

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

MULTIPLE USE OF AGENCY

SERVICES BY FAMILIES

A study of services used
by, and of problems occurring
in the families of children known
to the Juvenile Court of Winnipeg

BEING A REPORT OF A RESEARCH
PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

by

M. L. Faulder
L. M. Fisher
A. Getz
S. A. Grosh
A. Hoffer
M. A. Stewart

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

MAY, 1963





THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

MULTIPLE USE OF AGENCY

SERVICES BY FAMILIES

A study of services used
by, and of problems occurring
in the families of children known
to the Juvenile Court of Winnipeg

BEING A REPORT OF A RESEARCH
PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

by

M. L. Faulder
L. M. Fisher
A. Getz
S. A. Grosh
A. Hoffer
M. A. Stewart

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

MAY, 1963

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writers of this study wish to express their sincere appreciation for the interest shown in this work by the members of the Faculty of the University of Manitoba School of Social Work. We are particularly grateful for the guidance, advice and encouragement received from our research advisor, Mr. W. H. Rogers.

We also acknowledge the co-operation and assistance of Dr. G. I. Paul, Assistant Professor of Actuarial Mathematics and Statistics.

We would also like to express our appreciation to the staffs of the Winnipeg Juvenile and Family Court, and the Child Guidance Clinic of Greater Winnipeg.

ABSTRACT

This research project was designed to ascertain the social welfare services used and social problems occurring in the families of children formally charged by the Juvenile Court of Winnipeg.

The study was based on data with regard to a sample of 129 families of juvenile delinquents formally charged at the Juvenile Court which was obtained from Juvenile Court files, interviews with Juvenile Court workers, other agency registrations and Confidential Exchange listings.

The findings revealed that a major proportion (91.5 percent) of the families in the sample group were using one or more social agencies in addition to Juvenile Court. A large proportion of the families in the sample group manifested the social problems of dependency, indigent disability and disordered behaviour.

It was found that a large number of families known to a social agency prior to contact with Juvenile Court were known to Child Guidance Clinic. This showed that a child's problems are likely to become evident initially in the school setting.

The findings showed that while there was a trend toward a greater number of charges at Juvenile Court if a family was known to several agencies before Juvenile Court, the correlation was not high enough to be of real significance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
Chapter	
I INTRODUCTION	1
II BACKGROUND AND PREVIOUS STUDIES	10
III METHOD	20
IV ANALYSIS	30
V CONCLUSIONS.	39
BIBLIOGRAPHY	45
APPENDIX A	48
APPENDIX B	51

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Proportion of Families Known to Other Agencies	30
2. Proportion of Families with Problems Other Than Juvenile Delinquency	31
3. Distribution of Problems by Families	33
4. Distribution of Problems in Families by Means of Worker Interviews	34
5. Number of Families Using Agency Services	36
6. Average Number of Charges per Family and Number of Agencies Contacted Prior to Juvenile Court Contacts	37
7. Responses to Questions on Interview Schedule	51

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Often juvenile delinquency is "more than a formal breach of conventions; it is indicative of an acute breakdown in the normal functions of family life."¹ Current literature reveals a growing community and professional concern about this problem. The "breakdown" in functioning is frequently seen in other social problems as well as juvenile crime. This raises several questions. Are the social welfare services provided for the families of juvenile delinquents adequate? Are the services offered by the juvenile court being duplicated by other social agencies? Is there a small proportion of families known to Juvenile Court of Winnipeg who use a major proportion of social welfare services in this city?

In this study, carried out by six students in their Masters' year at the University of Manitoba School of Social Work, it was hoped to determine what proportion of families of children known to the Juvenile Court of Winnipeg are or have been receiving other agency services and what social problems do occur in these families. Our study is related to the over-all focus of the problem being studied by other students in their Masters' year at the University of Manitoba School of Social Work; namely, what is the distribution of social welfare

¹Harry M. Shulman, "The Family and Juvenile Delinquency", quoted in Sheldon Glueck, The Problem of Delinquency (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1959) p. 128.

services for families known to a Winnipeg social agency, and what are the types of social problems manifested by families using these services? The general focus of this study then was on the distribution of social welfare services for families known to an agency in Winnipeg and on what types of social problems occurred in these families.

Industrialization with its concomitant changes in social stratification and social mobility has brought about an increase in the social problem of juvenile delinquency. It is a form of deviant behaviour which is said to characterize an urban industrial society.

With industrialization it became impossible to maintain the extended kinship group of the traditional family. Increased mobility and stratification brought with them the nuclear family--parents and dependent children. The traditional family functions were economic, educational, and protective. Industrialization has meant that the state, school and industry have taken over many aspects of these functions.

Emancipation of youth has become essential in our society. After the intimate association of years among the few members of the immediate family, youth "moves out on his own generally with a sharp break in family and other kinship ties."² Rebelliousness, conformity to peer group standards while rejecting adult standards, can be seen

²H.L. Wilensky and C.N. Lebeaux, Industrial Society and Social Welfare (New York: The Russell Sage Foundation, 1958) p. 75.

as the means of moving from this extreme dependency to the emancipation expected of youth. Family conflicts arise over a child's choice of occupation, over changes in sexual standards; rapidity of social change means that there is a conflict between generations; authorities differ on ideas about child-rearing and confuse parents. The result of this is that the children have difficulty in accepting parental authority. In summation, industrialization and urbanization have placed a great deal of stress on the nuclear family. Family breakdown has been a result of this stress and has become a major social problem.

Our group was interested in the area of juvenile delinquency due to contact with Juvenile Court from a variety of agency settings. As social workers we knew the psychological, emotional, and social importance of the family. It is in the intimate family group that the child forms relationships which have a great bearing on his relationships with people outside the family group. He learns the basic cultural values, attitudes, standards of behaviour in the family. In an ideal family the parents are interdependent and maintain their roles as parents to the children, and as husband and wife to each other. The parents must have had their own needs satisfied to an extent that they are able to give enough to meet the needs of the children in a consistent manner.

Sociologically the attributes of the family include social interaction, common culture, viewing oneself as being a member of the family group, and performing one's roles in relationship to one another. In our society families usually perform the functions of reproduction,

provision of physical and emotional care for family members, and socialization of the children.

It is in a consistent, secure emotional climate that the child is able to meet the demands of the various stages of psycho-sexual development. However, when there is a breakdown in family functioning there is a likelihood that healthy personality functioning of all of the members of the family will be impaired.

There has been some research done on family-centered projects in St. Paul.³ This brought to our attention the fact that juvenile crime was an important social problem in the "multi-problem" families studied. This research further focused our concern on the fact that juvenile delinquency was an indication of poor family adjustment. Therefore, the focus of our study was on the distribution of social welfare services and the types of social problems with reference to the families of those children known to Juvenile Court of Winnipeg.

