


Winter 1939

## Can Rural and Urban Delinquency be Compared

Paul Wiers

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Paul Wiers, Can Rural and Urban Delinquency be Compared, 30 *Am. Inst. Crim. L. & Criminology* 522 (1939-1940)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

# “CAN RURAL AND URBAN DELINQUENCY BE COMPARED?”

---

PAUL WIERS\*

---

## *Introduction*

Although much has been done to analyze the juvenile delinquency in large urban areas, little attention has been given to rural areas and to comparisons of delinquency in rural and urban areas. Emphasis has been upon the relationship of delinquency to the effects of growing industrialization on our social life. The scarcity of such comparative analyses is doubtless partially due to uncertainty as to the comparability of delinquency measures between different geographical areas.

A comprehensive set of objections to comparisons of delinquency measures based upon court records is presented by Miss Robison in her book “Can Delinquency Be Measured.” These may be summarized briefly:

- A. Court records are not sufficiently inclusive. Other public and private agencies handle many cases which do not appear in the court records. Many acts of misbehavior, though discovered, are not reported to any agency. Still others remain undiscovered. The proportions between the number of individuals handled by the courts and the number handled by other public and private agencies without a court record may not be the same between geographical areas or between times for a given area. The same condition applies to the relative proportions of recorded and unrecorded misbehavior.
- B. The compositions of the groups involved may be different with regard to sex, age, race (cultural patterns), offense, and (as an indirect measure of the seriousness of offense) disposition. Miss Robison holds that such differences show that rates based upon court records do not measure the same thing and hence that comparisons between them are invalid.

If these objections are true, comparisons of delinquency rates may be misleading—an unfortunate situation from the standpoint of the administration of preventive efforts, since resources are generally so limited that some basis of selection must be adopted. This study will attempt to determine the validity of comparisons be-

---

\* Central Statistical Bureau, Lansing, Michigan.

tween court delinquency rates for urban and rural county groups in Michigan during the three year period, July, 1934, to June, 1937.

#### COUNTY GROUPS†

The juvenile populations of most Michigan counties are so small that, taken individually, they do not constitute adequate population samples. The eighty-three counties of the State have been classified into four groups shown in Table I. These groups are, with few exceptions, mutually exclusive with regard to population density and percentage of total employed engaged in agriculture, forestry, fishing and mining.

#### MICHIGAN'S JUVENILE COURT CORRECTIONAL CYCLE

The "correctional cycle" may be briefly described as having the following stages in Michigan. An act of misbehavior is committed by a child. Some individual or agency becomes aware of this act and, if sufficiently interested or aggravated, files a complaint with the juvenile court. (In the larger cities private individuals frequently complain to the police, who, in turn, may file a complaint in the juvenile court. Private agencies also handle cases with or without referring to the courts.) A preliminary investigation of the complaint is made and from this information the Judge decides whether or not to issue a summons. If the summons is issued, a date is set for the court hearing. The child and other concerned parties appear in court at this date; all information concerning the complaint in question and the family and social background of the child collected by the agents of the court is made available to the Judge. At this time the Judge attempts to determine the truth of the complaint. If the complaint proves to be true, the Judge may decide immediately what treatment (i.e., "disposition") should be given the child, or he may postpone his decision until further information concerning the child's background, etc., can be obtained. The disposition may be one of the following types:

1. Dismissed or dismissed with warning or adjustment.<sup>1</sup>
2. Probation (probation officer or some other agency or individual supervising).
3. Institutionalization.
4. Other.

#### DIFFERENT MEASURES OF DELINQUENCY POSSIBLE

An examination of the correctional cycle shows that several

† For a more complete description of the county groups, refer to "Juvenile Delinquency in Rural Michigan" by the author published in the July-August issue.

