organization on Male Adolescents," Social Problems, 1961, 8: 37-45.

Canada Yearbook 1961 (Ottawa: Dominion Bureau of Statistics), p. 740.

Census of Canada, V. I, Pt. 2, Population: General Characteristics, (Toronto: Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1941) Population by Specified Ethnic Groups, Table 32.

Census of Canada, V. I, Pt. 2, Population: General Characteristics, (Toronto: Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1961):

Catalogue 92 - 542,	Table 24;
" 92 - 544,	" 32;
" 92 - 545,	" 39;
" 92 - 546,	" 46;
" 92 - 547,	" 55;
" 92 - 549,	" 70.

Census of Canada, V. II, Pt. I; Families and Households, (Toronto: Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1961):
Catalogue 93 - 514, Table 4; Catalogue 93 - 516, Table 51.

Census of Canada, V. III, Pt. I, Labour Force: Occupations and Industries, (Toronto: Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1951 and 1961): Catalogue 94 - 508.

Census of Canada, Occasional publication, Distribution of Nonfarm Incomes in Canada by Size, (Toronto: Dominion Bureau of

- Statistics, 1959): Catalogue 13 - 517, Table 30.
- Chasan, Will; "Teenage Gangs From the Inside," New York Times Magazine, 1954, March 21.
- Cloward, Richard, and Ohlin, Lloyd E.; Delinquency and Opportunity (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960).
- Cohen, Albert; Delinquent Boys, (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955).
- , Lindesmith, Alfred, and Schuessler, Karl; The Sutherland Papers, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1956).
- , and Short, James; "Research in Delinquent Sub-Cultures," Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 14: 20-38.
- Crawford, Paul; Working With Teenage Gangs, (New York: New York Welfare Council, 1950).
- Cressey, Donald R.; "Application and Verification of the Theory of Differential Association," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1952, 43: 43-52.
- ; "Changing Criminals: The Application of the Theory of Differential Association," American Journal of Sociology, 1955, 61: 116-120.
- ; "The Theory of Differential Association: an Introduction," Social Problems, 1960, 8: 2-5.
- Dubin, Robert; "Deviant Behavior and Social Structure," American Sociological Review, 1959, 24: 147-163.
- Empey, LaMar, and Rabow, Jerome; "The Provo Experiment in Delinquency Rehabilitation," American Sociological Review, 1961, 26: 679-695.
- Finestone, Harold; "Cats, Kicks and Color," Social Problems, 1957, 5: 1-14.
- Furman, Sylvan, ed.; Reaching The Unreached. (New York: New York City Youth Board, 1950).
- Glaser, Daniel; "Criminality Theories and Behavioral Images," American Journal of Sociology, 1955, 61: 433-442.
- ; "Differential Association and Criminological Prediction," Social Problems, 1960, 8: 6-14.
- Goldman, Nathan; "Defining the Delinquent Child," read at the Eastern Sociological Society, (Philadelphia, 1958).

- ; "The Differential Selection of Juvenile Offenders for Court Appearance," unpublished dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Glueck, Eleanor and Sheldon; Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency (New York: Commonwealth Fund, 1950).
- ; Delinquency in the Making, (New York: Harper Bros., 1952).
- Glueck, Sheldon; "Theory and Fact in Criminology," British Journal of Sociology, 1956, 7: 92-109.
- Goodman, Paul; Growing Up Absurd, (New York: Random House, 1956).
- Haskell, Martin; "Toward a Theory of Reference Group Behavior," Social Problems, 1961, 8: 220-230.
- Healy, William; The Individual Delinquent, (Boston: Little, Brown, 1915).
- ; "The Practical Value of Scientific Study of Delinquents," (Washington, D.C.: United States Children's Bureau, 1922) Publication 26.
- , and Bronner, Augusta; Delinquents and Criminals: Their Making and Unmaking, (New York: Macmillan, 1926).
- ; New Light on Delinquency and its Treatment, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936).
- Jones, Peter d'A.; America's Wealth: The Economic History of an Open Society, (New York: Macmillan, 1963), pp. 320-325.
- Jones, Stacey; "The Cougars — Life With a Delinquent Gang," Harper's Magazine, 1954, November.
- Kitsusi, John, and Dietrick, David; "Delinquent Boys: a Critique," American Sociological Review, 1959, 24: 208-215.
- Krobin, Solomon; "Conflict of Values in Delinquency," American Sociological Review, 1951, 16: 653-662.
- Lander, Bernard; Towards an Understanding of Juvenile Delinquency, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954).
- Macoby, Eleanor, Johnson, J.P., and Church, R.M.; "Community Integration and the Social Control of Juvenile Delinquency," Journal of Social Ideas, 1958, 14: 36-52.
- McCord, Joan and William; "The Effect of Parental Role Models on Criminality," Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 14: 66-75.

