



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

Research Commons

<http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/>

Research Commons at the University of Waikato

Copyright Statement:

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

The thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of the thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from the thesis.

DELINQUENCY IN NEW ZEALAND:

An Investigation of the Influence of Parental and Peer
Group Relationships In the Etiology of Delinquency.

by: George W. Thompson.

As partial requirement for the degree of Bachelor of
Philosophy.

WAIKATO UNIVERSITY.

Jan. 1972.

Acknowledgements:

I am very grateful for the assistance received from Mr. I. Johnson, the staff, and boys at the Hamilton Boys Home and also the staff and pupils of the secondary schools in undertaking this investigation.

I would also like to thank my supervisor, Mr. I. McKissock for his guidance, and Mr. N. Hamid for statistical assistance.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife Bergan for her invaluable assistance in the compilation of this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
	Introduction -----	1
1	<u>Section One, A Review of the Literature</u> -----	2
	<u>Section Two, The New Zealand Situation</u> -----	7
2	Derivation of the Hypotheses	10
	<u>Section one</u>	
	(a) The Relationship of Social Status to Juvenile Delinquency.	10
	(b) Parental Contact.	11
	(c) Maternal versus Paternal Adequacy	14
	(d) Discipline Techniques	16
	(e) Gangs	19
	<u>Section two. Maori Delinquency.</u>	20
	(a) Maori Patterns	21
	(b) Cultural Awareness	24
	(c) Racial Prejudice	25
3	<u>Research Design</u>	26
	(a) Devising the Questionnaire	26
	(b) The Delinquent Sample	26
	(c) The Control Sample	30
	(d) Statistical Method	34
4	<u>Results</u>	36

Table of Contents Ctd.

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>page</u>
5	<u>Discussion of the Results and</u> <u>suggestions for Further Research</u>	53
	<u>Conclusion</u>	75
	<u>Appendices</u>	77
	<u>Bibliography</u>	87

INTRODUCTION.

The object of this research is to compare and contrast delinquent and non-delinquent boys on certain aspects of parent and peer relationships.

It should be obvious at the outset that this study was not designed to discover all the causes of delinquency, rather it was assumed that any one boy is a delinquent for a complex variety of reasons. Two of the most complex being the effects of family and peer relationships.

The main aim is to show that although juvenile delinquency is largely associated with the lower socio-economic groups, a major difference between delinquents and non-delinquents will be shown in the different kinds of attachment that the boys show towards their parents. Throughout attachment to parents is emphasised as a crucial hypothetical variable, as it is thought that adequate parental attachment is a very important aid to an effective socialisation process.*

Maori and pakeha delinquents and non-delinquents will be tested on such variables as the amount of leisure time shared with parents, perceived parental interest and affection and the type of discipline present in the home. As it is maintained that some inadequacy in parent child attachment predisposes the youth to misadventure it is also assumed that it is this rather than problems of status frustration, which make the gang an attractive proposition.

Because of the large proportion of Maori delinquents we will also deal with some of the problems of cultural contact.

In defining the term 'juvenile delinquency' we shall avoid cultural value judgements as to what constitutes a delinquent act which tend to end up lost in varieties and shades of delinquency. We shall use an operational definition in that delinquency is what the law says it is, which is comprehensibly presented by Miller (1959, P54), who defines juvenile delinquency as : 'Behaviour by non-adults which violates specific legal norms or the norms of a particular societal institution with sufficient frequency and/or seriousness as to provide a firm basis for legal action against the behaving individual or group'.

This then is the definition with which we shall work.

- * This may however be contradicted in the situation where a boy is attracted towards criminal parents. Although this does not occur with any of the boys in my sample, Hirschi (1969) gives some interesting comments on this situation.

CHAPTER ONE. Section one
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.

A study which has had tremendous impact on researchers in the field of delinquency was conducted by Glueck and Glueck (1950). In this extensive study they used a team of psychologists, psychiatrists, social investigators and statisticians to study 500 delinquent and 500 non-delinquent pairs, matched for age, type of neighbourhood and intelligence.

From the results of this research the Gluecks proposed a five point causal law. According to this formulation delinquents are distinguishable from non-delinquents on the following measures.

- (1) Physically in being essentially mesomorphic.
- (2) Temperamentally tending towards restlessness, impulsiveness and aggressiveness.
- (3) Emotionally in being hostile, defiant, resentful and non-submissive.
- (4) Psychologically in being direct concrete learners.
- (5) Socio-culturally in being reared by unfit parents.

From this the Gluecks published a prediction table, that they claim is both reliable and valid. From this table a boy's chances of becoming a fully fledged delinquent can be assessed by comparing his score with that of delinquents upon which the prediction tables were based. These suggest that what the Gluecks call the under the roof culture of the family has a powerful influence on the children, and thus psychological neglect by the parents may be a very important

factor in delinquency.*

An approach concerned more specifically with the influence of the parents in delinquency is reported by McCord and McCord (1959). This research was an outgrowth of the Cambridge Somerville Youth Study. Over a five year period observations were made of the day to day behaviour of 253 boys and their families. Twenty years later the criminal records, if any, of these boys, now adults, were examined. As all of the men came from relatively lower class urban areas one major factor in the causation of crime, the influence of a delinquent subculture or tradition was held constant. The McCords focussed on three interacting variables; the role model of the parents; the attitude of the parents towards the boy; and the methods of discipline used by the parents.

Some of the results of this and other studies will be given in the discussion of reasons for the setting up of particular hypotheses. However, suffice it to say that this study is of value because of the unique opportunity to do a longitudinal study on a group of boys, seeing which boys committed delinquent acts and then being able to look back into the extensive case notes to see possible causes.

So far I have concentrated on emphasising the importance of the parents in producing delinquency in the belief that 'A given parent ~~behaves~~ towards a given child in certain ways which (A) tend to be consistent from situation to situation. (note also the importance of parental inconsistency) and

* For comment on and criticisms of the Glueck's work see Reiss, A.J. and Rubin, J., 1951

(B) tend to differentiate him from other parents. Such consistently repeated situations are, for the child, learning situations in which social habits are formed, developed and generalised into habit systems which at length constitute his adult personality' (Champrey, P 529, 1941).

Laying aside biological theories and the influence of distinctive personality characteristics, the latter assumed to be a result of learning experience, the other major set of variables is how the wider society within which the child lives affects his behaviour. According to Durkheim (1897, 1898) serious economic or political stress can lead to the breakdown of power in the social system, whereby cultural norms no longer have an inhibiting influence over group and individual behaviour. He called this breakdown a condition of normlessness or 'anomie'. The influence of Durkheim's theory is shown very strongly in Lander's (1934) theory of weakened social controls. Lander asserts that juvenile delinquency is concentrated in normless neighbourhoods, occurring among youths who do not have strong ties to society, such as stable jobs or a network of friends and relatives. This type of situation is shown very well by Leighton's (1960) portrayal of a disintegrated community, such as Sterling Community.

Much contemporary sociological thinking concerning delinquency derives from Merton's (1961) extension of Durkheim's theory. This extension is the foundation of what Hirschi (1969) calls the strain or motivational theory. In an interesting attempt to impose some order onto the

recent prolifera of research, Hirschi maintains that three fundamental perspectives on delinquency dominate the current scene.

The strain or motivational theorists argue that legitimate desires unsatisfiable by conformity, force a person into delinquency. This is shown by Cloward and Ohlin's (1960) theory of opportunity. Delinquency in their view is the result of unsuccessful efforts to achieve the success goals of the dominant society, especially as they relate to money or power. Thus the individual engages in either, or both, illegal and antisocial activities to gain status. In so doing flouting the rules and standards of the larger society. Cohen's (1963) theory is essentially similar. He is first concerned with the conditions under which a distinctive culture will develop. 'The crucial conditions for the emergence of new cultural forms is the existence, in effective interaction with one another, of a number of actors with similar problems of adjustment' (Cohen p.59, 1963). The similar problems of adjustment that working class boys share is what Cohen calls denied status. Through inadequate training they are unable to achieve middle class status and react by using middle class values as a negative reference point forming their own status system.

However, as these authors regard delinquency very much as a working class phenomenon this means that their theories provide no satisfactory explanation for the middle class delinquent,

The second main type of theory in Hirschi's classification system are the cultural deviance theories. The advocates of this view, Miller (1958), Shaw and McKay (1949) and Surtherland (1966), view delinquency almost exclusively as culturally or class defined. The basic idea is that most members of any subculture will behave according to the ideology of that subculture. Hence it is postulated that most delinquents do not deviate from the norms of the lower class subculture which is viewed as a separate subculture with a distinct ideology. What is important in the causation of delinquency is how the norms of the lower class differs from the norms of the dominant class. According to Miller the ideology of the American lower class subculture stems largely from the prevalence of mother centred families and includes awarding prestige to males who are tough, and skilled at outsmarting others.

If this theory is correct then the fact that working class boys may be denied status in middle class society is irrelevant and Stinchombe (1964) may be correct when he maintains that it is the middle class boy, not the working class boy, who is doing badly at school who is more likely to suffer from a discrepancy between aspirations and reality and thus may be forced into delinquency. The issue ultimately boils down to whether there is an isolated lower class culture whose children are completely insulated from middle class values. Though Miller's research with a group of low status Negro families may have reinforced this

belief, this may have been a result of his sampling method and may have given rise to an overgeneralised impression.

The last area covered by Hirschi's classification system takes us back to placing importance on the effect that parents have on their children. According to the Control theorists a person is free to commit delinquent acts because his ties to conventional society have somehow been broken. These theorists see the delinquent as a person 'relatively free from the intimate attachments and moral beliefs that bind most people to a life within the law' (Hirschi P 1969). Hirschi as a major advocate of control theory maintains that the bond of affection to parents is a major deterrent to crime. In his book he puts this argument forward very strongly. Validating it by experimental work comparing and contrasting the sorts of attachment patterns delinquent and non-delinquent boys have with regard to such things as parents, school and peers.

SECTION TWO.

THE NEW ZEALAND SITUATION.

Hopefully most authors would agree that the extent of delinquency and even the way it is manifested is influenced greatly by the framework of society. For example Yablonsky (1962) shows how differing types of gangs form in accordance with differing types of social conditions.

In the main research areas of America and Britain slum environments seem to have a great effect on the rate of delinquency. Large groups of people are congregated in

areas where housing, employment and familial relationships are often inadequate. Status is frustrated and delinquency blooms. In New Zealand we have, as yet, few slums and this factor could influence the way delinquency is manifested. Also overseas literature has emphasised the importance of gang delinquency and the delinquent act is commonly regarded as a group adventure. Shaw and McKay (1949) found that 88% of juvenile crime was committed by two or more boys. This has also been supported by Reckless (1957). In New Zealand I would suggest that gang delinquency will not be so prevalent, boys tending to commit delinquent acts either in a small group, or by themselves. If this is so the latter assumption would support the Glueck's postulation that gang membership cannot be a cause of delinquency because in their sample most of the boys had become delinquent before joining the gang. This leaves us maintaining that in New Zealand at least, the family is the most important cause of delinquency, though in some cases the gang either acts as a catalyst or provides a refuge. Thus because of a deficient family relationship the boy may be more attracted to the gang whereas close parental attachment as measured by Hirschi (1969) seems to insulate a boy against delinquency even in high delinquency producing areas.

The second major difference lies in our racial structure. The Maori constitutes a sizeable minority who is in varying degrees different culturally and socially from the white minority. Delinquency is high among the Maori population,

according to some experts almost four times that of the pakeha rate (Ausubel 1965). This is probably because the Maori is undergoing a cultural change inevitably producing disorganisation and a period of confusion of norms which could lead to a high rate of delinquency. The racial difference has been mentioned now so that when we look at hypothesis regarding parental adequacy we shall remember that there may not only be differences between delinquents and non-delinquents, but also between Maori and Pakeha.

CHAPTER TWO.

DERIVATION OF HYPOTHESIS:

In reviewing the literature we have discussed the views of authors who have made important contributions to delinquency research. In this section we shall look at these and many other authors in the more specific context of how they have contributed to the formulation of these hypothesis.