<sup>1</sup> The records in Michigan combine those dismissed with warning and/or restitution without probation with those dismissed.

different measures of the amount of delinquency may be derived from court records. Any phase of the cycle from the initial petition to the final disposition might be used. These phases measure what might be termed different "levels" of seriousness in delinquent behaviour, the most serious being that in which it is considered desirable to remove the individual from his community by institutionalization.<sup>2</sup> The records available in Michigan make possible five measures based on court records:

1. Court Hearings.
2. Placed on Probation.
3. Sent to Institutions.
4. Probationers Outstanding.
5. Institutional Inmates.

Measures (4) and (5) are analogous to an "inventory" and refer to a balance on hand as of some given date, whereas (1), (2) and (3) refer to the number of cases received over a period of time.<sup>3</sup>

Differences between counties in the policies and activity of the courts and other agencies may not influence each of these measures in the same manner. Conceivably there might be more uniform agreement as to the types of cases which are sufficiently serious to warrant commitment to a correctional institution than there is with regard to those to be placed on probation. "Inventory" figures will be influenced by possible differences in the average length of the probation or commitment term. The selection of a measure must be a compromise between the desire to retain a large proportion of the total amount of juvenile misbehavior and the desire to minimize the effect of differences in the policies and facilities of the courts and other agencies.

#### ARE COURT RECORDS SUFFICIENTLY INCLUSIVE?

Obviously many factors stand between the commission of an act of juvenile misbehavior and a record of that misbehavior in the courts. Dr. L. J. Carr<sup>4</sup> has listed several of these as:

<sup>2</sup> It should be remembered that the environmental surroundings of the child as well as the nature of his delinquency are considered by the Judge in determining what disposition to make of the case. A disposition which might be satisfactory for a case in which the home and other environmental factors were good might be unsatisfactory if the home conditions of the child were likely to be conducive to further delinquency. The Juvenile Court is not a criminal court and does not have the same philosophy with regard to the relationship of offense and disposition.

<sup>3</sup> The differences between these two types of figures are analogous to the differences between the balance sheet and the income statement in accounting. Measure (5) is not shown.

<sup>4</sup> "Organizing to Reduce Delinquency," by Dr. L. J. Carr.

1. Discovery.
2. Willingness of someone to make a complaint.
3. Apprehension of the accused.
4. Police facilities and policies concerning such cases.
5. Facilities other than the juvenile court for handling such cases (i.e., without contacting the court).
6. Court policy concerning such cases (whether handled officially, unofficially, etc).
7. Accuracy of the complaint.
8. Pressure of public opinion.

Court records clearly do not measure the total amount of juvenile misbehavior. Many acts of misbehavior are either undiscovered or ignored. Of those which are apprehended, many are treated by the family, private agencies, or the police, without referring the individuals involved to the juvenile courts. Still, were there no differences in these conditions between counties or between times for a given county, court records would provide an accurate *index* of differences in the total amount of juvenile misbehavior, even though they would not provide an *accurate* measure of the *absolute* amount.

From the nature of the problem, it is not possible to determine the relative proportions of recorded and unrecorded delinquency. We can only surmise that there are a considerable number of acts of misbehavior which go undiscovered, and that many others which are discovered are treated by the family or otherwise without a record of any kind. In Michigan, existing records do not even make possible comparisons of the proportions between individuals handled by the courts and those handled without a court record by agencies other than the courts, except for those private agencies giving institutional care. There are six private agencies in the State offering institutional care for delinquents. The total number admitted to these institutions during the three year period Jan., 1934 to Dec., 1936 was 872. Of this number, 607 or 70% were referred directly by the courts. The remaining 30% were referred by parents, relatives or some agency. Individuals in this group may or may not have been contacted by the courts. Table II shows that the proportions of these individuals as between county groups are similar to those for court hearings.

The data for the five boroughs of New York presented by Miss Robison show that the rates based upon cases known to the court have relative sizes similar to those rates for individuals contacted

by courts and other agencies combined. This generalization likewise holds true for the data presented concerning truancy. (Table III). True, certain differences exist. Richmond borough,<sup>5</sup> for example, shows a lower percentage of the average rate for agency cases and truancy than for court cases. Yet the similarities between the various series are more striking than the differences. Manhattan is always high, Queens low.