Included in our study were families of active cases of juvenile delinquents in the month of September, 1962. The families considered consisted of a unit with either or both parents and one or more children under the age of 18 years. We did not consider children under 18 who had no family or who had been transferred from Juvenile Court to adult court. We also did not include children whose offences were such as to be handled informally in Juvenile Court. The following

³This is detailed in Chapter II where sources are given.

agencies were referred to in determining other agency services used by the family of the juvenile delinquent: City of Winnipeg Public Welfare Department, Province of Manitoba Department of Welfare, Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, Juvenile and Family Court, Family Bureau of Greater Winnipeg, Child Guidance Clinic of Greater Winnipeg, Out Patient Departments at the Winnipeg General, Children's and St. Boniface Hospitals. Social problems under discussion were limited to those with which an agency was set up to deal.

The scope of this study imposed limitations which included the following: we used the caseloads from Winnipeg Juvenile Court for only one month, and one month's caseload may not necessarily be typical of all months' caseloads. The list of agencies mentioned in the previous paragraph was not exhaustive. Families may have been known to other agencies which were not considered. Because of a lack of time, we were unable to consider all of the social agencies in the City of Winnipeg. Therefore we chose those social agencies considered to be the major family agencies.

As a result of our experiences as social workers and the knowledge from sources such as those already mentioned, we believed that juvenile delinquency would be only one symptom of breakdown in family functioning and that other symptoms would be present. This led us to the hypothesis that a greater proportion of the families of children known to Juvenile Court of Winnipeg are known or have been known to one or more other social agencies and manifest problems of dependency, indigent disability and disordered behaviour other than the juvenile crime exhibited by the child on our sample.

By "greater proportion" we meant over one half of the families.

By "dependency, indigent disability and disordered behaviour"

we meant the following:

1. Dependency: is the problem facing families who will be without the basic necessities of life unless the community makes some provisions for them. Dependency is defined in relation to the problems of unemployment and financial dependency. The agencies set up to deal with the particular types of problems considered for this study are City of Winnipeg Public Welfare Department and Province of Manitoba Department of Welfare.
2. Indigent Disability: Families within this class are those who are unable to meet medical or treatment costs. It is defined in relation to the problems of illness, both physical and mental. The agencies set up to deal with this are the General Hospital, Children's Hospital, and St. Boniface Hospital Out Patients' Departments.
3. Disordered Behaviour: By disordered behaviour we mean behaviour which contravenes the standards of society; for example severe marital problems and malfunctioning in a school situation. Sometimes this behaviour is reflected by formal judgment of society--that is, records of crime, delinquency, child neglect and other types of behaviour in respect to which society takes official action. The agencies set up to deal with this are the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, the Child Guidance Clinic of Greater Winnipeg, the Family Bureau of Greater Winnipeg, and the Juvenile and Family Court.

Several questions arose out of this hypothesis. Are there families who are known to Juvenile Court of Winnipeg who have other social problems but are not known to other agencies? What percentage of families are using the major proportion of social welfare services in the community? Is there a duplication of social welfare services provided to the families of juvenile delinquents? What proportion of families manifest only one category of the above-mentioned social problems and what proportion manifest more than one category (of social problems)?

It was felt that there may have been a pattern of agency services prior to contact with the Juvenile Court of Winnipeg. It was only possible to consider whether there was contact with one agency before contact with Juvenile Court and the Child Guidance Clinic of Greater Winnipeg was selected. If a child has conflicts with the law, it would seem likely that he would show behaviour problems elsewhere at an earlier time. Thus it was felt that the first place behaviour problems would be manifested outside the home would be in the school situation. It was also felt that recidivism was more common among the children of families using many of the social welfare services available in the community. Out of this the following sub-hypotheses emerged:

1. A large number of the families known to an agency prior to contact with the Juvenile Court were known to Child Guidance Clinic. By "a large number" we meant $33\frac{1}{3}$ percent. Our practical experience suggested that this would be a significant number.

2. The greater the number of agencies contacted prior to contact with Juvenile Court, the more likely is repeated contact of the child with Juvenile Court. By "repeated contact" we meant that the child has appeared repeatedly before a judge on formal charges.

For the purposes of our study it was assumed that if a family were known to a social agency it had a social problem of the type with which the agency was set up to deal. We further assumed that the Juvenile Court workers would have knowledge of other social problems in the families.

Our study design involved the selection of a sample of cases known to Winnipeg Juvenile Court, the recording of certain facts from the files, interviews with all of the Juvenile Court workers, and checking of family names against other agency lists. We also checked family names against the Confidential Exchange listing.

The workers at Juvenile Court were interviewed for the purpose of obtaining additional information regarding the social problems of the families from their respective caseloads.

We were aware that our method was limited. A limitation was that we were using only lists of cases from other agencies. Thus we knew only the general area in which the problem of the family occurred. We did not know the specific problems which the families showed at these agencies. Interviews with families might have given us more accurate data but lack of time prevented us from conducting such interviews.

The social problems were classified according to the three major areas: dependency, indigent disability, and disordered behaviour, and in accordance with the definitions on page 6. These problems were indicated by registrations at social agencies and derived from interviews with Juvenile Court workers. The primary source of data concerning agency registrations was the Confidential Exchange.⁴ In order to determine social agency registrations after December 31, 1960, we circulated a list of the names of families from our sample to each of the agencies under consideration. One agency was unable to provide the information requested due to reasons of confidentiality. The families in our sample were classified according to the numbers of agency services used in addition to the Juvenile Court. Statistical methods were employed to determine whether there was a correlation between the number of repeated contacts with Juvenile Court and the number of other agency services used. We did not consider the total number of contacts with each agency. We considered the total number of agencies used. We compared the number of social problems of the families with the number of agency services used.

We hoped that our study would add to knowledge of the problems occurring in, and services used by, the families of those children who appear before the Juvenile Court.

Before dealing with method in detail, background literature will be reviewed.

⁴The Confidential Exchange was operated by the City of Winnipeg Public Welfare Department. Families using social agency services were registered at Confidential Exchange by each social agency with the exception of the Child Guidance Clinic of Greater Winnipeg. Following the closing of Confidential Exchange December 30, 1960 the only registrations continued were those of the City of Winnipeg Public Welfare Department.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND AND OTHER STUDIES

In recent years there appears to have been an increase in juvenile delinquency in both Canada and the United States. According to Shulman, the increase in the United States has been evidenced in the juvenile court's intake and by the seriousness of crimes committed. This trend, he states, has outdistanced by far the increase in the population of children and youth.¹

There is considerable evidence that the families of most urban delinquents have a variety of problems, and conversely, that these families give rise to a disproportionate number of delinquents.² Consequently, the major emphasis of our study was on the families of juvenile delinquents.

In our perusal of the literature, we found no previous studies with our particular focus. Therefore we centered our reading within two main areas. Firstly, we considered the family in present-day society and its importance in the life of children and youth. Also, we considered those studies of juvenile delinquency which described families from which the delinquent came.

It is generally recognized that the family fulfills four major functions: "(1) the means to propagation, sustenance and survival; (2) habit-training; (3) interpersonal association; and (4) transmission

¹Harry M. Shulman, Juvenile Delinquency in American Society (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961) p. 9.