Section One.

(a) The Relationship of Social Status to Juvenile Delinquency.

Lower socioeconomic status among juvenile delinquents was first indicated by Shaw and McKay (1929). They found that the proportion of boys appearing before the court for criminal activities remained constantly higher in Chicago neighbourhoods populated by lower status families. Later work by the same authors (1949) uncovered the same phenomena in other areas, such as Seattle, Denver and Philadelphia. They suggest that high delinquency rates belong to low status neighbourhoods irrespective of the individuals or ethnic groups which live there. This has been reinforced by other researchers, (Kvaracus 1944: Carr 1950: Burgess 1952). However, critics claim that in these studies delinquency rates were obtained from cases handled by police courts, juvenile officers or social agencies. They maintain that these figures do not accurately reflect the incidence of delinquent acts among the social classes, as lower status youngsters, because of the neighbourhood and family backgrounds, are more likely to be

picked up by the police and referred to social agencies. Nye, Short and Ohlson (1958) tried to demonstrate this by using another method to gather delinquency data, which according to their theory should reveal equal proportions of high and low status delinquents. They presented a list of rules and regulations to boys of high school age and asked them to anonymously check those that they had broken since beginning grade school. The results, they say, prove the point that the commission of delinquent acts occurs equally among youths in the lower, middle and upper social strata.

Gold (1963) maintains that the findings of Nye, Short and Ohlson do not contradict findings based on official records, as in their questionnaire there are 10 items of 23 which would not be considered delinquent by officials. Looking at the 7 most delinquent items which would result in court appearance Gold found that lower status boys more often report committing those acts. Thus Gold maintains that the relationship of social status to delinquency seems to be demonstrated by self report techniques, as well as official figures. Thus it seems quite valid to hypothesise that New Zealand will follow overseas trends and that:

Delinquency will be associated with lower socio-economic status.

(Hypothesis One)

(b) Parental Contact.

Hirschi (1969) maintains that although the importance of attachment to parents is denied in some theories and ignored

in others the fact that delinquents are less likely than non-delinquents to be closely tied to their parents is one of the best documented findings of delinquency research.

Gold (1963) found that attraction to the family seems to be a crucial variable in determining a boy's vulnerability to delinquency. Attraction to his family helps to determine the degree to which the boy is influenced or controlled by his family and, thus, family cohesion is a major factor insulating some boys in high delinquency areas from serious involvement in delinquency.

The Gluecks in their comparison of 500 delinquents and 500 non-delinquents report that a close and affectionate relationship with parents was one of the features most often distinguishing non-delinquent from delinquents. The delinquents in the Glueck's sample did not think their parents were honestly concerned about their welfare. The McCords' followup of pre-delinquents yielded findings of parental relationships similar to those of the Gluecks, in which parental neglect, not broken homes, or criminal parents were associated with delinquency.

This summary seems to indicate that the amount and quality of contact that the boy has with his parents seems to be a vital factor in delinquency, and so as a formal hypothesis we will maintain that:

Delinquents Rather than Non-Delinquents are less Likely to be Closely Tied to their Parents.

(Hypothesis Two)

This hypothesis will be examined under three sub sections. Following Andry (p23 1960) the first two will examine environmental and psychological communication between parents and child.

Environmental communication considers how much , and in what way, the parent and child share their leisure activities. Both Nye (1958) and the Gluecks (1950) have shown that there is usually little recreation available in the delinquents' home and that the child tends to seek recreation away from the home and parents. Thus it is suggested that :

The Delinquent Will Spend More of His Leisure Time Away From His Parents and Home Than the Non-Delinquent.

(Hypothesis Two, Subsection one.)

Psychological communication focusses on whether the child thinks his parents understand him and are interested in him. Andry's (1960) enquiry about the adequacy of parental love showed that 78% of his non-delinquent sample felt that both parents were very satisfactory, while 75% of delinquents said their parents were unsatisfactory. Healy and Bromner (1936) studied a sample of delinquents and their non-delinquent siblings and in comparing these two groups they concluded that disturbed relationships with parents characterised the former. Thus it is suggested that :

Delinquents will Report More Often than Non-Delinquents, That Their Parents Are Not Interested In Them.

(Hypothesis Two, Subsection Two).

If it is shown that delinquents think their parents are not interested in them, and they have less leisure time contact with them than non-delinquents, then it will also be suggested that the amount of freedom granted to, or taken by, delinquents will be greater than non-delinquents. Greater freedom or independence could indicate a greater trust in the child, however, if the above two sections prove significant then a greater amount of freedom would be taken to mean neglect.

Delinquent Boys Will be Less Hampered by Parental Rules About Leisure Activities Than Non-Delinquents.

(Hypothesis Two, subsection Three)

(c) Maternal versus Paternal Adequacy.

So far we have been discussing a boy's relationship with both parents, now we shall separate the parents and compare the importance of fathers as against mothers in the creation of delinquency.

In reviewing the literature on the effect of the father or mother on delinquency Hirschi (1969) states that the empirical evidence that the father is more important than the mother is matched on the whole by evidence that he is less important in the causation of delinquency. The McCords (1959) attribute greater significance to the mother though relationships between crime and fathers attitude were also found. As expected crime was most frequent when both parents were rejecting and least when both were affectionate.

However, if the mother was rejecting those who had loving fathers were less likely to become delinquent than those with neglecting fathers, although the difference did not appear to be significant. If the father was rejecting the emotional status of the mother significantly affected criminal inclinations.

This view however, is challenged by Petterson and Brecker (1965) who show that the McCords' explanations have no statistical significance and therefore their conclusion that maternal rejection appears to be more crimogenic than paternal rejection is not fully justified.

Bowlby (1952) draws attention to maternal deprivation as a strong factor in producing serious and persistent delinquency. Andry(1960) criticises Bowlby by maintaining that he has relegated the role of the father to a secondary position without saying why. Andry places heavy emphasis on defects in the father son relationship as a major factor in delinquency. In a comparison of 80 court committed repeated offenders and a carefully matched sample of non offenders Andry found that though both parents of delinquents differed from control parents in adequacy of affection it was the attitude of the father which appeared to have the stronger influence in forming emotional predispositions to delinquency. The Gluecks(1950) came to a very similar conclusion.

The greater importance of the father in delinquency may be argued for by maintaining that the establishment of the boys physical similarity to his father, in addition to the

eagerness of most parents to encourage their children to behave in ways appropriate to their sex roles may lead most boys to model on their father rather than on the mother.

From the psychoanalytic viewpoint every boy goes through a stage when he wishes to supplant the father in the affections of his mother. When he is unable to take over from his father the boy substitutes identification with him and therefore enjoys the desired relationship with his mother vicariously. Thus the resolution of the Oedipal conflict may be posited as a major reason for boys identifying with their fathers and primarily incorporating their fathers standards of behaviour as their own.

Delinquents Will Tend to Feel Their Mother is a More Satisfactory Parent than Their Father, Whereas Non-Delinquents Will Tend to Feel That Both Parents are Equally Satisfying.

(Hypothesis Three)

(d) Discipline Techniques.

'If one endorses the theory that capacities for internal control are complexly but closely related to previously imposed external restraints then parental discipline assumes focal significance as a factor in delinquency' (Petterson and Becker (P32 1965) .

In one of the earlier studies on discipline and delinquency; Burt (1929) defective discipline emerged as one of the most important back-ground determinants of delinquency.

The defects included laxity, indifference, disagreement between parents and excessive strictness. Some combination of these faults was found seven times as often among the parents of delinquents as among parents of non-delinquents.

Merrill (1947) also found that 75% of her group of delinquents came from homes where parents were too strict, too severe, or too erratic. The findings of the Gluecks research show that most parents of non-delinquents treat their children in a firm but kindly way, whereas parents of delinquents tended to be too harsh or too soft and are inclined to alternate unpredictably between severity and complete license. According to McCords (1959) laxity or severity of treatment seems to be less damaging than an erratic approach to discipline. They classified disciplinary attitudes under six headings, and found that erratic parents especially those alternating from laxity to severity seemed to have a higher percentage of delinquents. In apparent contradiction to the findings of Burt, Merrill and the Gluecks, punitive discipline was associated with the lowest crime rate of all. Though studies have shown that parents of delinquent children are quicker to invoke corporal punishment and less likely to use deprivation, praise or reasoning, it is difficult to say whether cause or effect is represented here. It is possible that parents have resorted to physical punishment in an effort to control otherwise uncontrollable children whose delinquent tendencies have other determinants. There is reason however to believe that physical punishment can increase

aggressive and destructive behaviour through frustration effects (Dollard et al 1939) and modelling effects (Bandura 1962) and therefore increase delinquent tendencies. It could also be postulated that if there is an unsatisfactory attachment between parents and children then fear of physical punishment rather than respect or love may be the only method they can use, thus discipline is achieved by negative means. This type of discipline could be damaging as it provides little opportunity for the development of an internal moral code, rather the boy is subjected to an imposed code which may be restrictive and/or incomprehensible thus encouraging him to avoid it.

Overly lax parents also seemed to have contributed their share of delinquents, though we should be careful in distinguishing between freedom, leading to internal discipline as advocated by Neil (1970) and neglect in which the parents do not or the boy thinks they do not care what he does and therefore in accordance with Hirschi's theory would be very prone to delinquency.

Although the importance of erratic discipline is recognised we found information on this very hard to obtain, as will be shown later, and so the fourth hypothesis tests Nye (1958) and Andry (1960) views that when delinquent or delinquent prone youths are asked about the discipline methods of their parents they tend to indicate that parents fail to obtain a proper balance between strictness and leniency.

Delinquents, Rather than Non-Delinquents Parents, will Either Be Excessively Punitive or Overly lax in Matters of Discipline.

(Hypothesis Four).

(e) GANGS.

In the preceding discussion I have hypothesised that the parents provide less satisfaction for the delinquent youth than for the non-delinquent. This lack of attachment to parents makes the pre delinquent youth more susceptible to delinquency.

For the next part of the discussion we shall take the emphasis away from the parents and place it on the gang. I have previously said that gang delinquency in New Zealand does not seem to be as widespread as in America or Britain. However unfortunately gang related crime does seem to be increasing at an inordinately fast rate. In my three years of working with delinquents, gang associated offenders appearing in the institution have moved from a fairly small percentage to at least one third of the total offenders. Thus, as urban concentrations develop, we may be in the unfortunate transition towards gang dominated delinquent subcultures.

In order to test our thesis that one reason why boys move into gangs is because of a defective family life we shall look at boys within the control sample who are gang members. It is hypothesised that these boys will tend to fall more into delinquent categories regarding the variables of family life that are thought to have an effect on delinquency.

There Will Be No Significant Difference Between Delinquent Gang Members and Non-Delinquent Gang Members on Variables Of Family Life Already Tested.

(Hypothesis Five)

If hypothesis five is proven we will modify the strain theorists claims that gang membership is a result of a boys attempt to get into the middle class and failure because of inadequate preparation. Instead it will be hypothesised that the boy moves into a gang because of a defective family life and finds status in the gang which provides a way out from trying to move up into middle class society. His non-gang counterpart not having this convenient escape will be more motivated to try to attain middle class status.

Thus it is assumed that gang members will have little or no desire for social mobility. This should apply both to Maoris and pakehas as Ausubel (1965) in studying the job aspirations of both Maori and Pakeha shows that the Maori boys generally tend to have the same ambitions as their Pakeha counterpart regarding employment.

Gang Memembers will Aspire Significantly less to Social Mobility than Non-Gang Members.

(Hypothesis Six)

SECTION TWO

Maori Delinquency

Maori delinquency is to many a worrying problem. "The most disturbing cause of public concern today is juvenile

delinquency..... and ~~the~~ most serious aspect of it is the inordinately high incidence of law breaking by Maoris."