The meagre evidence available tends to show that even though we insist that our measure of delinquency must reflect all recorded delinquency, court hearings may be a useful indicator provided we insist that only relatively large differences be treated as significant. As between rural and urban counties in Michigan, the differences observed in court rates would probably be increased were agency cases unknown to the courts included, since the industrialized counties have better developed police and other agency facilities.

From some points of view, court delinquency rates may be of importance in and of themselves. They measure the amount of abnormal behavior officially recognized by the community as a community problem. The proportion of serious cases handled by the courts is unquestionably higher than the proportion of such cases handled by private agencies without any court record. To some extent non-court agencies may act as actual substitutes for the court, i.e., cases which would otherwise actually appear in the courts if the alternative agency did not exist may fail to be recorded in court records. Yet these agencies also deal with many cases which, were it not for the existence of the agencies, would go undiscovered, or at least unreported. If the proportion of the latter type of cases is large, comparisons between an area having well developed non-court facilities and an area having little or no facilities other than the courts may be more reliable if based upon court records than if based upon all recorded delinquency.

#### ARE COURT RATES COMPARABLE BETWEEN AREAS?

The second set of objections put forward by Miss Robison seems to the author to be more serious than the first. These objections lead to the conclusion that there are differences in the *nature* of the delinquency problem as between areas, and that these differences are so great as to make invalid any conclusions as to differences in the *degree or extent* of the delinquency problem as a whole. Quite an opposite conclusion is reached from a study of

---

<sup>5</sup> With only 28,500 population aged 7-15, and a single year's cases, there is some doubt whether this is an adequate sample.

the sex, ages, offenses and dispositions of delinquents heard by the Juvenile Courts of urban and rural county groups in Michigan. The similarities between the county groups, especially for boys, are remarkable. This is also true of those committed to State correctional institutions.<sup>6</sup>

Boys constitute the majority of those handled regardless of the measure used. The preponderance of boys is much the same as between county groups for a given measure (Table IV), although girls form a larger proportion for those institutionalized (28%) than for court hearings (14%).<sup>7</sup> The remaining tables show that other differences between the sexes overshadow the differences between the county groups for a given sex. This indicates that at least the external<sup>8</sup> aspects of the delinquency problem are different for girls than for boys. Yet the relatively small proportions of girls involved and the fact that the proportions between girls and boys are roughly comparable between county groups, means that rates based upon boys and girls combined are probably comparable if we can assume comparability between county groups for each sex taken separately.

The proportions of children in yearly age groups are shown in Tables V and VI. Only minor differences between county groups appear. For court hearings, the girls average half a year older than the boys (14.9 years as compared to 14.3), and are more concentrated in the older age groups. To a smaller degree, the same differences exist between the county groups, the industrialized counties having the higher average ages and more concentration in the older age groups.

The relative importance of the various offenses of boys is much the same in each of the four county groups. For court hearings (Table VII), stealing of various types constitutes over 55% of the offenses for each group. Wayne County somewhat exceeds the other groups in the proportion of stealing and correspondingly has smaller proportions for other offenses, especially for truancy and acts of carelessness or mischief. The latter two offenses constitute about 15% each in the other groups—8% in Wayne. Ungovernability ranks next in all groups, averaging 6.6%. Sex offenses are relatively low, amounting to only 3.4%. Offenses of those com-

<sup>6</sup> Only information with respect to sex is available for those placed on probation.

<sup>7</sup> Wayne County girls are low because only relatively serious girl's cases reach the Juvenile Court. Less serious cases are handled by private agencies and the Women's Police Division.

<sup>8</sup> If delinquent acts are regarded merely as indications of emotional conflicts, the nature of the delinquent act itself may or may not be important.

mitted to the Boys Vocational School (Table VIII), show even greater similarity. Stealing is charged in 75% of the cases.