²Ibid., p. 397.

of cultural patterns and values."³ As discussed in Chapter I, industrialization has resulted in the two generation nuclear family consisting of parents and children. Many writers agree that the period of transition to an urban industrial society has resulted in significant changes in each of the above-mentioned functions. This has "revolutionized the status of childhood and has created problems in child rearing that are now being reflected in the partial breakdown of social control over childhood and in the growth of juvenile delinquency."⁴ Thus, juvenile delinquency appears as a by-product of the difficulties facing the family in our present day ever-changing society.

In Merrill's study, it is stated that the family plays an important role in the child's socialization by being the source of affection and care, which is a source of security for the child. However, by being a source of discipline the family may frustrate the expression of the child's impulses and thus produce ambivalence and often confusion in the child.⁵

Flügel and others agree that the child "in adopting his attitude towards the members of his family circle, is at the same time determining to a large extent some of the principal aspects of his relations to his fellow men in general."⁶

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Maud A. Merrill, Problems of Child Delinquency (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1947) pp. 122-132.

⁶J.C. Flügel, The Psychoanalytic Study of the Family (London: The Hogarth Press Ltd., 1950) p. 4.

Witmer, Shulman, Glueck, Powers, McIver and many others agree that frequently antisocial behaviour begins in the stresses and strains of the parent-child relationships. Juvenile delinquency seems to be an indication of poor family adjustment and "conflict with the law represents a painful symptom of family disorganization."⁷ "Crime and delinquency go hand in hand with our disorganized families and it is from this deep well-spring of deprivation that the multiplicity of social ills flow."⁸

The St. Paul, or Family Centered Project was the most important study consulted for our purposes. The study was undertaken by eight agencies in St. Paul, Minnesota and was divided into three phases: (1) planning and study phase from 1947 to 1954; (2) demonstration phase from 1954 to 1959; and (3) implementation phase from 1959 to 1963. This pioneering cooperative community effort to improve the functioning of multi-problem families grew out of the Family Unit Report Study undertaken in St. Paul by Community Research Associates and community agencies. The study was an accounting of problems and services in the areas of economic need, social maladjustment, ill health and recreation, and involved over one hundred agencies. The most striking finding was that "6% of St. Paul recipients of social welfare services used about half of the services available, and were characterized by a multiplicity of problems."⁹ From the findings of the planning and study phase, it was decided to set up an experimental program to work with a group of

⁷William Hoffman, "Offenders Have Families Too", Families in Trouble, ed. L.L. Geismar and Beverly Ayres, Family Centered Project (St. Paul, Minnesota, 1958) p. 3.

⁸Ibid., p. 2.

⁹Joseph C. Lagey and Beverly Ayres, Community Treatment Programs for Multi-Problem Families, Research Department, Community Chest and Councils of the Greater Vancouver Area (Vancouver, 1962) p. 77.

problem families in an effort to develop or better identify family-centered treatment concepts. The criteria for selection of families was: "(1) at least one parent in the home and at least one child under 18 in 'clear and present danger' either through delinquency or neglect; (2) a problem in either the health or economic area."¹⁰ All families had problems in social functioning, and it was found that there was a high incidence of delinquency in these families and "in 100 families, 97 children from 47 families were known to the probation office."¹¹ Compton speaks of 150 cases studied where 50% of the fathers were out of the home; 43% had one or both parents with a history of one or more divorces; 45.3% of the children were born out of wedlock; 22% where official neglect petitions were filed; 28% of the fathers and 26% of the mothers were characterized by chronic physical diseases or handicaps; in nearly 33% of the families, one or more children were afflicted by chronic disease."¹²

In an associated study by Ayres and Geismar of a sample of one hundred St. Paul project families, one or more instances of behaviour disorders were found in every family studied. Included in this category were problem drinking in 50 families, promiscuity in 25 families, and other types of socially delinquent behaviour not adjudicated in 35 families.¹³

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Beulah Compton, The Family Centered Project, a paper presented to the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg Annual Meeting (Mimeographed, 1962) p. 6.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Hoffman, op. cit., p. 1.

In one of Glueck's studies where 500 delinquent boys were compared with a similar number of non-delinquents, it was found that in families of juvenile delinquents, there is a frequency of serious diseases; mental defectiveness or mental dullness are frequent problems; emotional disturbances are often present; alcoholism is frequent; delinquent parents or siblings are common; families are inclined to live from day to day; and there are problems of forced marriages, finances, broken homes, unemployment, desertion, neglect and truancy.¹⁴

Many other studies, including Breckinridge and Abbott's study of the Delinquent and the Home,¹⁵ and the New York City Youth Board study, identify similar problems of social maladjustment evidenced in the families of juvenile delinquents.

Although our study did not explore the environmental factors, we were aware of the fact that "the parents are (only) one of a constellation of interplaying factors that give rise to delinquency."¹⁶ During a child's early years, the day to day example of his parents is the strongest influence in shaping his personality and behaviour. Adverse factors in a child's early home life, such as parental conflict,

¹⁴Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Delinquents in the Making; Paths to Prevention (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952).

¹⁵Sophinsbe Breckenridge and Edith Abbott, The Delinquent Child and the Home (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1912).

¹⁶Helen L. Witmer, Parents and Delinquency. Report of a conference, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Children's Bureau Publication, 1954), p. 7.

neglect or mistreatment, feelings of being unloved and unwanted can impel him into delinquent behaviour.¹⁷ However, a poor home environment which predisposes a youngster to delinquency, can be offset by outside influences and personal relationships which encourage right conduct.¹⁸ On the other hand, "misbehavior, like any other kind of behavior, comes about through the general processes of socialization regardless of personal traits or characteristics. Any individual under the proper configuration of circumstances and associations can become a criminal, a drug addict, a drunk, a delinquent, or what have you."¹⁹

Through our experience as social workers, we were aware of the fact that some families do use many agency services. Glueck's study, already referred to, revealed that "the extent to which the parents of the delinquents were unable to fulfill their family obligations without outside help is further reflected in the fact that the average number of social welfare agencies that had to step in to serve the families of the delinquents in one way or another was twelve, a figure almost double that of the mean number of agencies serving the families of non-delinquents."²⁰

¹⁷U.S. Children's Bureau Publication #380, A Look at Juvenile Delinquency, 1960, p. 4.

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹Irwin Deutscher, "Some Relevant Directions for Research in Juvenile Delinquency," Casework Papers (New York: Family Service Association of America, 1960) p. 39.

²⁰Glueck, op. cit., p. 45.

The St. Paul project further revealed that a small group of families in a community absorbed a large proportion of all health and welfare services available. "6% of the worst-off families in the community were receiving 50% of the services of 108 agencies."²¹ These families were registered with 8.8 agencies.