(Hunn,1960). This fact is very well shown by these figures comparing Maori and pakeha crime rates. Between 1953-1955 and 1963-1965 the non-Maori crime rate rose by five per cent, while the Maori crime rate rose by 59 per cent. To help explain the high incidence of delinquency among the Maori we shall move away from pure delinquency research into some of the resultant problems of culture contact.

A. Maori Patterns.

Metge (1968,p.119) reports that according to the 1966 census the Maori population equalled 7.4 per cent of the total New Zealand population. The Maori population seems to be increasing almost twice as fast as the European population. During 1965 the Maori increased by four per cent while the increase in the European population was 2.3 per cent. Because of this recent large increase the Maori population is characterised by an extremely heavy weighting in the younger age groups. In 1966 49 per cent were under 15 years of age, 67 per cent were under 25, and only five per cent were over 55 years of age. Also, the Maori population is concentrated in the northern half of the North Island, (75 per cent live in this area) and these demographic factors should be taken into account if the reader is surprised or dismayed at the large numbers of Maoris in our sample.

The rapid growth of the Maori population has been paralleled by a "hew Maori migration towards the cities." (Metge,1963). Up to 1945 30 per cent of Maoris lived in the

country, while in 1966 it was found that 55 per cent of all Maoris lived in urban areas with over 20,000 inhabitants. This Maori migration has increased the problems of culture contact tremendously within the last few decades. Ausubel (1965) maintains that culture contact has increased because of many interlocking features. The effect of the second world war was profound, it catapulted thousands of young Maori men into the army, giving them a host of new experiences foreign to previous generations. The length of time since the Maori wars (1860-1872) means that much of the bitterness and disillusionment, caused by defeat, has softened, especially among the younger Maoris. Modern developments such as roads, telephones and the wireless make it harder for the Maori villages to maintain their former isolation. The younger ones, seeing the 'good things' of urban society are tempted to migrate to the cities, especially as the Maori population increases rapidly and land is already in short supply.

To give some idea of the cultural distinctness of the Maori we shall have to look at the more traditional Maori socialisation patterns as described by Ritchie in the Rakau studies (1956). The general pattern that emerges is that of an extremely permissive early period of about two years. Breastfeeding is usual, and weaning and toilet training, although started fairly early, are relaxed and unhurried. The new baby is petted and indulged by everyone. This indulgence continues until a new baby arrives, usually when

the infant is around 18 months old. The mothers attention is then completely taken up with the new baby and the toddlers golden period comes to an end. From now on, till adolescence, the child looks to his peers for learning and amusement, the older members of the family guiding the younger children. "In the middle years the child gains striking autonomy as far as the home is concerned, but not as far as the peer group is concerned." (Ritchie, 1965). Of primary interest to us, however, is what happens during adolescence. *According to Mulligan's study of adolescence in Rakau (1957) there is a marked change in the orientation pattern following the onset of puberty. "The home gains in stimulus value and becomes once again for the individual the primary social reality ... as cultural sanctions do not permit the expression of extrapuniton against superiors it becomes directed towards ones contemporaries. This causes disharmony and for a period of two years between 13 and 15 the peer culture provides few satisfactions. The young adolescent is only too willing to reorientate himself to his parents who once again hold for him the promise of gratification." (Mulligan, 1957, p.41).

The newly urban Maori because of his cultural differences has to make adjustments to try to fit into the dominant society, if we take delinquency to give some sort of rough index of adaption to the dominant societal process, then the

*One criticism of Mulligans research is that he used the T.A.T. to get his results and then compared them to Ritchie's Borschach results - the difference found may have been due to the different test used.

urban Maori may be regarded as more delinquent prone than his pakeha counterpart. From my observations, over a three year period, of delinquent boys entering a custodial institution I would suggest that a high proportion of the Maori delinquents belong to the predominantly Maori gangs. The reasons for this may be twofold: firstly, the distinctive Maori socialisation pattern and secondly the cultural disorganisation produced by culture contact. Previously the Maori parent would have been fairly confident of how to rear children, but now pakeha values and the complex number of opportunities and different life styles in the pakeha society, challenge traditional values. Thus, Maori parents are no longer able to train their children to cope with situations they will encounter as they grow older. Parents no longer provide attractive or even adequate models for their children, who may carry their traditional peer group associations into adolescence.

It is Thus Hypothesized that gangs will be predominantly Maori in Composition.

(Hypothesis Seven)

B. Cultural Awareness.

It has been assumed that boys join a gang primarily because of an unsatisfactory home life. If this assumption is proven to be true and the Maori gang member has a generally unsatisfactory home life he may also tend to reject the more traditional Maori way of life as shown by his parents and others as unsatisfactory and outmoded.

Another explanation could be that his parents have not bothered to teach him about Maori culture as they feel that it is outmoded. However, whatever the reason, it is Hypothesized that the Maori gang member will have little knowledge of traditional Maori cultural patterns.

The non-gang member should have more idea of his Maori Heritage because he should have a more satisfactory home life, and thus, his parents may come across as better models and more successful individuals than the gang members parents.

It is hypothesized that the Maori gang member will be less aware of his culture than the non-gang member.

(Hypothesis Eight)

C. RACIAL PREJUDICE

The following hypothesis rounds out the picture by suggesting that because the gang member has rejected the dominant societal patterns he will project hostility outwards onto these. These patterns threaten his gang because of its anti-social nature, and thus also threaten his status. This hostility will be in the form of dislike based on colour because this is the most obvious difference between him and the dominant white society.

It is thus hypothesized that Maori gang members will show more racial prejudice against pakehas than non-gang members.

(Hypothesis Nine).

Chapter Three.

RESEARCH DESIGN.

A. Devising the Questionnaire.

A questionnaire was devised to test the preceding hypotheses and a pilot survey carried out. The pilot questionnaire was administered to ten delinquents and the answers given were analysed. The wording of the questionnaire was altered so that it was less ambiguous and more easily understood by the boys. This was essential so that the boys who did not really understand the questions would not just give me the answers they thought I wanted.

B. The Delinquent Sample.

Fifty delinquent boys ranging in age from twelve to fifteen, with a median age of 13.7 were individually interviewed. The interviews took from one to over two hours, including many discussions which, though not directly related to the questionnaire, provided valuable insights into the associated factors of delinquency. Certain limitations were imposed on the selection of the delinquent sample, and were also applied to the control. To qualify the subjects needed to be comparatively normal, by this I mean that :-

- (a) They had no major physical defects. This was checked by the doctor's report on the individual record cards as all boys entering the institution are given a physical examination.

- (b) All had a normal intelligence. No boys with an intelligence quotient of less than 70 were included. Most of the boys had been given intelligence tests by the Welfare Psychologist, and any that had not were tested by me before being interviewed. The tests used were the W.A.I.S. and the W.I.S.C., and this proviso excluded two boys from the sample.
- (c) The boys selected were free from any grave mental disturbance, such as organic brain damage or psychotic states. This was again obtained from the psychologists report and excluded only one boy from the sample.

Boys failing to meet these criteria were excluded because it was thought that special problems, such as the inability to distinguish between right and wrong, may have contributed towards the boy's delinquency and thus may not tell us much about family and peer group variables. Fortunately the large majority of the boys tested were comparatively normal, as the institution was a Boys Home which functioned mainly as a short term remand home for boys sent from the courts. Boys with special problems tended to be sent to a more specialised institution, such as Tokanui Mental Hospital or the Christopher Park School for Intellectually Handicapped. All boys in the delinquent sample were obtained from this remand home, and each boy interviewed had to have at least two appearances before the Children's Court.*

*See Appendix for details of offenses which resulted in these boys being placed in this institution.
Also to see with whom the boys committed these offences.

As this sample constitutes a group of hard-core delinquents it may be criticised for being too specialised and not including the more marginal delinquent. However, we can assume that not all the control will be non-delinquent, and some at least will have a marginal status. This should not, however, prevent significant results emerging because of the selection of a group of practising rather than potential delinquents. If the hypotheses are not valid in differentiating between the professed delinquent and the control, then their validity may indeed be limited.

Though one should not place too much confidence in the literal accuracy of a delinquent's appraisal of his parents, if delinquents say that their parents care is inadequate, then this in itself is an attitudinal factor that may have contributed to their delinquency. However, to prevent gross distortions of the truth, responses to the interview were checked, where possible, with the boy's records. Two boys found consistently lying were discarded. Another problem especially in the control group was encountered with boys who tended not to answer or answer inconsistently, either because they did not understand what I was asking, or because they resented my asking questions. If boys refused to answer or answered inconsistently they were dropped from the sample. Eight boys, including six from the control, were dropped for this reason, but in most cases rapport was good. In the case of the delinquent boys this may have been because I had worked at the home for

some time. This familiarity, however, also posed problems, because through the ever-present grapevine most boys knew that I had worked with the Welfare Department and assumed that the interview was to decide where they would go in the future. The danger was that they would purposely give a wrong impression of their home-life, depending on whether they wanted to return to their home or go to a foster home. To overcome this each boy was told that the interview had nothing to do with the Welfare Department, but was part of a general survey of boys in their age group, the object of which was to find out how boys in New Zealand get on with their families and spend their leisure time. A similar explanation was made to members of the control group.

Another proviso was that boys were only interviewed if they lived in a comparatively normal family situation. It did not matter if this was not their own family as long as they had lived with that family, more or less continuously (i.e. away for not more than six months) for five years. The reason for this was that I wanted to test the role of both parents. Also, although the available literature on this topic indicates that children from broken homes are more likely to commit delinquent acts, (Glueck and Glueck, 1950, and Oldman, et al, 1952) I feel that quarrelling parents and insecure children would be more likely to contribute to delinquency than the actual break-up, which may well release these tensions. Surprisingly, this provision excluded only six boys from the delinquent population, and four boys from

the control sample.

Boys for the delinquent sample were selected simply on an entry basis, beginning on the 21st. of June, 1971. Boys entering after this date were tested, and those that were suitable were interviewed. The interviewing continued until a suitable fifty were obtained. This method was used because it was the simplest and also to avoid the criticism that Subin (1951) made of the Gluecks experiment. This criticism was that a period of institutional life may have in some way altered the boy's perception of his family.

C. The Control Sample

This consisted of 50 boys matched to the delinquents for age, race, intelligence and socio-economic background. The Government statistician defines a Maori as a person with half or more Maori blood. Our report will not give an account of the number of boys who are technically Maoris, instead, the boys were asked to which racial group they belonged. This gives us the number of boys who identify themselves as Maoris which is probably a more reliable indication of the individual's affinity with the Maori. For the purposes of comparison the boys school progress record cards were obtained, which provided the boys' score on the Otis intelligence test. I did not attempt to compare intelligence quotients directly because it has been shown that, due to cultural differences, conventional intelligence tests are not very meaningful as far as racial groups are concerned. (Vernon, 1969). However, these figures do give a general indication of the boys' intelligence, and this

was all that was required. Socio-economic background was measured by the Congalton-Havighurst scale (1954) of occupational status, which although outdated, is the only scale of this nature that has been standardized for use in New Zealand. It was also ascertained from the boys' progress cards that they had no major physical or psychological defects and that they were living in a comparatively normal family situation.

Although I had neither the time, nor the resources, to use matched pairs as utilized by the Gluecks and Andry every effort was made to ensure that the two groups were as comparable as possible.* Non-delinquency of the control group was checked by questioning the boys and through examination of Child Welfare reports. This method was far from perfect and we probably will get some unapprehended delinquents in our non-delinquent sample. However, it is hoped that broad differences between the groups will not be obscured by this small minority.

The major problem encountered in this research was that I was refused permission to interview boys in the control sample individually. The school's concern was that they did not want parents to think that their child had been singled out for special attention. Another reason was that many schools in the Waikato with a high percentage of Maori pupils had had problems with Maori-pakeha relations and several of

*A comparison of the two groups may be found in the Appendix.

these schools refused to participate, in the belief that my questions about racial prejudice would stir up further racial strife. Eventually, two secondary schools were found, who agreed to participate, but only with the proviso that the questionnaire be printed and handed out to the pupils. Another pilot study was carried out with eight boys, with printed copies of the questionnaire handed out and the boys writing their answers on the paper provided.* The results obtained from the pilot study seemed researchable and so I proceeded. Small groups of boys, usually about four, and including both Maori and pakeha, were given the questionnaire. Clear instructions were given on how to answer the questions, stressing the fact that there were no right or wrong answers and that the boys were to ask questions if there was anything that they did not understand. The boys did ask questions, and with the small group it was possible to regain some of the rapport lost from the one to one situation.