The types of offenses reported for the court hearings of girls do not show the same consistency between county groups as those for boys. Nevertheless, truancy and running away, ungovernability, and sex offenses combined amount to 80% or more of the cases in each group. Since there is doubtless considerable overlapping of these terms with reference to girls' cases, the similarities of offenses in the different groups may be greater than they appear. Stealing ranks fourth in all groups, but does not amount to more than 11% in any of them.

The type of disposition made of a case may perhaps be taken as indicative of the seriousness of the offense involved.<sup>9</sup> Here again differences in the proportions for the three main types of dispositions are not so great between county groups as they are between the sexes (Table IX). Dispositions of boys' cases are much the same in all four groups. About 50% are placed on probation. Dispositions of girls' cases show some differences, as between county groups, especially for Wayne, which has relatively few dismissals and more placed on probation. In Wayne County only the more serious girls' cases reach the Juvenile Court. Less serious cases are handled by private agencies and the Women's Police Division.

#### SUMMARY

Several different measures of delinquency based upon different phases of the correctional cycle are available. Of these, rates for court hearings are most inclusive. What evidence is available tends to show that even though we insist that our measure of delinquency must reflect all recorded delinquency, court hearings may be a useful indicator provided only relatively large differences are treated as significant.

The different measures available in Michigan show remarkable comparability between rural and urban county groups with respect to sex, age, offense and disposition.<sup>10</sup> Differences between the sexes are greater than the differences between the county groups for a given sex. Boys are more comparable between county groups than girls.

The *nature* of the delinquency problems dealt with by the Ju-

<sup>9</sup> See footnote 2.

<sup>10</sup> Studies by the author published in the "Delinquency News Letter" for January and February, 1937, indicate that the seasonal variations and the yearly trends are similar as between these county groups.



venile Courts is apparently quite similar as between urban and rural county groups in Michigan. The *extent* of the problems is, however, different. Apart from the fact that rural counties have smaller numbers because of their smaller populations, their rates per capita are considerably lower for all measures (Table X). Rural county rates for court hearings are about half those for industrialized counties. This indicates that although industrialization leads to higher rates, it by no means accounts for the entire delinquency problem.

TABLE I  
COUNTY GROUP CHARACTERISTICS  
1930 Census

	Wayne County	Industrial Counties	So. Agri. Counties	Up-State Counties	State of Michigan
Number of Counties.....	1	16	26	40	83
Population Aged 10-16.....	225,800	215,900	94,600	85,900	622,200
Total Population Density per Square Mile .....	3046.7	167.6	41.5	18.3	84.2
Percentage of State's Area..	1.1	17.9	28.3	52.7	100.0
Percentage of Total Employed Engaged in Agriculture, Fishing, Forestry or Min- ing .....	.9	12.8	44.8	44.4	15.1

Source: 1930 Census.

TABLE II  
PRIVATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS: TOTAL ADMISSIONS BY COURT AND NON-COURT  
REFERRAL; AVERAGE YEARLY RATES PER 1,000 POPULATION AGED 10-16  
January, 1934, to December, 1936

Boys					
	Wayne County	Industrial Counties	So. Agri. Counties	Up-State Counties	State of Michigan
<i>Admissions to Private Cor- rectional Institutions</i>					
Court Referral .....	.712	.235	.106	.062	.364
Non-Court Referral .....	.062	.080	.049	.062	.066
<i>First Admissions to Boys'</i>					
<i>Vocational School</i>					
July, 1934, to June, 1937...	1.13	1.41	.80	1.03	1.16
<i>Court Hearings</i>					
July, 1934, to June, 1937...	19.3	16.4	7.9	10.3	15.4
GIRLS					
	Wayne County	Industrial Counties	So. Agri. Counties	Up-State Counties	State of Michigan
<i>Admissions to Private Cor- rectional Institutions</i>					
Court Referral .....	.756	.019	.000	.039	.286
Non-Court Referral .....	.177	.367	.106	.070	.218
<i>First Admissions to Girls'</i>					
<i>Training School</i>					
July, 1934, to June, 1937...	.30	.58	.42	.55	.45
<i>Court Hearings</i>					
July, 1934, to June, 1937...	1.9	3.5	2.4	1.7	2.5

Source: Institution reports of admissions.