Healy and Bronner, in a study of 133 families of delinquents and non-delinquents in the same families, found that in 38% of the cases, families were helped by 5 or more social agencies.²²

The duplication of services offered to juvenile offenders and their families is suggested as still another factor in the multiple use of services. Perhaps our present organization of services may mean that a family may have to utilize a number of services to help with its related problems. Fisher, Konopka, and others speak of duplication of services.²³ Konopka states that "many of our social agencies are effective and manage to help children and young people with a complicated growing-up process. Yet, their efforts are separated, at times duplicated, at times contradictory and exceedingly confusing and frustrating."²⁴

²¹Marion Robinson, "The Quiet Revolution", reprinted from Canadian Welfare (XXXVIII, July 15-August 15, 1962).

²²William Healy and Augusta Bronner, New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment (New Haven:Yale University Press, 1936) p. 35.

²³Bernard C. Fisher, "Juvenile Court: Purpose, Promise and Problems", Social Service Review, XXXIV, No. 1 (March 1960) pp. 75-82.

²⁴Gisela Konopka, Co-ordination of Services as a Means of Delinquency Prevention. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCXXII (March 1959) p. 33.

In addition, the National Conference on Juvenile Delinquency speaks of the need for co-ordination of juvenile delinquency services.²⁵

From our reading on juvenile delinquency, it became apparent that many writers agree that school was one of the best places to discover problem children whose behaviour may signal danger ahead.²⁶

Truancy seems to be a common forerunner of delinquency and the school is the first place outside the family where the child's problem may become apparent.²⁷ Kravaceus' research projects on juvenile delinquency and the school, show that the incidence of truancy is higher for delinquents than for non-delinquents.²⁸

"School maladjustment, ranging from misbehavior for the purpose of attracting attention, to truancy and vandalism, is a frequent precursor of more serious forms of delinquency."²⁹ Powers,³⁰ Witmer and Morris³¹

²⁵National Conference on Juvenile Delinquency (Washington, D.C., 1954) Report, p. 39.

²⁶U.S. Children's Bureau Publication, op. cit., pp. 31-32.

²⁷E.H. Stullkin, "Schools and Delinquency Problem", The Problem of Delinquency, ed. Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1959) p. 154.

²⁸Wm. C. Kravaceus, Juvenile Delinquency and the School (Yonkers-on-Hudson: World Book Company, 1940) pp. 144-145.

²⁹Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency (Boston: Harvard University Press, 1950).

³⁰E. Powers and H. Witmer, An Experiment in the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency, The Cambridge Somerville Youth Study (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957) pp. 257-70.

³¹N. Morris, The Habitual Criminal (London School of Economics and Political Science).

agree that there is great validity in observing the disturbances in children at school. According to Powers and Witmer,³² school attendance and academic progress are the most important indicators of the child's disturbance, for the school child must conform to certain norms approved by society. A potential offender will most probably come in conflict with such norms and manifest his asocial behaviour. One study of 347 consecutive cases of a juvenile court showed that two-thirds had been school conduct problems, truants, and disliked school.³³

We also felt the more social welfare services used, and social problems manifested by these families, the more likely is repeated contact of the delinquent youth with the juvenile courts. Cavan agrees that "the families of juvenile delinquents often have problems of neglect, poor identification, broken homes, financial dependency. The more of these factors that are present, the more likely is recidivism."³⁴ Other researchers' attention has mainly been directed towards the extent of recidivism as centered around characteristics such as race, sex and ethnic origin.³⁵

³²Powers and Witmer, op. cit.

³³Rachel Dunaway Cox, "School Counselors Contribute to the Prevention of Delinquency", The Problem of Delinquency, ed. Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, op. cit.

³⁴Ruth Shonle Cavan, Juvenile Delinquency--Development, Treatment, Control (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott and Company, 1962) p. 125.

³⁵Shulman, op. cit., p. 81.

Although there have been no previous studies, to our knowledge, with our particular focus, we found it valuable in this chapter to draw upon several related studies, making special reference to the St. Paul project, Glueck's studies and the writings of various authors. The stresses and strains of our modern industrial society have resulted in increased pressures upon the nuclear family and have resulted, in some families, in disorganization and breakdown manifested in a variety of social problems. Our area of concern in this study has been on the problems of the families of the juvenile delinquents and the social welfare services they use, as was focused upon by the review of the literature.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

We secured data about families of children whose cases were active at Juvenile Court of Winnipeg in the month of September, 1962. This data was obtained from four sources--Juvenile Court files, interviews with Juvenile Court workers, other agency listings, and Confidential Exchange Registrations. A schedule was completed with respect to the families of each child in the sample. The schedule consisted of two main parts. In the first section, concerning identifying information, we read parts of Juvenile Court files and checked the family names with other agency listings, and Confidential Exchange Registrations. This part included ten questions. The second section of the schedule consisted of data obtained from interviews with Juvenile Court workers. This section was comprised of three questions.

The schedule was first drafted and tested in November and December, 1962. It was tested on a sample of six cases at the Juvenile Court. We interviewed three Juvenile Court workers concerning two cases on each of their caseloads. We then read specified sections of these six files and checked the family names against listings at other agencies and Confidential Exchange. After testing the schedule, we examined and analyzed the collected data, and made minor changes in the schedule. These changes consisted of eliminating unnecessary questions, and reformulation of others to ensure objectivity of the responses. Appendix A contains the schedule in its final form.

From the Juvenile Court face sheets, we determined the family name, address, birthdate of the juvenile offender, parents' names, marital status of parents and siblings of the juvenile delinquent. Date of first charge laid and total number of charges laid at Juvenile Court were recorded from Juvenile Court charge sheets. The primary source of data for other agency registrations was the Confidential Exchange. The name of each family in the sample was checked with the records there and if an agency (or agencies) were registered this was recorded. We also recorded whether the registration preceded or followed the date of the first contact with Juvenile Court. In order to determine social agency contacts after the closing of Confidential Exchange on December 31, 1960, we circulated a list of the names of families from our sample to each of the agencies under consideration. One agency was unable to provide the information requested due to reasons of confidentiality. We recorded the family's address because the family had to be living within the boundaries of the City of Winnipeg in order to be considered in the sample group. The Christian names of the parents were necessary in order to check the families with other agency registrations. Marital status was considered in order to determine whether there were one or more parents in the home. Knowledge of the date of first charge laid at Juvenile Court was necessary to determine whether contact with other agencies preceded or followed the date of first charge against the juvenile. The total number of charges laid at Juvenile Court was considered in order to determine the relationship between prior agency contacts of the family and the number of subsequent charges laid against the juvenile.

It was necessary to obtain the names of the delinquent's siblings because two social agencies (the Child Guidance Clinic of Greater Winnipeg and Children's Hospital of Winnipeg) registered the children according to their own names and not according to parental names.

We recorded date of first contact with Child Guidance Clinic in order to determine whether there was a pattern of agency services prior to first contact with Juvenile Court. We recorded contacts with other agencies in order to determine distribution of services prior to and following Juvenile Court contact. If a family were known to the City of Winnipeg Public Welfare Department (henceforth referred to as the City Department) or the Province of Manitoba, Department of Welfare, (henceforth referred to as the Provincial Department), it was considered to have a problem of dependency. If a family was known to Out-patients Departments of Winnipeg General, Children's or St. Boniface Hospitals, it had a problem of indigent disability. If a family was known to Juvenile and Family Court (henceforth referred to as Family Court), Family Bureau of Greater Winnipeg, Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, or Child Guidance Clinic of Greater Winnipeg, it had a problem of disordered behaviour. We included the question concerning social problems known and not known in order to assimilate data from both parts of the schedule.