As the shift from an interview situation in which I asked the questions, and recorded the replies, to a situation in which the boys wrote down their answers from a printed questionnaire could have significantly affected the results I decided to test some of the original delinquent sample who were still in residence, by the latter method. Twelve boys were re-tested three months after the original interviews and the replies compared. In general, the results obtained in

*A copy of the questionnaire may be found in the Appendix.

the two different instances were gratifyingly similar. This was substantiated by having a post-graduate student independantly ranking the two sets of answers on the variable of family life. Results showed that in ten cases there were no significant differences. In the remaining two cases slight inconsistencies were present in the answers given to the printed questionnaire.

When all the sampling and interviewing was finished, four groups emerged. These consisted of: Two Maori groups, one of delinquents, and one of non-delinquents, with 35 boys in each group and two pakeha groups of delinquents and non-delinquent with 15 in each group. Although I tried to keep the sample and the control group reasonably similar differences were still present that may have influenced results, especially with regard to Maori delinquents.

The first of these factors was fostering which was fairly common among the Maori delinquents, of whom 23 per cent were not living with their natural family. Of these 20 per cent were living with grandparents. This applied to only 12 per cent of the Maori control group. Metge, (1970, p.129) reporting about the Kowhai community, says that "Fostering was common with 15 per cent of the.....children living with other than their physiological parents. When broken down 5% lived with grandparents; 7% with other kin and 3% with non kin. Foster parents were usually elderly and parents could, and often did, reclaim their children. As a result, foster children often developed special behaviour

problems".

Secondly the Maori delinquents tended to have larger families than the Maori control. According to the 1961 census the average Maori family had 5.5 members. Our delinquent sample had an average family of 7.2 while the control averaged out at 5.9.

D. Statistical Method:

In my research I have hypothesised that two groups, usually delinquent and control, differ with respect to some characteristic and therefore with respect to the relative frequency with which group members fall into several categories.

As the data is arranged in categories the statistic most used will be χ^2 .

$$\chi^2 = \frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$$

Also used is the Kolmogorov - Smirnov two sample test where

$$\chi^2 = 4D^2 \frac{n_1 n_2}{n_1 + n_2}$$

In two cases I think the use of the t test can be justified with the proviso that the distributions are skewed.

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{N_2}}}$$

$$df = N_1 + N_2 - 2 .$$

Chapter Four.RESULTS.1. 'Delinquency will be associated with low economic status'.Method.

The index of socio-economic status used was the father's occupation. This was obtained from the questionnaire and checked with boys progress cards or Welfare reports. Fathers occupation was then ranked on the seven point Congalton-Havighurst scale. The nearest approximation to a normal distribution was obtained from Taylor (1961) who ranked the occupations of the fathers of a sample of 20,000 pupils who left New Zealand secondary schools in 1961. As 98% of New Zealand children enter secondary schools this should provide a fair indication of the total distribution of occupations.

Table 1. Socio-economic background of delinquent and Control group.

<u>Class</u>	<u>Delinquent sample</u>	<u>Taylor's Sample.</u>
1	0	3
2	0	7
3	0	23
4	2	16
5	6	13
6	14	20 N = 100
7	28	18

$\chi^2 = 9.657$ with $df = 2$ significant at the 0.1 level.

2. Delinquents, rather than non-delinquents, are less likely to be closely tied to their parents.

This hypothesis is examined under three subsections.

- 2(I) The delinquent will spend more of his leisure time away from his parents and home than the non-delinquent.

Method.

To test this we first looked at the leisure facilities of the home. These were ascertained by the following questions.

- I) During your spare time what sort of things can you do at home? Do you wish there was more to do?
- II) Do you often bring your friends home? If so, what sort of things do you do at home?

The answers to these questions were ranked on a four point scale.

- A) Good : The boy has plenty to do, he has hobbies and seems to spend a large amount of time at home, and often brings friends home.

For example: "I read, listen to records, fix slot cars and play soccer and other games with Dad, my brothers and mates. I've plenty to do".

- B) Adequate : The boy usually has enough to occupy him, but occasionally wishes there was more to do. For example: "Play games, sometimes bring friends home to play records and watch T.V. Can stick stamps in album or read a book but sometimes I wish there was more to do."

C) Inadequate: The boy feels he has not enough to do and rarely brings friends home because of this.

For example: 'Tidy up my room and then go out to my friends' or 'I study, when I finish I wish there was more to do - but there isn't so I go away'.

D) Poor. The boy does not seem to have anything to do at home and stays out and away from home as much as possible. For example: "Nothing I am usually in town. I usually spend my weekend with friends playing snooker.

As these, and other later categories are fairly broad and open ended my categorisation of answers was checked by three post-graduate psychology students. The agreement between these four categories was 98% or above in each case.

Table II. Leisure Facilities of the Home.

	<u>Numbers</u> <u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control</u>	<u>Percentages</u> <u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control</u>
Good	2	5	4	10
Adequate	13	28	26	32
Inadequate	13	16	26	32
Poor	22	3	44	6

N = 50

$\chi^2 = 20.38$ with $df = 3$ significant at .001 level .

When these categories were broken down into Maori and pakeha delinquents and controls there proved to be little difference in the results. Thus; when there are no significant differences between racial groups we shall ignore them, only splitting the sample up if the difference seems to be influenced by ethnic origin rather than delinquency.

The second area tested was the amount of time that the boy spent with parents in leisure activities. This was

obtained from these questions.

Method

(a) Do you go out much with your parents? What sort of things would you do?

(b) What does your mother do on the weekends, or when she's not working?

(c) What about your father, what does he do when he's not working?

(d) Do you usually spend most of the weekend by yourself? With your family? or with some friends?

The large number of questions in this, and other sections is an attempt to give the questionnaire some internal consistency in providing a check that the boy understands what is required and is at least answering consistently, if not truthfully.

With this method the individual questioning of the boys proved far superior; if the boy was answering inconsistently I could question him further. The other method, that of giving written answers to a questionnaire provided more inconsistencies, shown by the replies of 6 boys from this group who had to be discarded.

The answers given to the above questions were again divided up into four categories.

A. Often. The children and parents go out together regularly and share an interest in some hobby or sport.

For example: "Yes, we go to soccer and other sports together and go into town." Or "Go out nearly every Sunday to relatives,

to watch sport, or just driving."

B. Sometimes. The boy sometimes goes out with his mother and/or father. For example: Sometimes we go for a drive in the car, or to the beach' or "Only sometimes, and we would go to the pictures."

C. Rarely. The family goes out together when necessary, but most of the time is spent in separate activities.

For example: 'Yes, once in a blue moon". Or "Not much and when I do they only go visiting."

D. Never. The family only meets for basic family processes such as eating. For example "I go out by myself - they go out by themselves." Or "Do nothing with parents - either of them.

Table III Amount of leisure time spent with parents.

	<u>Numbers</u>		<u>Percentages.</u>	
	<u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control</u>	<u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control</u>
Often	1	9	2	18
Sometimes	9	18	18	36
Rarely	13	5	26	10
Never	27	13	54	36

$\chi^2 = 14.76$ with $df = 3$ significant at .001 level .

2(II) The second subsection of hypothesis two is that:

Delinquents will report more often than non-delinquents that their parents are not interested in them.

Method.

Questions pertaining to this hypothesis were:

(a) In general do you think your parents are interested in you and what you're doing? Or do you think they're too busy with other things?'

(b) Do you think your parents give you enough attention?

(c) How about showing affection? Would you say your parents often, sometimes or never show you affection?

(d) Do you often, sometimes, or never show them affection?

Though these last two questions are not directly related to the hypothesis they did prove valuable check questions. For example if a boy maintains his parents are not interested in him and then says that both himself and his parents express affection often then he may be confused and further questioning may be necessary.

Table IV. Index of Percieved Parental Interest.

	<u>Number</u>		<u>Percentage</u>	
	<u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control</u>	<u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control</u>
yes	20	38	40	76
No	28	12	56	24
D.K.	2	--	4	--

$\chi^2 = 10.57$ with $df = 1$ significant to .01 level.

The third subsection of hypothesis two is that:

2(III) Delinquent boys will be less hampered by parental rules about leisure activities than non-delinquents.

Method.

Questions asked were

(a) Do your parents have any rules about how often you should be allowed out and when you should come back?

Could you tell me about them?

(b) How often are you allowed out?

Again these replies were divided into four categories and the consistency of ranking verified by the same three

post graduate students.

A. Restricted Freedom.: In which the boy is rarely allowed out. For example: "Doesn't like me going out - when I was 13 asked if I could go out with a girl, mother got mad and slapped me'. or "Not allowed out at night by myself, she says she'll take me out then forgets.

B. Average Freedom: This consists of fairly definite rules about when the boy is able to go out and when he must be back. For example: "Usually not allowed out at night. If so have to be back as soon as the thing finishes" or "Not allowed out after 9 o'clock on school days. Allowed out on Friday and Saturday night till midnight."

C. Relative Freedom. The boy is allowed out almost anytime but has to ask and give parents or someone some indication of where he is going. For example: "Allowed out as long as I tell someone where I am going." or "Every night I am allowed out till 12 p.m. they let me out enough."

D. Complete Freedom. In which the boy is allowed to come and go as he likes, or, if his parents try to restrict his freedom the boy ignores this and does as he pleases. Though these types differ they are similar in that the boy seems independent of his parents. For example: 'Anywhere as long as I come back, stay at my mates place for 3 or 4 days" or "I just go away, sometimes they try to stop me; when I come back nothing happens."

Table V. - Index of Parental Freedom.

	<u>Numbers</u>		<u>Percentages.</u>	
	<u>Delinquent.</u>	<u>Control.</u>	<u>Delinquent.</u>	<u>Control.</u>
Restricted	13	4	26	8
Average	13	21	26	42
Relative	11	21	22	42
Complete	13	4	26	8

$\chi^2 = 14.52$ with $df = 3$ significant at .01 level.

As there is some evidence of a racial difference we shall look at the Maori and Pakeha groups.

Table VI. - Maori and Pakeha groups contrasted on Index of Freedom.

<u>Maoris.</u>	<u>Numbers</u>		<u>Percentages.</u>	
	<u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control</u>	<u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control.</u>
Restricted	7	4	20	11
Average	5	10	14	29
Relative	10	17	29	49
Complete	13	4	37	11

$N = 35$ $\chi^2 = 9.065$ with $df = 3$ significant at .05 level.

Pakeha

	<u>Numbers.</u>		<u>Percentages.</u>	
	<u>Delinquent.</u>	<u>Control.</u>	<u>Delinquent.</u>	<u>Control.</u>
Restricted	7	0	46	0
Average	5	11	33	73
Relative	3	4	20	27
Complete	0	0	0	0

$N = 15$ Insufficient expected frequencies for testing.

3. Delinquents will tend to feel their mother is a more satisfactory parent than their fathers, whereas non-delinquents will tend to feel that both parents are equally satisfying.

Method:

Again a large number of questions provided information on this question.

- (a) Which parent (if any) knows more about you and understands you better?
- (b) If you got into trouble and had to tell your parents, which one would you tell?
- (c) If you had a problem which parent would you prefer to talk to about it?
- (d) Which parent (if any) would you like to be like when you get older?
- (e) Could you tell me which parent (if any) is most interested in you?

RESULTS. Table VII. The Adequacy of the Delinquents Father.

	<u>Number</u>		<u>Percentage.</u>	
	<u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control</u>	<u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control.</u>
Mother	26	17	52	34
Father	5	14	10	28
Both	7	14	14	28
Neither	12	5	24	10

$\chi^2 = 11.36$ with $df = 3$ significant at 0.1 level.