TABLE III  
BOROUGH RATES AS PERCENTAGES OF CITY RATES  
AGENCY AND CHILDREN'S COURT RECORDS, NEW YORK CITY, 1930

	Manhattan Borough	Bronx Borough	Brooklyn Borough	Queens Borough	Richmond Borough	N.Y.C. Rate Per 1,000 Aged 7-15
<i>Series A: Referred During 1930</i>						
Known to Court..	151	76	100	52	124	6.8
Total Known to Court and/or Agencies.	161	82	90	62	86	10.0
<i>Series B: Referred Before 1930; Care Continued in 1930</i>						
Known to Court..	203	109	32	104	164	.75
Total Known to Court and/or Agencies.	191	110	63	58	55	3.02
<i>Series C: Selected Truancy Cases*</i>						
Total .....	176	81	91	46	41	3.54
Serious .....	205	93	76	32	23	1.52
Percentage of Court Cases dismissed ..	43.6	37.6	48.3	34.0	44.0	43.9
1930 Population Aged 7-15 Years .....	234,500	194,700	417,000	162,900	28,500	1,037,500

\* Cases taken from the records of the Bureau of Attendance, Department of Education. Cases consist of deliberate absence from school without the knowledge or consent of parents. 35% of the cases included in Series C were also included in Series A.

Source: "Can Delinquency Be Measured," by Miss S. M. Robison.

TABLE IV  
PROPORTIONS OF BOYS TO GIRLS  
July, 1934 to June, 1937

	Wayne County		Industrial Counties		So. Agri. Counties		Up-State Counties		State of Michigan	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G
1—Court Hearings .....	91.0	9.0	82.4	17.6	76.7	23.3	85.8	14.2	86.0	14.0
2—Placed on Probation.	90.7	9.3	85.3	14.7	83.6	16.4	86.8	13.2	87.7	12.3
3—First Admissions to BVS and GTS*.....	79.1	20.9	70.7	29.3	65.5	34.5	65.0	35.0	72.1	27.9
4—Probationers Outstand- ing End of Mo. Avg..	87.2	12.8	82.4	17.6	85.3	14.7	87.3	12.7	85.5	14.5

\* From reports made by the Boys' Vocational School and Girls' Training School. These figures include individuals initially placed on probation and subsequently discharged from unsuccessful probation by commitment to the Boys' Vocational School and Girls' Training School. Such cases are included under probation in Table IX.

Source: Reports of County Agents and Juvenile Probation Officers.  
Boys' Vocational School, first admissions.  
Girls' Training School, first admissions.

TABLE V  
AGES OF DELINQUENT CHILDREN HEARD BY COURTS  
PERCENTAGE EACH AGE GROUP FORMS OF THE TOTAL  
July, 1934 to June, 1937