We constructed our interviewing schedule to further our knowledge of the social problems of the families of juvenile offenders as obtained from the Juvenile Court worker.

The questions were divided into the three major categories of social problems--dependency, indigent disability, and disordered behaviour.

We had a standardized method of introducing our questionnaire to the workers. Each worker was told before the questioning began that we were interested in determining social problems in the entire family unit not solely in relation to the juvenile delinquent. They were also told that there were three possible responses to the questions: "yes", "no" and "don't know".

The broad social problem area of dependency is related to the specific problem of unemployment and financial dependency. It was defined as the inability of a family to meet the costs of the basic necessities of life. The question, "Is the breadwinner employed?", was asked of the worker to ascertain whether there was a problem of unemployment in the family. If the response to this question was negative, then the further question, "Is the breadwinner in receipt of Unemployment Insurance?", was asked to ascertain whether there was financial dependency.

Indigent disability was the problem area related to the specific problems of mental and physical illness. Indigent disability was defined as the inability of a family to meet medical or treatment costs. We asked the worker if he was aware of any mental illness in the family. In order to ensure objectivity of his response, we first named the four broad psychiatric classes of mental illness, namely: psychosis, neurosis, character disorder and mental deficiency, and

secondly, asked for this diagnosis of mental illness only if made by a psychiatrist. We asked the worker if he was aware of any disabling physical condition. We asked that this diagnosis be made by a medical doctor, and secondly that in order to be considered disabling, the illness should limit functioning in the areas of employment, education and household tasks. If the response to the above questions was in the affirmative, we asked if they had problems meeting medical costs.

The broad problem area of disordered behaviour was related to the specific problems of adult criminality, juvenile delinquency, family breakdown, school problems, child neglect, marital problems, problem drinking which contravenes the standards of society and which are sometimes judged formally by society. In order to determine if there was a problem of adult criminality, we asked consecutively if either parent or any siblings were known to the adult court. We wished to know if the offense was criminal behaviour rather than a minor traffic offense. For the same reason, we asked whether any of the delinquent's siblings were known to the Juvenile Court. We asked if there were two parents in the home, and if so, were they married to each other. This was to determine whether there was or had been a problem of breakdown in the family unit. If there were not two parents in the home, we wanted to know whether this was due to divorce, separation, death, or to the fact that the mother was unmarried. We felt that this would further our knowledge of the problems within the family.

Knowledge of school problems either academic or conduct was necessary to determine whether the child was having behaviour or learning problems in the school setting. We asked whether in the worker's opinion there was and/or had been parental neglect of children to the degree that the worker had considered referral to a child protection agency. We asked this to find out if there was a problem of neglect of children in the family. We asked the worker if either parent had mentioned marital difficulties to him and/or to a previous worker or recorded in the file. In this way, we tried to discover whether at the present time there were or had been in the past marital difficulty. We asked if the worker was aware of problem drinking of any family member. Before we asked this question we defined the problem drinker as one who "indulges to such a degree as to cause concern to his family, friends, or employers, and/or the extent of his drinking makes serious inroads upon his budget."¹ In Winnipeg the Alcohol Foundation is set up to deal with alcoholism and for this reason, we felt we were able to ask this question of the worker. We asked the question in order to determine further problems in the family.

Our method was limited firstly by the fact that the Juvenile Court workers had been employed by that agency for lengths of time varying from approximately three weeks to two years. There were also

¹T.A. Pincock, "The Frequency of Alcoholism Among Self-Referred Persons and Those Referred by the Courts for Psychiatric Examination", (Winnipeg, 1962).

variations in their training and experience in the field of social work. These factors meant that their knowledge of the families on their caseload varied.

We were also limited by using a sample drawn from only one month's caseload. For example, the families known to Juvenile Court in the month of September, 1962, may not necessarily be representative of families known to Juvenile Court for a period of one year.

If we had been able to conduct interviews with families from our sample, we might have been able to obtain more specific information about the social problems of these families. However, lack of time prevented us from conducting such interviews.

If a family was registered at a particular agency, we assumed that it had the social problem with which the agency was set up to deal. If lack of time had not prevented us from reading the files at the agencies at which the families were known, we might have been able to obtain further information concerning peripheral problems of the families.

One agency was unable to give us the precise opening date of their contact with the families known to their agency. This meant that in some cases, we knew only generally whether a family was known prior to or following Juvenile Court contact, and in other cases we knew only that a family was known to this agency.

If workers replied that the breadwinner was unemployed, we asked if he was in receipt of Unemployment Insurance. This was not indicative of financial dependency because Unemployment Insurance is an

insurance benefit program to which a person must contribute in order to be eligible for benefits.

The complete listing of all cases open at the end of September 1962 was perused and the names of those juveniles who had not been formally charged were eliminated. This brought the total population for research purposes to 397. Each juvenile among the total population was assigned a number and 200 names were selected by a random sampling method. Once this was done, we drew the files representing the sample population and recorded the available information from the face sheet on our schedule. At this stage we discarded from the sample of 200 the names of those juveniles residing outside the limits of the City of Winnipeg, as these families were not within the scope of this study. There were 61 names falling into this category. An additional six juveniles were eliminated because, although they were listed as formally charged for the month of September, they were not formally charged until after this date.

Four additional names were eliminated because they were wards of the Children's Aid Society and there was no family history available. This left us with a total sample of 129 families for our study.

The problem area of dependency for purposes of classification was recognized by registrations of the families at City Department and Provincial Department. Dependency was further recognized from affirmative responses to the question posed to Juvenile Court workers which attempted to ascertain whether the breadwinner in the family was unemployed. The problem area of indigent disability was determined by

registrations of the families at the Out Patient Departments of Children's, St. Boniface and Winnipeg General Hospitals. Indigent disability was further ascertained from questions posed to the worker which elicited an affirmative response to the questions relating to knowledge of any mental or physical illness as diagnosed by a doctor as well as the client's ability to pay for treatment costs. The problem area of disordered behaviour for purposes of classification, was determined by registrations of the families at the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, Child Guidance Clinic of Greater Winnipeg, Family Bureau and Family Court. Disordered behaviour was further ascertained from affirmative responses to any one of questions one, two, three, seven, eight, nine and ten under the heading of disordered behaviour in the schedule that was posed to the Juvenile Court worker.

Our data for analysis then consisted of information from agency records and interviews with Juvenile Court workers. Data for analysis was classified into four major areas. First, classification was in terms of the distribution of agency services used by the families of the sample group. Secondly, we classified the proportion of problems manifested by the families which were those other than the problem of Juvenile Delinquency. These problems fell into the three major problem areas previously defined, that of dependency, indigent disability, and disordered behaviour. The third classification analyzed the number of families using individual agency services. In our final

classification, we attempted to determine a relationship between the number of agencies the families used prior to contact with Juvenile Court and the subsequent charges against the child at Juvenile Court.

CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The first major step in the analysis consisted of tabulating the data pertinent to the questions posed by the main hypothesis, that is, a greater proportion of the families of the children known to Juvenile Court of Winnipeg are known or have been known to one or more other social agencies and manifest the problems of dependency, indigent disability and disordered behaviour.

The first analysis reveals the distribution of agency services to family members and consisted of classifying the number of families with the number of agencies they are, or have been, known to other than Juvenile Court. We were thus able to determine the proportion of families known to other agencies, ranging from those known to no other agencies to those families known to all seven other agencies. These findings are shown in Table I.

TABLE I
PROPORTION OF FAMILIES KNOWN TO OTHER AGENCIES

Known To	Frequency	Per Cent
0 other agencies	11	8.5
1 other agencies	20	15.5
2 other agencies	25	19.4
3 other agencies	13	10.1
4 other agencies	17	13.2
5 other agencies	22	17.0
6 other agencies	14	10.8
7 other agencies	7	5.5
Totals	129	100%

It can be noted that 118 out of 129, or 91.5 percent of the families in the sample group are or have been known to at least one other social agency. Of this total, the families who are or have been registered with two agencies other than Juvenile Court, appear in the greatest frequency, that is, 25 families, representing 19.4 percent of the sample.

The distribution of the problems manifested by the families in the sample are shown in Table 2..

TABLE 2
PROPORTION OF FAMILIES WITH PROBLEMS
OTHER THAN JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

No. of Other Problems	Number of Families	Percent of Families
0 other problems	4	3.1
1 other problems	34	26.3
2 other problems	25	19.4
3 other problems	66	51.2
Totals	129	100%

The above figures are derived from Confidential Exchange and social agency records and interviews with a Juvenile Court worker assigned to the particular delinquent member of the family. It can be noted that compared with the other classes, those which exhibited problems in all three other areas, excluding Juvenile Delinquency, are the largest. In this class there were 66 families, or 51.2 percent of

the sample which manifested problems indicative of dependency, indigent disability and disordered behaviour combined.

From the data obtained we note that, of the 34 families in the sample that had only one area of problem, 32 had problems of disordered behaviour, one each had problems of dependency and indigent disability respectively. Of those families where there were two problems, 21 out of the 25 had problems of disordered behaviour and indigent disability, the other four families had problems of disorder behaviour and dependency. There were no families that combined the problems of dependency and indigent disability, while all of the families with two problems exhibited problems of disordered behaviour as one of the problems.

The three defined problem areas and the proportion of the families manifesting or having manifested problems in each of the areas, first, as indicated by agency registration, then as indicated from the interviews with the Juvenile Court worker, and finally as indicated by a combination of the two, were then classified. Table 3, page 33, shows this distribution and their proportion to the total sample.

We note from agency registrations, worker interviews and their combinations that a higher proportion of families were prone to problems of disordered behaviour as compared to problems of indigent disability and dependency or no other problems. 112 families, or 86.8 percent of the sample, were noted to have problems of disordered behaviour based on agency data, 90 families, or 69.8 percent of the

sample were noted to have problems of disordered behaviour as ascertained from worker interviews, while 119 families, or 92.2 percent of the sample had problems of disordered behaviour as shown by the combination of agency registration and worker interview.

TABLE 3
DISTRIBUTION OF PROBLEMS BY FAMILIES

Problem	Agency Registration		Worker Interview		Combined	
	No. of Families	Per Cent	No. of Families	Per Cent	No. of Families	Per Cent
Dependency	68	52.7	21*	16.3	75	58.1
Indigent disability	79	61.2	18	14.0	90	69.8
Disordered behaviour	112	86.8	90	69.8	119	92.2
No Problem	11	8.5	34	26.3	4	3.1

*Seven of these families were receiving Unemployment benefits.

The high proportion of families with problems of disordered behaviour might be attributed to the fact that there were more agencies identified with this problem area and more questions asked Juvenile Court workers that were indicative of this area. Only one registration at any of the designated social agencies or knowledge of the Juvenile Court worker of any one of the signs of disordered behaviour pertaining to the schedule questions was condition enough for a family to be classified in this category.

We further classified the distribution of problems by families based on interviews with the respective Juvenile Court workers in order to determine the proportion of families where the workers were certain that a problem existed or not and what proportion they were uncertain of. The figures are revealed in Table 4.

TABLE 4
DISTRIBUTION OF PROBLEM IN FAMILIES
BY MEANS OF WORKER INTERVIEWS

Problem Area	Number of Families		
	Problem	No Problem	Problem not Known
Dependency	21	72	36
Indigent Disability	18	76	35
Disordered Behaviour	90	12	27
No Other Problem	34	10	24

Of the total sample there appeared to be only four families who did not have problems other than that of Juvenile Delinquency, based on the study of agency registrations and worker interviews. It is interesting to note that 34 families were identified as having no other problems, other than juvenile delinquency, by the Juvenile Court workers, while 11 families had no other problem as indicated by agency registration. The high proportion of families in which the Juvenile Court worker had seen no problem could be due to the fact that some of the workers were newly

assigned to their caseloads and did not have sufficient knowledge about the families.

It can be ascertained that of the 34 families that were reported to have no problems in any of the areas, 24 of these represented the worker's insufficient knowledge of the family and thus they were uncertain, while only 10 represented certainty that no problems were evident. The "don't know" responses in the three problem areas were all higher than the 24 "don't know" responses associated with no problem. We might assume from this that 24 of the families in the sample group were completely unknown to the worker and with a better knowledge of the caseload, it would seem that there would be a higher proportion of families with problems, which in turn might have affected the figures in favour of a higher combined percentage. The responses to each of the schedule questions are tabled in Appendix B.

In order to test the first sub-hypothesis we had to take a close look at the individual social agencies and determine the proportion of families known to each agency prior to contact with Juvenile Court. It was determined that 114 out of the 129 families in the sample were registered at at least one social agency prior to contact with Juvenile Court. The number of families registered with each agency used in the study, both before and after contact with the court are given in Table 5, page 36.

TABLE 5
NUMBER OF FAMILIES USING AGENCY SERVICE

Agency	Known		Known but No Date ¹	Not Known	Total
	Before	After			
Child Guidance Clinic	87	12	2	28	129
Out Patients Departments	76	7	0	46	129
Children's Aid Society Winnipeg	73	4	0	52	129
City Welfare	65	1	0	63	129
Family Court	41	4	0	84	129
Family Bureau	34	0	0	95	129
Province	22	0	0	107	129

¹These families were registered but date of first contact was not available.

Out of the 114 families who were known to at least one social agency preceding formal court contact, 87, or 76.3 percent were known to the Child Guidance Clinic. This agency constituted the agency with the largest number of contacts, when compared to the other six agencies. The Out Patients Departments of the General, St. Boniface and Children's Hospitals were the next largest group, with 76, or 66.7 percent of the registrations.