4. Delinquents', rather than non-delinquents' parents, will either be excessively punitive or overly lax in matters of discipline.

Method:

Information for this hypothesis was collected from these questions.

- (a) If you do something wrong do you get punished?
- (b) What sort of things do your parents punish you for? Can you give me an example please?

(c) What sort of punishment do you receive?

(d) Do you think your parents punish you too little, too much, or about the right amount?

The answers to the above questions were divided into three categories:

(A) Excessively punitive in which the boy felt his parents were overly harsh and critical when judging his actions. The boys in this category often maintained that parents were unfair and tended not to heed explanations. Punishment tended to be physical, which will be commented on in the discussion of these results.

For example: "Get a hiding with a belt, too much?" or "There was too much belting thats why I ran away."

(B) In which the boys' included felt that their parents were in general fairly reasonable in disciplining. The boys generally regarded the parents as trying to be fair with punishments.

(C) Into this category came boys whose parents for one reason or another did not punish or who according to the boys did not punish enough.

For example: " Never get punished as he is too old to catch me."

Table VIII : Discipline

	<u>Number</u>		<u>Percentage</u>	
	<u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control</u>	<u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control</u>
Excessive	20	12	58	34
Reasonable	12	19	34	65
Lax	3	4	8	11

$$X^2 = 2.677 \text{ with } df = 1 \text{ not significant}$$

5. There will be no significant difference between delinquent gang members and non-delinquent gang members on the variables of family life already tested.

Method: A gang was defined as consisting of a number of identifiable participating members organised into some sort of hieratical structure. The authenticity of the gang was checked by asking welfare authorities and other boys from the same district if they knew of the gang. However, in most cases the gangs that the boys belonged to were well known and usually more than one member was included in the sample. The most common gangs were : The Rat Patrol; Huck 70 and Junior Hucks; Tokoroa Dogs and the 21st. Century.

I interviewed 30 boys belonging to gangs. Nineteen were in the delinquent sample and eleven in the control. These boys will be tested on all the hypotheses that resulted in significant differences between the delinquent and control groups. However, in these results we will be hoping to prove the null hypothesis.

TABLE IX : Differences Between Delinquent and Non-delinquent Gang Members.

A) Leisure Activities of the Home.

	<u>Number</u>		<u>Percentage</u>	
	<u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control</u>	<u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control</u>
Good	0	0	0	0
Adequate	1	3	5	27
Inadequate	3	6	16	55
Poor	15	2	79	18

B) Amount of Leisure Time Spent with Parents.

	<u>Number</u>		<u>Percentage</u>	
	<u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control</u>	<u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control</u>
Often	0	0	0	0
Sometimes	0	2	0	18
Rarely	3	1	16	9
Never	16	8	34	73

C) Index of Perceived Parental Affection.

	<u>Number</u>		<u>Percentage</u>	
	<u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control</u>	<u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control</u>
Yes	3	3	16	27
No	16	8	34	73
Don't Know				

D) Adequacy of Father.

	<u>Number</u>		<u>Percentage</u>	
	<u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control</u>	<u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control</u>
Mother	14	6	77	55
Father	0	2	0	18
Both	0	0	0	0
Neither	5	3	23	27

E) Discipline

	<u>Number</u>		<u>Percentage</u>	
	<u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control</u>	<u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control</u>
Excessive	12	6	63	54
Reasonable	5	4	26	36
Lax	2	1	11	9

Unfortunately this hypothesis proved statistically untestable as the expected frequencies were too small for X^2 , and the Fisher exact probability tables in both Siegal and Bradley were of no help. Consequently any conclusions drawn from this data are not statistically validated.

6. Gang members will aspire significantly less to social mobility than non-gang members.

Method:

This hypothesis was tested by the following questions.

- (a) How much longer do you want to go to school?
(b) What sort of job would you like when you leave school?

The job aspirations were compared to their fathers' jobs and both were ranked on the Congalton Havighurst scale of socio-economic status.

Table X. Socio-economic Aspirations.

Congalton Havighurst Scale	<u>Gang Members.</u>				<u>Non-gang Members</u>			
	<u>*Socio-economic class</u>		<u>Aspirations</u>		<u>Socio-economic Class</u>		<u>Aspirations</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	
3	0	0	1	3	0	0	3	8
4	11	3	4	13	2	5	3	8
5	27	7	2	7	4	10	11	27
6	7	22	4	18	16	40	6	15
7	27	66	15	50	18	45	9	22
D.K.			4	13			5	13

* As measured by fathers socio-economic status.

† was significant at the .005 level

7. Gang Members will be predominately Maoris.

This hypothesis did not require testing as all boys belonging to gangs identified themselves as Maoris. Of these 30 boys only two said they belonged to mixed gangs, the rest were in Maori gangs.

8. The Maori Gang Member will be less aware of his own culture than the Non-Gang member.

Method:

This hypothesis was tested by a number of questions dealing with the knowledge of the Maori language and culture. These questions were obtained from Ritchie's (p39 1963) Index of Maoriness.

- (a) Do you visit the Marae? If so, how often?
- (b) What is a Tohunga?
- (c) Do your parents speak Maori? If so, would they speak it most of the time, sometimes, or hardly ever, at your place?
- (d) How much Maori can you speak?
- (e) Can you name the tribe that you belong to?
- (f) Have you at any part of your life lived in a Pa? If so, for how long?

A scoring system was worked out for the answers to these questions.

- | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------|-----|--|
| (a) Do you visit a Marae: | Never | = 0 | <u>Number of points</u> |
| | Often | = 2 | Sometimes = 1 |
| (b) What is a Tohunga? | Knows | = 1 | Does not know = 0 |
| (c) Do your parents speak Maori? | No | = 0 | Yes = 1 if only one parent speaks it and 2 if both speak it. |

If they speak it hardly ever = 0. Sometimes = 1
Often = 2.

- (d) How much Maori can you speak?

None = 0 Some = 1 A lot = 2

- (e) Can you name your tribe?

No = 0 Yes = 1

- (f) How long have you lived in a Pa?

0 - 6 months = 1 6 months to a year = 2

over a year = 3

The boys were then ranked on a 1 to 5 system according to their total scores.

The total possible score = 12

A rank of 1 was given if the score was between 10 and 12

A rank of 2 was given if the score was between 8 to 10

A rank of 3 was given if the score was between 5 to 8

A rank of 4 was given if the score was between 3 to 5

A rank of 5 was given if the score was between 0 to 3

Table XI: Index of Maoriness.

	<u>Numbers</u>		<u>Percentages</u>	
	<u>Gang-members</u>	<u>Non gang members</u>	<u>Gang members</u>	<u>Non Gang Members.</u>
1	0	1	0	2
2	2	6	7	15
3	4	10	13	21
4	16	15	53	37
5	8	8	27	20

† significant at the .005 level.

9. The Maori Gang Members will show More Racial Prejudice than his Non-gang Member counterpart.

Method:

The questions asked to verify this hypothesis were:

- (a) Did you ever think you were being picked on at school (or anywhere else) because you were a Maori?
- (b) What do you think about Pakehas?
- (c) What about your parents, any ideas how they regard pakehas?
- (d) What about your Maori mates, how do they regard pakehas?

The results obtained were divided up into 3 groups.

- A. Those who showed some dislike towards "pakehas"

B. Those who maintained that they had no personal animosity towards pakehas but who attributed dislike to parents or friends.

C. The group who said that neither they or their associates felt any racial animosity.

Table XII.

	<u>Number</u>		<u>Percentage</u>	
	<u>Gang</u>	<u>Non-gang</u>	<u>Gang</u>	<u>Non-gang</u>
Subject dislikes	9	8	30	20
Others dislike	18	13	58	32
No dislike	3	19	10	48

Only one boy said that his parents showed active dislike of pakehas, though a large percentage of the gang said their mates disliked pakehas.

$\chi^2 = 11.298$ with $df = 2$ significant at .01 level.

CHAPTER FIVE.DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR
FURTHER RESEARCH.A. The relationship of Social Status to Juvenile Delinquency.

From the figures obtained hypothesis one seems well proven. None of our samples fathers were contained in the upper three categories, while 33% of Taylor's sample were represented in these categories. Also, 49% of our sample were contained in the bottom category, while only 13% of Taylor's sample were in this category.

Before further discussion we should note that traditionally New Zealand has been thought of by New Zealanders as having very little class structure and hence a high degree of social mobility. If this was so it would mean little if delinquents came from predominately lower classes. However, results seem to contradict this belief in a relatively classless, highly mobile society. For an example compare the occupations of our samples fathers with the occupations of fathers of first year university students.

(Parkyn 1967)

TABLE XIII

<u>Socio-economic Class</u>	<u>Samples Fathers</u>	<u>University Students Fathers.</u>
1	0 %	30 %
2	0 %	21 %
3	0 %	14 %
4	4 %	14 %
5	11 %	15 %
6	36 %	4 %
7	49 %	2 %

Parkyn arrives at the conclusion that the lower class child regardless of ability, has less chance of attending university and moving into a higher status occupation. In this respect New Zealand's social stratification system differs little from overseas systems, and because of this social class may be seen as self perpetuating.

Because of the extreme concentration of delinquents in the lower socio-economic classes these results support the findings of Shaw and McKay (1949) and may also give some validity to the claims of the cultural deviance theorists, (for example, Miller 1958). However, one factor that may diminish this extreme picture is that the kind of family the boys come from is an important variable in determining placement in an institution. (Nye, Short, and Ohlson 1958) If the family is thought to be adequate then the boy is sent back to them, and a superficial impression of adequacy is often gained from the family's social class.

Despite this caution, delinquency seems to arise more frequently within the lower socio-economic classes. The crucial question that has to be asked is why is there a relationship between delinquency and social class? Matz (1964) characterises delinquency as a pick up game in which the lower class child has more chance to participate. While agreeing with this, my thesis tries to show that attachment to parents is the more important variable in insulating a child against this temptation.

A promising area for future research would be a

a comparison of a group of middle class delinquents and controls with a group of working class delinquents and controls. The objective would be to see if differences exist primarily between classes or between delinquents and controls. That is, does delinquency arise predominately within the lower classes because of either the occurrence of status frustration or the adherence to different social norms, or is it due to some other variable, more prevalent in, but not exclusively a lower class characteristic.

An example of this being lack of attachment to parents.

I would hypothesise that the way the delinquency manifests itself may be due to class influences, but that the causes of delinquency would be essentially similar.

B. Parental Contact.

The adequacy of environmental communication between parents and children was gauged by looking at the leisure facilities of the home, and the amount of leisure activity spent in the company of parents. Both sets of results proved significant, with 44 per cent of the delinquents, compared to 6% of the control saying that the leisure facilities of their home were poor, while 62% of the control compared to 30% of the delinquents said leisure facilities were good or adequate.

With regard to leisure activities shared with parents, 80% of the delinquents said they rarely or never went out with their parents, while only 46% of the control group said this. These results compare well with other studies. For

example, the Gluecks found that with regard to family group recreations (P 112) 67% of the delinquents and only 38% of the controls reported never participating in family group recreations.

As the majority of delinquents spend little time at home or with parents we can infer that other influences must play an important part in their socialisation process. To test this we asked each boy what he did on the weekends and holidays so as to build up a picture of their leisure activities. The boys included in each of the four categories gave these as their predominant activities which are useful, although in reality considerable overlap between categories may exist.

1. The primary recreational activities of this group included hanging around town, going to the pictures, and most especially frequenting billiard salons. Fifty per cent of the delinquents, compared to 26% of the control engaged in these activities. It was interesting to note that a large proportion of these boys belonged to gangs.

2. Included in this group were boys whose recreational activities focussed on playing sport, like riding and swimming. 20% of the delinquents compared to 48% of the control were engaged primarily in this type of recreation.

3. The third group consisted of boys whose recreational activities generally focussed on the home and family. Included in this was 14% of the delinquent sample and 26% of the control sample. The boys in this category reported

that they usually had nothing to do, this included 14% of the delinquents, while none of the control fell into this category.