		Boys				
Ages		Wayne County	Industrial Counties	So. Agri. Counties	Up-State Counties	State of Michigan
Under	10	.3	3.8	6.6	5.1	3.3
10	— 11	2.8	3.6	4.6	7.0	3.9
11	— 12	6.2	5.8	8.3	7.9	6.4
12	— 13	9.4	10.1	10.3	12.4	10.2
13	— 14	15.1	12.7	13.8	15.1	13.8
14	— 15	22.1	20.5	19.9	20.6	20.9
15	— 16	23.3	23.3	21.0	19.8	22.6
16	— 17	20.8	20.2	15.6	12.0	18.9
14 and Over		66.2	64.0	56.5	52.4	62.4
Average Age		14.5	14.3	13.9	13.8	14.3
		GIRLS				
Under	10	.2	2.2	4.3	2.0	1.9
10	— 11	.2	2.0	3.0	3.4	1.7
11	— 12	1.4	3.3	3.3	4.9	2.9
12	— 13	2.0	5.7	7.2	12.2	5.4
13	— 14	6.3	11.2	11.1	10.2	9.7
14	— 15	18.1	22.5	24.6	21.0	21.3
15	— 16	35.9	29.3	26.9	25.9	30.6
16	— 17	35.9	23.9	19.7	20.5	26.5
14 and Over		89.9	75.7	71.2	67.4	78.4
Average Age		15.4	14.8	14.5	14.4	14.9

Source: Reports of County Agents and Juvenile Probation Officers.

TABLE VI  
AGES OF DELINQUENT CHILDREN  
FIRST ADMISSIONS TO STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS  
PERCENTAGE EACH AGE GROUP FORMS OF THE TOTAL  
July, 1934 to June, 1937

		Boys' Vocational School				
Under	10					
10	— 11					
11	— 12		.5	.9	1.6	.5
12	— 13	3.2	11.3	12.6	17.2	9.3
13	— 14	6.2	16.9	8.1	15.6	12.1
14	— 15	19.6	23.2	27.9	27.3	23.0
15	— 16	30.1	26.0	29.7	22.7	27.4
16	— 17	38.7	21.2	19.8	15.6	26.6
17	— 18	2.2	.9	.9		1.2
14 and Over		90.6	71.3	78.3	65.6	78.2
Average Age		15.5	14.8	14.9	14.5	15.0
		GIRLS' TRAINING SCHOOL				
Under	10		.5			.2
10	— 11		.5		2.8	.7
11	— 12		2.1	3.3	2.8	1.9
12	— 13	4.0	2.1	10.0	2.8	3.8
13	— 14	5.0	10.6	10.0	9.9	9.0
14	— 15	11.0	23.3	15.0	25.4	19.5
15	— 16	31.0	29.6	36.7	33.8	31.7
16	— 17	46.0	30.2	23.3	21.1	31.4
17	— 18	3.0	1.1	1.7	1.4	1.7
14 and Over		91.0	84.2	76.7	81.7	84.3
Average Age		15.7	15.2	15.0	15.0	15.2

Source: Boys' Vocational School. Girls' Training School.

TABLE VII  
 REPORTED OFFENSES OF CHILDREN HEARD BY COURTS  
 PERCENTAGE EACH OFFENSE GROUP FORMS OF THE TOTAL  
 July, 1934 to June, 1937

Offense	Boys				
	Wayne County	Industrial Counties	So. Agri. Counties	Up-State Counties	State of Michigan
Burglary and Stealing....	69.7	56.4	55.0	56.2	63.0
Truancy and Running					
Away .....	7.5	16.5	16.8	14.8	12.1
Ungovernable .....	6.2	7.4	8.0	4.4	6.6
Sex .....	4.2	3.0	1.7	2.3	3.4
Injury to Person.....	2.0	1.3	2.5	2.4	1.8
Acts of Carelessness					
or Mischief .....	7.8	11.2	14.6	18.9	10.5
Traffic Violations .....	1.6	4.2	1.3	1.1	2.5
		GIRLS			
Burglary and Stealing....	3.4	11.3	9.0	10.4	8.6
Truancy and Running					
Away .....	26.4	37.6	29.2	31.7	32.6
Ungovernable .....	53.0	21.7	21.9	27.7	31.3
Sex .....	12.3	19.2	36.2	22.3	19.9
Injury to Person.....	1.1	.9	.3	1.0	.9
Acts of Carelessness					
or Mischief .....	1.5	8.9	2.7	6.4	5.6
Traffic Violations .....	2.3	.5	.7	.5	1.0

Source: Reports of County Agents and Juvenile Probation Officers.