To test our second sub-hypothesis it was necessary to determine the number of contacts made with the agencies prior to contact with Juvenile Court and compare this with the frequency of contact, or

charges laid, at Juvenile Court. Table 6 shows the number of families registered at either none or one of the seven agencies and the number of charges laid.

TABLE 6
AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHARGES PER FAMILY
AND NUMBER OF AGENCIES CONTACTED
PRIOR TO JUVENILE COURT CONTACT

Number of Agencies	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Number of Families	15	26	16	14	18	22	12	6	129
Number of Charges	46	90	54	63	79	114	32	28	506
Average no. of Charges	3.0	3.5	3.3	4.5	4.4	5.2	2.7	4.5	3.9

Figures shown in Table 6 reveal that from the sample group of 129 families, there were a total of 506 charges or contacts with Juvenile Court. This is an average of 3.9 charges per child. Of the 15 families with no previous agency registrations, there was an average of 3.0 Juvenile Court charges. In addition to those families known to no other agencies besides Juvenile Court, the families known to one, two and six other agencies have a child whose average number of court contacts was below that of the average for the sample. Children of families known to three, four, five and seven agencies had an average

number of contacts above that of the sample. A rank difference correlation shows a correlation of plus .364 between the number of agencies contacted and the average number of charges per family. While this score indicates some trend towards a greater number of charges if families are known to more agencies, it is not high enough to be of real significance.

CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS

A group of families of children known to the Juvenile Court were studied in an attempt to determine what agency services they were using and what social problems they manifested.

A sample group of 129 families of children formally charged at the Juvenile Court of Winnipeg was studied by interviewing the Juvenile Court workers, extracting information from the case records pertinent to our study, and checking the family names against selected agency registrations and Confidential Exchange. We attempted to determine the distribution of social services used by the families of the delinquents. We categorized the social problems according to the three main areas of dependency, indigent disability and disordered behaviour. It was recognized that there are further social agencies in the City of Winnipeg which could have been used, but due to time restrictions it was necessary to limit the number of agencies checked in this study. We chose the five main family agencies in the City of Winnipeg, as well as the Child Guidance Clinic and the Out Patients Departments of the Children's, General and St. Boniface Hospitals.

The hypothesis tested was that a greater proportion of families of children known to the Juvenile Court of Winnipeg are known or have been known to one or more social agencies and manifest the problems of dependency, indigent disability and disordered behaviour.

Our findings substantiated that a greater proportion of families of children known to Juvenile Court of Winnipeg are known or have been known to one or more social agencies. It was found that 91.5 percent of the families were known or had been known to at least one other social agency. On the basis of this data, we can anticipate that children formally charged by the Juvenile Court will come from families who are known to other social agencies. We further found that 46.5 percent are known to from four to seven social agencies. It would seem then that a small number of families are using a major proportion of social welfare services. This data suggests that there could be a duplication of services, as a small proportion of the families are using more than one half of the agencies. These results seem to correspond to the findings of the St. Paul Project as stated on page 13.

The second part of the hypothesis stated that a major proportion of families of children known to Juvenile Court of Winnipeg manifest the problems of dependency, indigent disability and disordered behaviour. We found that 51.2 percent of the families manifested social problems in all three areas. Although this percentage indicated a greater proportion, this could not be said to be significant because 1.2 percent above one half of the population is not statistically significant. There were more families showing problems in all three areas than showing no problems, one other, or two other problems. A family in receipt of Unemployment Insurance was considered to have a

problem of dependency. However, this might not be considered dependency, as it is a contributory benefit program. There were seven families in this category, and while this might tend to invalidate the findings, it was to some extent offset by the fact that a far greater number of families (68) show the problem of dependency by virtue of agency registration. More than 90 percent of the families manifested the problem of disordered behaviour as determined from worker interviews and agency registrations. A major proportion of families indicated a problem of disordered behaviour, as compared to the other two problem areas. We found that we had a greater knowledge of problems from agency registrations than from worker interviews. We might assume that the families of children known to Juvenile Court manifest social problems severe enough to warrant use of social agencies. This seems to be in accordance with the findings of the studies by Glueck and Breckinridge and Abbott referred to on pages 14 and 15.

Evaluation will now be made of the two sub-hypotheses. The first sub-hypothesis stated that a large number of the families known to an agency prior to contact with Juvenile Court were known to Child Guidance Clinic. 114 out of 129 families were known to at least one social agency prior to contact with Juvenile Court. 76.3 percent of these families were known to Child Guidance Clinic. Therefore, this would suggest that the school setting would be the most likely place outside the home that we would see evidence of family breakdown. It would seem that with regard to prevention, intensive work with families

of children manifesting difficulty in the school setting might be effective. This would seem to be in accordance with the findings of Powers, Witmer, Morris et al to which reference was made on page 18.

The second sub-hypothesis stated that the greater the contact of the families with agencies prior to contact with Juvenile Court, the more likely is repeated contact of the child with Juvenile Court. The rank difference correlation between the number of agencies contacted and the average number of charges per family indicated some trend towards a greater number of charges if families are known to several agencies. This correlation we found was not high enough to be of statistical significance.

It must be taken into consideration that this study was limited by the fact that there was an inconsistency in the workers' knowledge, training and experience. Consequently, there may not have been as thorough an awareness of the social problems as we would have wished in order to confirm or refute our premise.

It was not possible to interview the families because of lack of time, and this affected the depth of our awareness of social problems in the families. This raises the question as to the extent to which an agency registration is indicative of the problems of a family. In assuming that registration at a particular agency indicated a particular social problem, we recognized that there may have been other social problems than the one the agency is set up to deal with. In collecting data, we found that one agency, due to reasons of confidentiality, would

not permit us to check family names in the period following closing of Confidential Exchange, i.e. December 31, 1960 to September, 1962.

The data regarding the number of charges referred to only one child, while if we had considered charges laid against all members of the family, this might have shown a higher correlation between the number of charges and the number of agencies used. We attempted to set out the schedule as objectively as possible. For example, in regard to physical and mental health, we asked for an answer based on a physician's diagnosis. The schedule was applied uniformly and clearly stated.

The high proportion of families with problems of disordered behaviour might be attributed to the fact that there were more social agencies identified with this problem area and more questions were asked of Juvenile Court workers that were indicative of this area. Since the agency we are using is an agency indicative of the problem of disordered behaviour, it is likely that the families from our sample will exhibit other problems in this area. These factors would tend to weigh heavily in the direction of a high incidence of disordered behaviour.