This question showed interesting differences. The delinquent was involved in hanging round the town and frequenting billiard salons, which is illegal till the age of 13. The control generally seemed to engage in, for want of a better word, constructive or more socially acceptable activities. Thus, it could be suggested that the boy who is attracted to society plays at games which society accepts, while the boy who is not attached to parents or society plays at games or indulges in activities which are unlikely to increase his attractiveness to society.

As a sideline to the amount of leisure contact that parents have with their children, we shall deal briefly with the working mother. Much has been made of the role of the 'Working mother' in the etiology of delinquency, as it is thought that if she is at work then she may not be able to give the children the attention they require. However, Nye, (1953) Andry (1960) and the Gluecks (1950) generally found no deleterious effect stemming from regular employment on the part of the mother. In our sample a fairly high proportion of mothers worked, being 48% for the delinquents, and 45% for the controls. As there was no significant difference between them, these figures may be related more to social class than delinquency, and it may be postulated

That the type of contact that the mother has with the child is more important, in most cases, than the amount.

The questions concerned with parental interest showed that 56 per cent of the delinquent sample thought that their parents were not interested in them, while 76 per cent of the control thought that their parents were interested. This compares fairly well with the results of other studies. Andry found that 73% of his non-delinquent sample felt that their parents were very satisfactory while 75 per cent of parents in the delinquent sample were characterised as unsatisfactory. An interesting question which tended to reinforce these results, dealt with the boys rejection of their parents. The boys were asked if they felt ashamed of their parents. The results showed that 88 per cent of the control were not ashamed of their parents, while 53 per cent of the delinquents were ashamed of one or both parents.

Another variable worthy of consideration is that the delinquent may be the odd one out in the family. For some reason his parents treat him differently from the others. This, of course, may be due to his delinquency, but may also be due to other factors, such as Watzlawick's (1963) contention that some families need a scapegoat for their deviant impulses. The boys were asked if they thought that their parents were more interested in their brothers and sisters than them. The results were not conclusive, 60 per cent of the delinquents said that they were all given

the same treatment, compared to 76% or the control.

When asking questions about the love and affection between parents and the child I was disturbed by the amount of emotional blocking that occurred, especially with the Maori delinquent. Up until these questions were asked rapport had generally been good, but at this point the Maori subjects tended to become emotional or turn surly. It was for this reason that I did not do any statistical comparison on the differing amounts of love and affection shown to the delinquents and controls. Rather, the less emotionally loaded term of parental interest was used, the questions on love and affection being used as checks. This blocking so common among the Maori delinquents may be accounted for by several reasons. They may not have understood the concepts, love or affection, and although I doubt this, asking questions in understandable terms was a major problem. Another possible reason was that they may have resented me prying into personal matters, although they seemed quite open on all other questions. A third possible explanation is that they were afraid of deep feelings or commitments. A number gave the impression that they did not want any attention or love from their parents as it would be too embarrassing. This is supported by Ritchie who suggests that fear of deep emotional commitment may be present due to the fact that the Maori has been rejected in his first close personal relationship, (that is with his mother), and is scared to form any others. Instead, he compensates by

forming many friendships on a superficial level .

In accordance with our theory it has been found that the delinquent's parents tend to be less interested in their children than non-delinquents. Interest, however, is a very broad concept and introducing more specialisation may be advocated. Some research along similar lines to that of Hewitt and Jenkins (1946) may be useful. They found, although their methodology is open to question, that the delinquency of city gangs (called socialised delinquency) was related to parental neglect, while unsocialised aggression was evidently related to active rejection by both parents.

The questions concerning parental rules about leisure activities showed that this hypothesis was ~~not~~ significant. Although 26 per cent of the delinquents had complete freedom compared to 8 percent of the control, this was balanced by 26 per cent of the delinquents having restrictive freedom compared to 8 per cent of the control. Thus the delinquents seemed to fall more significantly into the two extreme categories rather than in the direction predicted. As I was trying to show that parents of delinquent children did not have much control over their sons' leisure activities, a better way to ascertain this may have been to ask questions about parental awareness of the boy's leisure time activities.

When breaking the sample up into Maori and Pakeha groups several distinctive differences emerged. Of the Maori delinquents 37 per cent were included within the

category of complete freedom compared to 11 per cent of the Maori control. In general the Maori sample showed a trend, although not statistically significant, towards greater freedom. The most interesting group was the pakeha delinquent. While the control group was very neatly contained in the two middle categories, the delinquent sample had almost half, 46 per cent, in the restricted category. Looking at this group in more detail it was discovered that it contained the same boys who reported on the questions concerning leisure activities that they stayed at home and yet had nothing to do. Although they stayed at home they reported little leisure activity with their parents. These boys may be showing a different type of delinquency in that they appear to be dominated by their parents, yet do not seem very attached to their parents and have few friends or activities with which to compensate. To generalise from the meagre amount of information available I would suggest that these boys lack attachment and are thus predisposed towards the stereotype of the psychopathic delinquent, contrasting with the majority who could be classified more as social delinquents. As these boys, five in number, form a very small minority of the total delinquent sample, I shall not carry this discussion any further except to add that their delinquency probably stems from different sources, and an interesting study would be to try and illuminate these differences.

C. Paternal versus Maternal Adequacy.

This hypothesis was significant as only 10 per cent of the delinquents said their father was the most satisfactory parent compared with 28 per cent of the controls. 52 per cent of the delinquents felt their mother was a more satisfactory parent while 34 per cent of the control felt this way. The other results showed that 14 per cent of the delinquents compared to 28 per cent of the controls thought that both parents were equally satisfactory, while 24 per cent of the delinquents compared to 10 per cent of the control thought that neither parent was satisfactory. From this we can see that for the control satisfaction is evenly balanced between the mother (34 per cent) father (28 per cent) and both parents (28 per cent). The delinquents tend to be heavily in favour of the mother (52 per cent), then neither parent (24 per cent) while the father comes bottom of the list with 10 per cent.

Andry's results were very similar, 69 per cent of the delinquents felt more loved by their mother compared to 14 per cent of the control. The Gluecks though instead asking the parents about their feelings towards their children showed similar results. They found that 55 percent of the delinquents fathers were either hostile or indifferent towards their children, whereas 19 per cent of the fathers of the control had these attitudes. 72 per cent of the mothers of the delinquents were characterised as warm towards their children, whereas 96 per cent of the mothers of control children had this characteristic.

These statistics present a rather poor view of the delinquents' father, and this is further accentuated by the results from the question asked earlier about the boys being ashamed of their parents. When the answers were analysed it was found that 19 of the boys were primarily ashamed of their father, three of their mother, and 8 of both parents. The most common behaviour that the boys found shameful or distasteful about their fathers were: excessive drinking (7) beating the mother or sisters (6) and beating the subject (4). Another feature of the delinquent boys general lack of attachment was the small amount of leisure activities that they shared. This of course may be due to the fathers work, as if he is working long hours or shift work he may have little time to spend with his family. However, presumably, controlling for socio-economic status should also control this factor, the control fathers would have similar jobs and yet managed to spend more time with their sons.

The lack of communication between father and son may be partially due to the boy's reaching adolescence. As the boy is maturing the father may feel challenged by his son, who often becomes critical of his actions and because of this he may feel the need to assert his superiority. As this pattern seems to be more in evidence in the delinquents family, then we may suggest that many fathers of delinquents are very insecure people. This is a point which will be returned to. The next section, on discipline methods should help to give us a more complete picture of the delinquent father.

D. Methods of Discipline.

This hypothesis was only partially confirmed as eight percent of the delinquents parents, compared to 11 per cent of the controls parents, seemed to be lax in punishment. However, 53 per cent of the delinquents, compared to 34 per cent of the control, maintained that their parents punished them excessively. These results differed from other research, for example Burt (1929) found that 63 per cent of the mothers of delinquents, compared to 17 per cent of the mothers of the control, were overlax in discipline. While 15 per cent of the delinquents fathers, compared to 9 per cent of the controls fathers were classified as being overstrict. The Gluecks found similar results in that of the delinquent sample, 57 per cent of the mothers were overlax and 26 percent of fathers were overstrict. This compared to 12 per cent and 8 per cent for the respective parents in the control group.

From these figures the trend which becomes apparent is that of an overlax mother and an overstrict father. The obvious difference between this and our results is that we asked the boys to indicate the usual way in which he was punished, rather than differences between parents in the methods, and amount of punishment. This may have been a mistake and if questions had been asked about how each parent punished the results could have been different. However, indications of excessive puniton coupled with a general negative attitude towards the boy lend support to the results

obtained.

In both samples the father was the chief dispenser of discipline. In both the control and delinquent samples 53 per cent were punished mostly by the father, whilst the mother punished mostly in 25 percent of cases with the delinquents and 26 per cent of the control group. Here the similarity ended and as shown by this table the methods of discipline were strikingly different.

Table XIV Discipline Methods.

<u>Main form of Punishment</u>	<u>Delinquents</u>	<u>Non-delinquents.</u>
Physical	60%	27%
Verbal	22%	40%
Deprivation of privileges	11%	22%

Looking more closely at these results we can see that 88 per cent of the delinquent fathers who were the dominant source of punishment within the family punished physically, while almost half of the control fathers used other methods.

This is not to say that physical punishment causes delinquency, but it may be an influence when physical punishment is excessive. In our delinquent sample physical punishment was generally regarded by the boys as excessive, and excessive punishment seemed to be associated with unfairness in which the boy resented parental, and especially paternal, control being asserted in such a way. What is interesting is that it was usually the father who punished excessively, and this may reinforce our earlier statement that as the father feels challenged by his adolescent son, he needs

to assert his superiority, which he does in a physical manner.

A question that showed the general negative atmosphere within the homes of many delinquents was that concerning doing jobs around the house. The boys were asked what would happen if they did all their jobs or did something that they knew their parents would approve of. The answers were divided into four categories. The first was that the boy would get some monetary reward, 12% of both delinquent and control fell into this category.

The second category was that the boy would be allowed out usually into town. 20 percent of the delinquents compared to 16 percent of the control said that this was their usual reward.

The next category contained those who received verbal praise, and this included 50 per cent of the control and 16 per cent of the delinquents.

The last category consisted of boys who maintained that they received no rewards, it was expected that they did their jobs and were punished if they did not do them. This included 52 per cent of the delinquents and 22 per cent of the control. Although many of the other boys may have been punished if they did not do their jobs the emphasis of the question was on the positive aspect, that is what would happen if the boys were good? The interesting factor brought out by the last category was that the boys received no positive reinforcement for good behaviour, rather only

negative reinforcements for bad behaviour.

From these results I would suggest that in our sample discipline in the delinquents home tended to be negative rather than constructive . The boys seemed to need constant threats before they would do jobs, maybe again indicating a general lack of cohesiveness within the family.

Unfortunately, I did not measure the erraticness of discipline within the delinquent and non-delinquent homes. In the original questionnaire questions were included aiming to find out how consistent the discipline was. However, these questions were abandoned after studying the replies of the pilot group as they tended to cause too much confusion. However, the unfairness and arbitrary nature of parental punishment, which seemed to be associated with excessive physical punishment, may be similar in its effects to erratic discipline, in that it shows the parent to be unfair or inconsistent and therefore an inadequate model.

These results seem to suggest that the boy has little reason to be attracted towards his parents and thus will be predisposed towards influence from other sources. One of these sources is the gang, which shall now be looked at.

E. Gangs.

These results showed no significant differences between delinquent and non-delinquent gang members on the variables of family life which produced significant differences between the delinquent and control samples. These results were validated by gang members responses to a question asking what

they thought their parents attitudes were towards their joining a gang. The replies showed that 13 boys thought that their parents did not know they belonged to a gang, 11 boys said their parents knew and the fact caused them some concern or annoyance, while 6 said their parents knew but did not seem to mind. As the majority of parents, 19 out of 30, either did not know or did not mind it seems unlikely that gang membership caused the initial lack of attachment.