TABLE VIII  
 REPORTED OFFENSES OF CHILDREN  
 FIRST ADMISSIONS TO STATE CORRECTIQNAL INSTITUTIONS  
 PERCENTAGE EACH OFFENSE GROUP FORMS OF THE TOTAL  
 July, 1934 to June, 1937

Offense	Boys' VOCATIONAL SCHOOL				
	Wayne County	Industrial Counties	So. Agri. Counties	Up-State Counties	State of Michigan
Burglary and Stealing....	79.5	73.0	73.3	73.8	75.4
Truancy and Running					
Away .....	6.6	9.5	6.7	9.0	8.1
Ungovernable .....	8.6	13.6	15.2	14.8	12.1
Sex .....	1.4	3.0	2.9	.8	2.2
Injury to Person.....	3.3	.7		.8	1.6
Acts of Carelessness					
or Mischief .....	.6	.2	1.9	.8	.6
Traffic Violations .....					
		GIRLS' TRAINING SCHOOL			
Burglary and Stealing....	3.2	8.0	9.4	7.3	6.9
Truancy and Running					
Away .....	24.2	30.4	31.3	12.2	25.9
Ungovernable .....	53.2	31.2	28.1	58.5	40.9
Sex .....	17.7	30.4	31.3	22.0	25.9
Injury to Person.....	1.6				.4
Acts of Carelessness					
or Mischief .....					
Traffic Violations .....					

Source: Boys' Vocational School.  
 Girls' Training School.

TABLE IX  
DISPOSITIONS OF CHILDREN HEARD BY COURTS  
PERCENTAGE EACH MAJOR TYPE OF DISPOSITION FORMS OF TOTAL DISPOSITIONS  
July, 1934 to June, 1937

Disposition	Boys				
	Wayne County	Industrial Counties	So. Agri. Counties	Up-State Counties	State of Michigan
Dismissed .....	27.4	23.0	22.7	27.5	25.5
Probation .....	51.1	51.4	54.0	53.4	51.6
Boys' Vocational School..	5.4	6.4	6.9	7.1	6.2
Other .....	16.1	19.2	16.4	12.0	18.7

Disposition	Girls				
	Wayne County	Industrial Counties	So. Agri. Counties	Up-State Counties	State of Michigan
Dismissed .....	4.5	23.7	29.2	19.4	18.6
Probation .....	53.2	41.5	34.8	49.3	44.7
Girls' Training School....	14.6	11.2	11.4	14.7	12.9
Other .....	27.2	23.6	24.6	16.6	24.1

Source: Reports of County Agents and Juvenile Probation Officers.

TABLE X  
URBAN AND RURAL DELINQUENCY RATES COMPARED  
AVERAGE YEARLY RATES PER 1,000 POPULATION AGED 10-16  
July, 1934 to June, 1937

	Wayne County		Industrial Counties		So. Agri. Counties		Up-State Counties		State of Michigan	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G
1—Court Hearings .....	19.3	1.9	16.4	3.5	7.9	2.4	10.3	1.7	15.4	2.5
2—Placed on Probation.	9.86	1.01	8.43	1.45	4.27	.84	5.50	.84	7.95	1.12
3—First Admissions to BVS and GTS*.....	1.13	.30	1.41	.58	.80	.42	1.03	.55	1.16	.45
4—Probationers Outstanding End of Mo. Avg. ...	12.41	1.82	7.56	1.61	5.26	.91	3.43	.50	8.40	1.43

\* From reports made by the Boys' Vocational School and Girls' Training School. These figures include individuals initially placed on probation and subsequently discharged from unsuccessful probation by commitment to the Boys' Vocational School and Girls' Training School. Such cases are included under probation in Table IX.

Source: Reports of County Agents and Juvenile Probation Officers.  
Boys' Vocational School, first admissions.  
Girls' Training School, first admissions.