We hope that this study has added to a greater knowledge of facts pertaining to the families who are known to Juvenile Court. We have shown that many of these families are not just known to Juvenile Court alone, but are brought to the attention of other significant social agencies in the City of Winnipeg. Because of the broad general

nature of our study, we could not go into any depth regarding the extent of services given, the degree of possible inter-agency collaboration, or into the pervasiveness of problems. This might indicate areas of further study. The exploratory nature of the study, we feel, provides a basis, however, for adding to our knowledge and assisting us in achieving the goal of giving the most effective social service to families with social problems.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Barron, Milton L. The Juvenile Delinquent in Society. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.
- Breckenridge, Sophinsba, and Abbott, Edith. The Delinquent Child and the Home. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1912.
- Cavan, Ruth S. Juvenile Delinquency--Development, Treatment, Control. New York: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1962.
- Eaton, Joseph W. and Polk, Kenneth. Measuring Delinquency. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1961.
- Flügel, John C. The Psychoanalytic Study of the Family. London: Hogarth Press Ltd., 1950.
- Glueck, Sheldon (ed.) The Problem of Juvenile Delinquency. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1959.
- Glueck, Sheldon, and Eleanor. Delinquents in the Making: Paths to Prevention. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952.
- _____. Unravelling Juvenile Delinquency. Boston: Harvard University Press, 1950.
- Healy, William, and Bronner, Augusta F. New Light on Delinquency and its Treatment. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947.
- Kravaceus, William. Juvenile Delinquency and the School. Yonkers-on-Hudson: World Book Company, 1940.
- Merrill, Maud A. Problem of Child Delinquency. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1947.
- Morris, Norval. The Habitual Criminal. London School of Economics and Political Science. New York: Longmans Green, 1951.
- Powers, Edwin, and Witmer, Helen. An Experiment in the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency: The Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.
- Shulman, Harry M. Juvenile Delinquency and American Society. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961.
- Wilensky, H.L., and Lebeaux, C.N. Industrial Society and Social Welfare. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1958.

ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

- Deutscher, Irwin. "Some Relevant Directions for Research in Juvenile Delinquency", Casework Papers, 1960.
- Fisher, Bernard C. "Juvenile Court: Purpose, Promise, and Problems", Social Service Review, XXXIV, No. 1, (March 1960).
- Hoffman, William. "Offenders Have Families Too", National Conference on Social Work, May, 1958.
- Konopka, Gisela. "Co-ordination of Services as a Means of Delinquency Prevention", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCXXII, (March 1959).
- MacIver, Robert M. "Juvenile Delinquency", White House Conference on Juvenile Delinquency, 1960.
- Robinson, Marion. "Quiet Revolution", Canadian Welfare, XXXVIII, (July 15 and August 15, 1962).

REPORTS

- Bovet, L. Psychiatric Aspects of Juvenile Delinquency. Geneva: World Health Organization, 1951.
- Compton, Beulah. The Family-Centered Project and Correction: The Story of the Family-Centered Project. St. Paul: Family Centered Project, 1959.
- Geismar, Ludwig, and Ayres, Beverly. Families in Trouble. St. Paul: Family-Centered Project, 1958.
- Pincock, T.A. "The Frequency of Alcoholism Among Self-Referred Persons and Those Referred by the Courts for Psychiatric Examination", Winnipeg, 1962.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

- United States. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Social Security Administration. A Look at Juvenile Delinquency, Children's Bureau, No. 380, 1960.
- _____. Understanding Juvenile Delinquency, Children's Bureau, No. 300, 1949.
- _____. Witmer, Helen L. (ed.) Parents and Delinquency. Children's Bureau, 1954.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

- Coombs, Walter, et al. Characteristics and Methods of Disposition Related to Successful Outcome in Cases of Juvenile Delinquency. Winnipeg, 1960. (mimeographed).
- Emery, Lois, et al. A Study of Juveniles in Greater Winnipeg Who Committed Car Theft During the Year 1958. Winnipeg, 1960. (mimeographed).
- Forbes, Marjorie, et al. A Comparison of Certain Selected Social Problems of Families of Juvenile Delinquents in Two Areas of the City of Winnipeg. Winnipeg, 1960. (mimeographed).

APPENDIX A

SCHEDULE

GROUP II

J.C. Staff _____
Group Member _____
Sample No. _____
J.C. file # _____

STUDY OF JUVENILE COURT CASES

1. Identifying information

1. Name (Surname first) _____

2. Address _____

3. Birthdate _____

4. Parents

Father _____

Mother _____

5. Marital Status of parents (circle letter)

(a) Married (b) Divorced (c) Separated (d) Common-law

(e) Widow(er) (f) Unmarried mother

6. Dates of 1st charge laid at Juvenile Court _____

7. Total number of charges laid at Juvenile Court _____

8. Children (other than Juvenile Delinquent)

Name

Name

9. Number of contacts with other agencies

Prior to 1st Juv. Cr.

After 1st Juv. Cr.

Contact

Contact

1. Wpg. City Welf. _____

2. Prov. Moth. Allow. _____

3. O.P. Dept. _____

4. Fam. Cr. _____

5. Fam. Bur. _____

6. C.A.S. of Wpg. _____

7. Date of first contact with

Ch. Guid. Clinic _____

Total number of contacts with

Ch. Guid. Clinic _____

- | <u>10. Social Problem</u> | <u>Known</u> | <u>Not Known</u> |
|---------------------------|--------------|------------------|
| 1. Dependency | _____ | |
| 2. Indigent disability | _____ | |
| 3. Disordered Behaviour | _____ | |

11. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (circle answer)

11. Dependency

- | | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| 1. Is the breadwinner employed? | 1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know |
| 2. If no, is the breadwinner in receipt of Unemployment Insurance? | 1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know |

12. Indigent Disability

- | | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| 1. Are you aware of any mental illness, namely mental deficiency, character disorder, neurosis, psychosis, as diagnosed by a psychiatrist? | 1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know |
| 2. Are you aware of any disabling physical condition as diagnosed by a medical doctor which limits functioning in the areas of employment, education, household tasks? | 1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know |
| 3. If yes, do they have problems in meeting medical costs? | 1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know |

13. Disordered Behaviour

- | | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| 1. Are either parents known to adult court for other than minor traffic offences? | 1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know |
| 2. Are any of the delinquent's siblings known to Juvenile Court? | 1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know |
| 3. Are any siblings known to adult court for other than minor traffic offences? | 1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know |

13. Disordered Behaviour (cont'd.)

4. Are there two parents in the Home? 1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
5. If yes, are they married to each other? 1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
6. If not 2 parents in the home, is this because of
 (1) divorce _____
 (2) separation _____
 (3) death _____
 (4) unmarried mother _____
 (5) don't know _____
7. Do any of the children in the home have school problems, either academic or conduct problems? 1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
8. In your opinion, is there parental neglect of children to the degree that you have considered referral to a child protection agency? 1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
9. Has either parent mentioned marital difficulties to you or to another worker? 1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
10. Are you aware of problem drinking of a family member? 1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

APPENDIX B

TABLE 7

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ON INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Question re: Problem	Number of Families		
	Problem	No Problem	Problem Not Known
Breadwinner Unemployed	21	72	36
Mental Illness	11	83	35
Physical Disability	10	85	34
One-Parent Homes	33	68	28
Parent Known to Adult Court	16	70	43
Sibling Known to Adult Court	8	75	46
Sibling Known to Juvenile Court	28	66	35
School Problem	72	27	30
Parental Neglect	33	61	35
Marital Difficulties	45	53	31
Problem Drinking	33	68	28