An interesting factor was the reasons the boys gave for joining the gang. These fell basically into three categories. The first was for something to do and included answers such as 'Join in the fun' and 'better than staying at home'. 8 boys gave this as their main reason for joining the gang. 'Look like ruffians' and 'wear leather jackets and long hair' typified the responses of boys who joined because they wanted to identify with the gang. 13 boys fell into this category. The remaining 9 joined because all their friends belonged to the gang.

From this and general discussions with the boys about gang activities it seems that most boys get a great sense of identity from the gang, an identity which unfortunately tends to be socially unacceptable. Gang life, which usually includes all of the weekend, does seem important to these boys who were not hesitant in telling me about their gang activities. Though this could be used to back up numerous differing theories about gang involvement it does seem that the boys generally lack an adequate identity which according

to our theory is at least partially attributable to a lack of parental attachment.

In conclusion it seems fair to state that the main reason why boys are attracted to gangs is a defective family life.

F. Socio-economic Aspirations.

This hypothesis was proven, as only 9 per cent of the non-gang members were content to remain in the bottom social class compared to 50 per cent of the gang members. Perhaps all that this shows is that the gang member is more realistic and an interesting question would have been to ask not only "what job do you hope you will obtain?" but also what job do you think you will obtain? Ausubel (1965 p.76) reports, however, that 90 per cent of his sample when asked a similar question were confident that they would succeed in entering the occupation of their choice.

These results tend to lend support to Cohen's hypothesis that the gang provides a way out for the boy faced with the problem of status frustration in that the gang values and aspirations come to be viewed as the social reality. My results, however, seem to show that a prime reason for gang membership is a lack of attachment to parents and family rather than status frustration.

To produce their own identity the boys create their own group norms which establish their identity. Thus either in Cohen's terms or mine the result is a lack of social aspirations, the difference being as to whether the initial cause stems from status frustration or lack of attachment to parents and

families.

I believe an interesting parallel could be drawn between the hippy movement and the socialized delinquent gang. They show the differing responses, one essentially middle class, the other essentially working class, to a lack of attachment and disillusionment with parents as representatives of conventional society.

G. Maori Gang Members.

As all the boys in gangs were Maoris this hypothesis is well substantiated. This research was complicated throughout by the possible different patterns of Maori and pakeha which is further complicated by the many differing degrees of maoriness. Although the differences seemed surprisingly small one important difference was in the amount of freedom allowed in leisure activities. The more freedom, of course, given the boy, the more chance to come into contact with, and spend more time with the gang. The high incidence of Maori gang members is partially attributable to the peer group associations prior to adolescence.

It seems also, that the breakdown of the Maori social system and the varying degrees of absorption of pakeha values have created the problems that account for the large proportion of Maori delinquents. It is evident that the Maori delinquents relationships with his parents differ from the pakeha families, the Maori control group and the more traditional Maori pattern. Evidence for the first two patterns is shown by my research, the third is taken from

Mulligan, who has shown that adolescence is traditionally a time to return to the family. He has also found that (p56) "the mother is seen as the greater source of frustration and is less affectionate, more assertive and more inclined to be aggressive in her relationships with her children than the father. The mother tends to be seen as punishing of aberration, whilst the father is more often seen as the provider of reward!"

Today in many Maori families the roles seem reversed. If we stereotype the Maori delinquents' father we can include him in Hagen's (1956) concept of a retreatist individual whose traditional status and identity have been severely disturbed by the larger white society. Consequently, he can get neither satisfaction from his job nor a feel of security in the home. He compensates by trying to gain satisfaction from other areas, such as the consumption of alcohol. If he feels his precarious authority challenged at home he asserts this dominance in a physical manner. As we have seen, delinquents often seem to be ashamed of their father's for the above reasons. Generally the Maori control fathers seemed to have made a more satisfactory cultural adjustment.

From our evidence the Maori mother seems to be a more satisfactory parent possibly as this role is less disturbed by the changing social environment. This has also been stated by Ausubel (p74) "generally Maori women constitute a more cohesive and responsible group than the Maori men in family and community life". Hagen maintains that during

culture ~~contact~~ or social change a woman's role will change less than the mans. The man will have to adapt to a new society, a society that will under value or even reject his traditional skills. The woman still has her home and family and can still produce children.

H. Cultural Awareness.

Although our ~~Index~~ of Maoriness and especially the scoring system used may not be very extensive or valid it did provide some very interesting results. 80 per cent of the gang members were contained in the bottom two categories, compared to 57 per cent of the non-gang members. Only 7 per cent of gang members were contained in the top two categories, compared to 17 per cent of the control.

One problem is that this index may also distinguish those Maoris who, having been successfully assimilated into the white culture, may show very little Maori cultural knowledge. However, there is some evidence to suggest (Ritchie 1963 p37) that the more highly acculturated Maoris tended to consciously try to accumulate Maori lore. Thus, in this index two factors are being tested which might be called 'Maoriness by enculturation' and 'Maoriness by choice'.

Many of the Maori gang-members think that Maori customs are outdated and irrelevant to their life, even something to be slightly ashamed about. When I asked the boys to explain why they were ashamed of their parents, six boys said it was because they looked and acted like old fashioned Maoris.

Speaking Maori and the women going to town wearing their long black skirts were cited. One boy said that the most shameful experience he had had was taking his parents to see his probation officer. He was not ashamed because he had got into trouble, but because of the way his parents looked, 'just like old Maoris'.

Most gang members did not seem very proud or even conscious of any sort of 'Maoritanga', by which I mean the essential nature of the Maori culture, that which distinguishes it from all others.

I. Racial Prejudice.

The results showed that 35 per cent of the gang members said that either they or their friends disliked pakehas, while just over half of the non-gang Maoris said this. The reasons for disliking pakehas were embodied in such comments as 'they're too smart' or 'think they're big' or they call us names such as 'black pigs'. 10 per cent of the gang members showed no dislike of pakehas while 48 per cent of the non-gang members had this attitude. Only two boys in the Maori sample, both gang members, said that their parents expressed any dislike of pakehas. One said that his parents did not want to have them as neighbours.

The responses to these questions were obviously influenced by the fact that I was white, and although some boys were very frank, others probably denied any animosity towards pakehas yet claimed that all their friends disliked pakehas. Some of these boys, rather than tell me they did not like

pakehas which they may have thought was implying that they did not like me, may have projected their dislike onto their friends. Although one cannot be certain about this it may have been a factor influencing the results. Unfortunately, the Maori gang members did show a definite racial dislike, this was also shown by the question asking gang members what sort of things they did when they were with the gang. For many, gang fighting against pakehas seemed to occupy a large proportion of their time.

Example of some of the more colourful responses included: 'Hang round or go to Putararu to fight the Pakehas'., and 'Walk round, if any Pakehas got smart, belt them'. Though these may seem merely boasting phrases they do show an underlying racial tension, which in many cases exploded into violence. This happened, for example, with the 'Rat Patrol', a Whakatane gang, now largely defunct, who used to have full scale gang brawls with the 'Gisborne surfies', a predominantly white group.

From this we can see that the Maori gang member has a new identity which unfortunately seems to be based largely on colour, rather than on his cultural difference or Maori-tanga. This situation may lead to the creation of colour stereotyping on both sides, and is frighteningly similar to the situation of the American negro shown by Griffin(1962).

CONCLUSION.

A brief summary of the results shows that delinquency tends to be associated with the lower soci-economic classes. Controlling this variable it was found that the delinquents generally spend less time with their parents in leisure pursuits and think that their parents are less interested in them than the non-delinquent sample. Though both the delinquents' parents seemed less satisfactory than the non-delinquents, it was shown that the delinquents' father was especially unsatisfactory. The two groups also showed a difference in the method of discipline, the delinquents tending to be punished physically and more excessively than the control.

Having put it forward as a basic premise that delinquents tend to be less attached to their parents, it was suggested that lack of attachment to parents would be a major reason for the boy joining a gang. This was well shown by comparing delinquent and control gang members.

Finally it was shown that the Maori was particularly predisposed towards gang membership not only because of a lack of parental attachment, but also because of the influence of the peer group before adolescence. The Maori gang member was pictured as caught between two cultures, regarding the more traditional Maori culture as outmoded while also being prejudiced against the white society. In the attempt to escape he forms his own identity in gangs, often based on colour.

Throughout this research was complicated by possible racial differences between the Maori and Pakeha subjects. As these did not seem to alter the basic results any future research would be concentrated more specifically on the different types of attachments shown between parents and children in the belief that these differences may produce differing types or shades of delinquency.

An advantage of a broad based piece of research is that it suggests many ideas for further specific research. Included among these would be an attempt to look more fully at the fathers role in the causation of delinquency. Another idea would be to compare and contrast the differences and similarities between lower class and middle class delinquency.

Finally, in an attempt to validate these results delinquency should be regarded from a cross cultural perspective, as a similar study throughout several cultures would indicate whether there is any validity in assuming that a major causative factor in delinquency is inadequate relationships between parents and children. In this research a hopeful sign has been the essential similarity between the Maori and Pakeha sample, indicating that parental relationships are the key causative factor in delinquency.

APPENDIX ONE:A. The offenses which Resulted in the boys Appearing in the Remand Home.

Total Number = 50

1. Stealing = 41

This can be sub-divided into:

a. Breaking and entry = 11

b. Car conversion = 13 (this was the elite group of delinquents, as for some reason car conversion was considered the most glamorous offense.)

c. Receiving = 4

d. Burglary = 12

2. Drunk and Disorderly. = 33. Gang Fighting = 54. Homosexuality = 1B. Who the boy committed the crime with.

Friends = 18

Gang = 5

Relatives (brother or cousin) = 4

by himself = 23

This seems to contradict Reckless's (1957) assertion that the delinquent act is commonly a group adventure.

However, the results may be open to question as of the 23 boys who said they committed the crime by themselves some may have been lying in order to protect unapprehended accomplices or to appear a more accomplished criminal, which seems to be somewhat of an ideal. Assuming that the results are

reasonably valid, they could reflect the New Zealand situation in which the delinquent subculture has yet to fully arise.

APPENDIX TWO.

An effort was made to keep the samples reasonably comparable. Once the delinquent sample was completed distributions for age, socio-economic status and intelligence were calculated, as well as for the racial composition.

The controls were selected firstly by dividing the delinquent sample according to race, thus we had to select 35 Maoris and 15 pakehas. Taking the Maori sample we calculated the mean and standard deviation of the sample age, and ensured that the age of the controls fell within this range. The same was done with socio-economic status, the controls needed to be within the limits shown by the delinquents.

Intelligence posed a problem, as there was insufficient time to test all the control and also as the efficacy of conventional intelligence tests with different racial groups may be questioned. I decided any formal comparison may not have been worth the effort involved.

Generally the delinquents scored between 8 to 15 points below average, though their non-verbal intelligence quotient tended to be higher. As the Otis has no non-verbal section and tends to be primarily a test of language ability results on the delinquent non-verbal section of the W.A.I.S. or W.I.S.C. were compared to the controls

results on the Otis. As there are many differences between the tests, as one is an individual test, and the other a group test, we merely checked to see that the controls results were within the same range as the delinquents.

AGE GROUPINGS: (The Remand Home catered for boys ranging from 9 to 17 years of age).

Maori.

<u>Age</u>	<u>Delinquent</u>		<u>Control</u>	
11	1		0	
12	5		3	Mean = 13.8
13	11	Mean =	12	
14	13	13.7	11	
15	3		6	N = 35
16	2		3	

Pakeha

<u>Age</u>	<u>Delinquent</u>		<u>Control</u>	
12	2	Mean =	0	Mean = 13.9
13	4	13.7	4	
14	5		6	N = 15
15	4		5	

Socio-economic Levels.

Maori

<u>Social Class</u>	<u>Delinquent</u>		<u>Control</u>	
1	0		0	
2	0		0	N = 35
3	0		0	
4	1		2	
5	4		3	
6	9		13	
7	21		17	

Pakeha

<u>Social Class</u>	<u>Delinquent</u>	<u>Control</u>	
1	0	0	
2	0	0	
3	0	0	
4	1	0	N = 15
5	2	3	
6	5	8	
7	7	4	

Intelligence Quotient.