Meier, Dorothy, and Bell, W.; "Anomie and Differential Access to the Achievement of Life Goals," American Sociological Review, 1959, 24: 189-202.

Merton, Robert K.; Social Theory and Social Structure, (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1949 and 1955).

Miller, Walter, B.; "Lower-Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency," Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 24: 5-20.

Mizruchi, Ephraim H.; "Social Structure and Anomie in a Small City," American Sociological Review, 1960, 25: 50-55.

Nye, F. Ivan and Short, James, F. Jr.; "Scaling Delinquent Behavior," American Sociological Review, 1956, 22: 326-331.

-----; "Reported Behavior as a Criterion of Deviant Behavior," Social Problems, 1957-58, 5: 207-214.

-----; "Parent-Adolescent Relationships and Delinquent Behavior," Research Studies of the State College of Washington, 1956, 24: 160-170.

-----; "The Rejected Parent and Delinquency," Marriage and Family Living, 1956, 18: 291-297.

-----; "Child-Adjustment in Broken and in Unhappy, Unbroken Homes," Marriage and Family Living, 1957, 19: 356-361.

Pfautz, Harold; "Near-Group Theory and Collective Behavior," Social Problems, 1961, 9: 167-174.

Powers, Edwin, and Witmer, Joan; An Experiment in the Prevention of Delinquency, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951).

Reiss, Albert J. Jr.; "Delinquency as the Failure of Personal and Social Controls," American Sociological Review, 1951, 16: 196-208.

Salisbury, Harrison; The Shook-Up Generation, (New York: Harper Bros., 1958).

Shaw, Clifford; Delinquency Areas, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929).

-----; The Jack Roller, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930).

-----; and Moore, Maurice; The Natural History of a Delinquent Career, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931).

-----; and McKay, H.D.; "Social Factors in Juvenile Delinquency," National Commission of Law Observance and Enforcement, V. II, No. 13, (Washington, D.C., 1931).

- ; Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942).
- Short, James, Jr.; "Differential Association and Delinquency," Social Problems, 1957, 4: 233-240.
- ; "Differential Association as a Hypothesis: Problems of Empirical Testing," Social Problems, 1960, 8: 14-25.
- Sutherland, Edwin; Principles of Criminology, (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippencott, 1924, 1937, and 1947).
- ; The Professional Thief, by a Professional Thief, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937).
- Sykes, Gresham M., and Matza, David; "Techniques of Neutralization," American Sociological Review, 1954, 22: 664-670.
- ; "Juvenile Delinquency and Subterranean Values," American Sociological Review, 1961, 26: 712-719.
- Tannenbaum, Frank; Crime and the Community, (Boston: Ginn, 1938).
- Tappan, Paul; Survey of Juvenile Delinquency, Part I: North America, (United Nations: Division of Social Welfare, 1952-53).
- ; "Who is Criminal?" American Sociological Review, 1947, 12: 96-103.
- Thrasher, Frederick; The Gang, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927).
- ; "Gangs," Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, pp. 564-567.
- Toby, Jackson; "Differential Impact of Family Disorganization," American Sociological Review, 1957, 22: 505-512.
- Turner, Ralph; "The Quest for Universals," American Sociological Review, 1953, 18: 604-611.
- ; "Value Conflict in Social Disorganization," Sociology and Sociological Research, 1954, 38: 301-308.
- Wattenburg, William, and Balistreri, James; "Automobile Theft: A 'Favored Group' Delinquency," American Journal of Sociology, 1952, 57: 575-579.
- Whyte, William Foote; Street-Corner Society, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943).
- Witmer, Helen L., and Kotinsky, Ruth, eds.; New Perspectives for Research on Juvenile Delinquency, (Washington, D.C.: United States Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Children's Bureau, 1956).

Yablonsky, Lewis; "The Delinquent Gang as a Near-Group," Social Problems, 1959, 7: 108-117.

Yinger, Milton; "Contraculture and Subculture," American Sociological Review, 1960, 25: 625-636.