For the delinquents scored on either the *W.I.S.C. or *W.A.I.S.

	<u>Maori</u>	<u>Pakeha</u>
70 - 80	9	3
80-90	14	7
90-100	11	3
100 +	1	1

A difference in the selection methods which should have been mentioned earlier was the area from which the boys came. The boys from the Remand Home came from all over the Waikato and further afield including a large number from the Whakatane Opotiki area, whereas the control were drawn exclusively from the Hamilton and Ngaruawahia area. The effect of this on the results was probably minimal but must be kept in mind.

* Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children

* Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale.

APPENDIX THREE.

The Questionnaire.

This questionnaire contains questions about your family life and about your leisure activities. If you don't want to answer any of these questions, just leave it and go onto the next one. What you write is confidential, we won't be using your name or anything else that could identify you.

*Section I

1. Are you living with your natural family?
2. If this is not your natural family, who are you living with and how long have you lived with them?
3. How many brothers and sisters do you have?
4. What ages are the ones immediately older and younger than you?.
5. What sort of job does your father have? Can you tell me the hours he works?
6. Does your mother work? What sort of job does she have?.

*Where the boy was not living with his natural family, but was living in a normal family situation he was instructed to consider that the people he lived with were his parents, and that the other members of the family were his brothers and sisters.

SectionII

1. Do you go out much with your parents and the rest of the family? What sort of things would you do together?

2. Do you go out more with one parent than the other?
If so, what sort of things would you do with that parent?
3. What does your mother usually do in the week-ends,
or when she has got some free time?
4. What does your father do when he's not working?
5. During your spare time, what sort of things can you
do at home? Do you wish there was more to do?
6. Do you have any hobbies or belong to any clubs?
Please describe them.
7. What sort of things do you usually do in the week-ends?
(excluding work)
8. Do you usually spend most of the weekend by your self,
with your family or with friends?
9. Do you often bring your friends home? If so, what
sort of things do you do at home?

Section III

1. In general, do you think your parents are interested
in you, and what you're doing, or do you think they're too
busy with other things.
2. Which parent do you think is most interested in you?.
3. Do you think your parents give you enough attention?
4. Would you say that your parents often, sometimes, or
never show affection towards you?.
5. Do you often, only sometimes, or never show them
affection?

Section IV.

1. Do your parents have any rules about how often you are allowed out and when you should be back?. If so, what are these rules?
2. Are you allowed out only sometimes, often, or never?
3. Do you have any special jobs to do around the house? If so, what do these jobs entail?
4. Are there any things which you can do that will please your parents? Please give some examples?
5. If you do something which pleases your parents do they give you some reward, praise you, or act as though they just expect you to do it anyway?
6. What sort of things do you do that make your parents angry?
7. If you do something your parents think is wrong do you get punished?
8. What sort of punishment do you receive?
9. Which parent (if any) is the boss in your home?
10. Which parent do you obey most?
11. Do you think your parents punish you too much, too little, or about the right amount?

Section V.

1. How do you get on with your brothers and sisters?
2. Do you think that your parents treat your brothers and sisters better than you? Please give examples.
3. Which parent (if either) knows more about you, and understands you best?

4. If you got into trouble would you tell your parents or try to get away with it?
5. If you got into trouble and had to tell your parents, which one would you tell?
6. If you had a problem, which parent would you prefer to talk to about it?
7. Do your parents argue or quarrel much in front of you?

Section VI.

1. Which parent do you think you are most like?
2. Which parent (if either) would you like to be like when you get older?
3. Have you ever been ashamed of anything either of your parents have said or done? Give examples.

Section VII

1. Have you ever belonged to a gang?
2. If so, why did you join the gang?
3. Was it a Maori, mixed or pakeha gang?.
4. How much time would you spend with the gang on an average weekend.
5. What sort of things would you do as a gang?
6. What did your parents think about your belonging to a gang?

Section VIII.

1. Do you like school? Why, or why not?
2. Do you ever 'wag' school?
3. How often would you do this and what sorts of things would you do when you didn't go to school?/

*4. Have you ever done anything else such as stealing?

How often?

5. Do you ask your parents to help you with home work?

If not, why not?

6. How much longer do you want to stay at school?

7. What sort of thing would you like to do when you leave school?

8. What do you think your parents want you to do when you leave school?.

*Delinquents were not asked this question. See special section attached.

This last section of the questionnaire is to be completed by Maori children only.

Section IX.

1. Have you ever felt that you were being picked on at School (or elsewhere) because you are a Maori?.

2. How do you feel about pakehas?

3. How do you think your parents regard pakehas?

4. Have any of your Maori friends ever told you that they dislike pakehas?

5. Are both of your parents Maori?

6. Do you ever visit the marae? If so, how often?

7. What is a tohunga?

8. Do your parents speak Maori? If so, do they speak it most of the time, only sometimes, or hardly ever, in the home?.

9. How much Maori can you speak?

10. Can you name the tribe that you belong to?.
11. Have you at any stage of your life lived in a Pa?
If so, for how long? .

*This section was only presented to the delinquent sample.

Section X

1. What are you in the Boys Home for?
2. Did you do this by yourself, or with some others?
3. Have you ever committed this or other crimes such as this before? If so, was this often, or only occasionally?

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- Andry, R.C., Delinquency and Parental Pathology,
London: Methven and Co., 1960.
- Ausubel, D.P., The Fern and the Tiki.
Angus and Robertson, 1960.
- Maori Youth,
Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Bandura, A., Relationship of Family Patterns to Child
Behaviour Disorders.
N.I.M.H. Progress Report, Standford Uni., 1960.
- Boulby, J., Maternal Care and Mental Health,
World Health Organisation Monograph,
Geneva, 1952.
- Bradely J.V. Distribution Free Statistical Tests,
Wright, Air, Development Division,
Technical Report, 1960.
- Burgess, E.W., The Economic Factor in Juvenile Delinquency.
J. Crim.Law, Criminol., and Polit.Sci, 1952.
43 p.p. 29-42.
- Burt, C., The Young Delinquent,
N.Y. Appleton, 1929.
- Carr-Saunders, A.M. Maunheim, H., and Rhodes E.,
Young Offenders,
N.Y. MacMillan, (1944)
- Cavan, R.D., (Ed.) Readings in Juvenile Delinquency,
N.Y. Lippincott, Co., 1964.
- Champrey, H., The Variables of Parent Behaviour,
J. Abnormal and Soc.Psychology, 36 pp 525-542

- Cloward, R.A. and Ohlin, L.E. Delinquency and Opportunity,
N.Y. Free Press, 1960.
- Cohen, A.K. Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang,
Free Press of Glencoe, 1955.
- Congalton, A.A., and Status Rankings of Occupations in
Havighurst, R.J., New Zealand, Aust.J. of Psych., 1954
Vol. 6, No.1 pp 10-15.
- Dollard, J., Miller, N.E., Dobb, L.W., Mowrer, O.H.,
and Seers, R., Frustration and aggression
New Haven: Yale Uni., Press, 1939.
- Downie, N.M. and Heath, R.W., Basic Statistical Methods, 2nd.Ed.,
Harper and Row, Inc., 1965
- Dirkheim, E. Suicide (transl.) Chicago:
Free press 1951.
- Erickson, E.H. Childhood and Society,
N.Y. Norton, 1930.
- Giallombardo, R. (Ed.) Juvenile Delinquency, a Book of
Readings, J. Wiley and sons Inc., 1966.
- Glueck, S. & Glueck, E.T. Unravelling Juvenile Delinquency,
N.Y. Commonwealth Fund, 1950.
- Gold, M., Status Forces in Delinquent Boys,
Uni., of Michigan, 1963.
- Griffin, J.H. Black like Me. Panther, 1962.
- Guilford, J.P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and
Education, 4th Ed., McGraw Hill, 1956
- Hagen, E.E., On the Theory of Social Change,
Tavistock Publications, 1964.

- Healy, W. and Brommer, A., A New Light on Delinquency and its Treatment.
New Haven: Yale Uni. Press 1936.
- Hirschi, T. Causes of Delinquency,
Uni. of California Press, 1969.
- Honnigman, J., Personality in Culture,
Harper and Row, 1967.
- Houston, S., (Ed.) Marriage and the Family in New Zealand,
Sweet and Maxwell ltd., N.Z. 1970.
- Hunn, J.K. Report on Department of Maori Affairs.
Govt. Printer, 1960.
- Kvaracus, W.C. Juvenile Delinquency and Social Class,
J.Educ. Sociol., 1944, 13 pp 51-54
- Lander, B. Towards an Understanding of Juvenile Delinquency.
N.Y. Columbia Uni., Press, 1954.
- Leighton, A.H. An Introduction to Social Psychiatry,
Springfield, Ill., 1960.
- Matza, D. Delinquency and Drift,
N.Y. Wiley, 1964.
- McCord. W. & McCord J., Origins of Crime,
with Zola, I.K. Columbia uni. Press, 1959
- Metge, J. A New Maori Migration,
Melbourne Uni. Press, 1964.

- The Maori Family, reported in Family in N.Z., S. Houston (Ed.) pp 112-140.
- Merrill, M.A. Problems of Child Delinquency.
 Boston: Houghton Mifflin 1947.
- Merton, R. Social Problems and Sociological Theory, reported in R.K. Merton, & R.A. Nisbett (Eds.) Contemporary Social Problems.
 N.Y. Harcourt Bruce & World, 1961.
- Miller, W., Lower Class Culture as a Generating Millieu of Gang Delinquency,
J.Soc.Issues 1958 14 pp 5 - 19
- Mulligan, D.G.? Maori Adolescence in Rakau,
 Vict.,Uni, Publications in Psych. No. 9 1957.
- Neil, A.S. Summerhill, Penguin Books, 1970
- Nye, R., Short, J., & Ohlson, V., Socio-economic Status & Delinquent Behaviour.
Amer. J. Sociol. 1958, 63 pp 381 - 389
- Peterson, D.R. & Wesley, C.B. Family Interaction in Delinquency, reported in Juvenile Delinquency Research and Theory,
 H.C. Quay (Ed).
 D. van Nostrand Co., Inc. 1965.
- Reckless, W.C. Dintz, S. & Murray, E.,
 'The Good Boy' in a High Delinquent Area.
J.Crim.Law Criminol. 48, pp18-26.

- Reiss, A.J. (Jr.) Unravelling Juvenile Delinquency I, An Appraisal of Research Methods, Amer.J. of Sociology, 1951
V. LVII No.2 pp 107-114
- Ritchie, J. Maori Families, Vict. Uni. Publications in Psych. No. 13, 1964.
- Ritchie, J.E., Basic Personality in Rakau, Vict. Uni. Publications in Psych No. 8, 1956
- The Making of a Maori.
A.H. & A.W. Reed, 1963.
- Rubin, J. Unravelling Juvenile Delinquency II Illusions in a Research Project Using Matched Pairs.
Amer. J. of Sociology, Vol. L.V.II No.2 pp. 115-120.
- Shaw C., & McKay H. Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas.
Chicago: University of Chicago press, 1942.
- Rejoinder to Jonassen,
Amer.Sociol. Rev. 14, pp 614-617.
- Siegel, S., Non-Parametric Statistics for the Behavioural Sciences.
McGraw Hill &Co., 1956
- Stinchombe, A.L. Rebellion in a High School,
Chicago: Quadrangle 1964.
- Sutherland, E.H. Principles of Criminology,
N.Y. Lippincott, 1939.
- Taylor, P.A. Ability, Education & Occupation in New Zealand, N.Z.C.E.R. unpublished data 1961.

- Taylor, ctd: Reported in Success & Failure at
the University, C.W. Parkyn, Vol.II.
The Problem of Failure, N.Z.C.E.R.1967.
- Vernon, P.E. Intelligence and Cultural Environment,
London: Methven & Co., 1969
- Watzalwick, P. 1963. A Review of the Double Bind
Theory. Family Process, 2: pp132-153