

Spring 1964

The Offense Patterns and Family Structures of Urban, Village and Rural Delinquents

Theodore N. Ferdinand

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

Theodore N. Ferdinand, The Offense Patterns and Family Structures of Urban, Village and Rural Delinquents, 55 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 86 (1964)

This Criminology 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.

THE OFFENSE PATTERNS AND FAMILY STRUCTURES OF URBAN, VILLAGE AND RURAL DELINQUENTS

THEODORE N. FERDINAND*

Benjamin Whorf's hypothesis that the ontology a group develops depends upon its language structure is illustrated nicely in the manner in which the data supplied by state and federal agencies have shaped the research efforts of sociologists seeking to unravel delinquency. Not only have these agencies supplied the ammunition with which many of the sociological battles concerning delinquency have been fought, but the manner in which they have unself-consciously grouped their information has also determined to some degree the specific points over which the skirmishes have contended.

The fact, for example, that official agencies routinely report the sex, race, family structure, and offense of the delinquent but not the social characteristics of his community has inclined researchers to ask many questions about the contribution of the family to delinquency but relatively few about the way in which community organization induces delinquency. The question, for example, as to whether broken homes, *per se*, are causally related to delinquency today has largely been resolved thanks to the efforts of men like Monahan,¹ Nye,² and Toby.³ The consensus among sociologists seems to be that broken homes, while often themselves the product of conditions that encourage delinquency, e.g., alienated and anomic marriage partners, also deprive the adolescents involved of the parental guidance that would help insulate them from other pressures toward delinquency.

A second issue that has consumed much energy is based upon the well known fact that family disorganization is more prominent in the history of

delinquent girls than delinquent boys. One explanation asserts that girls are more sensitive to rents in their social fabric than boys and, therefore, when exposed to the trauma that surrounds a broken home, they are more likely to respond in maladaptive, deviant ways.⁴ Another interpretation suggests that families at a given level of cohesiveness provide their female adolescents considerably more guidance and supervision than their male teen-agers, and when the family is ruptured through divorce or death, the consequent collapse is much more significant for girls than boys.⁵

Additional explanations for the relative prominence of broken homes in the backgrounds of female delinquents could be offered, but the main point here is that the early patterns which emerged in the data collected by official agencies captured the attention of sociologists to an inordinate degree, leaving other equally important issues relatively untouched. Our knowledge about male and female delinquents is far more complete than our knowledge of middle and working class delinquency, and the contribution of family disorganization to delinquency is more thoroughly understood than that of community unsolidarity.

In order to help redress the balance, therefore, this paper will attempt to identify some of the respective characteristics of delinquents residing in urban, village, or rural communities. Much of the information currently available concerning rural and urban delinquency deals with either the relative delinquency rates in these two areas or the degree of sophistication displayed by rural and urban delinquents.⁶

Our knowledge of the offense patterns or the social background of rural and urban delinquents is negligible, but such information, it would seem,

* Dr. Ferdinand is Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology of Northeastern University.

The author is deeply grateful to the Michigan Department of Social Welfare and Mr. Willis M. Oosterhof for making available to him the data upon which this study is based.

¹ Monahan, *Family Status and the Delinquent Child: A Reappraisal and Some New Findings*, 35 *SOCIAL FORCES* 250-58 (1957).

² NYE, *FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS AND DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR* (1958).

³ Toby, *The Differential Impact of Family Disorganization*, 22 *AM. SOC. REV.* 505 (1957).

⁴ BLOCK & FLYNN, *DELINQUENCY; THE JUVENILE OFFENDER IN AMERICA TODAY* 185 (1956).

⁵ Toby, *supra* note 3, at 512.

⁶ See, e.g., WIER, *ECONOMIC FACTORS IN MICHIGAN DELINQUENCY* (1944); Lentz, *Rural-Urban Differentials and Juvenile Delinquency*, 47 *J. CRIM. L., C. & P.S.* 331 (1956); Clinard, *The Process of Urbanization and Criminal Behavior*, 48 *AM. J. SOC.* 202 (1942).

is indispensable if we are to resolve our image of rural and urban delinquents to the same clarity that characterizes our picture of male and female delinquents.

To this end the Michigan Department of Social Welfare made available to the writer all the data routinely collected from the juvenile courts of Michigan in 1960. Over the years the Department of Social Welfare has become the clearing house to which all the juvenile courts in Michigan, except the Wayne County courts serving Detroit, send information about their delinquency experience. Each court is supplied by the Department of Social Welfare with a standard form upon which it records a wide range of information about each child it receives. This report is subsequently returned to the Department of Social Welfare.

The information in these reports is gathered by the courts in the course of their social investigation into each child's case, and since many unofficial cases are subjected to this procedure, the reports describe both official and unofficial cases. Indeed, in 1958, 29.8 percent of the cases reported to the Department of Social Welfare were handled unofficially by the courts in Michigan.⁷ After the Department of Social Welfare had processed the reports of the several courts, a copy of the assembled data was turned over to the writer for this investigation.

In analyzing this information, it was decided to compare the social characteristics of delinquents living in urban, village, and rural communities. There is good reason to suspect that the social organization of these three types of communities is sufficiently different to affect the style or manner in which deviant behavior is expressed. And accordingly the data were first broken down into three categories defined in terms of the offender's place of residence. In order to identify these three community types in Michigan, information supplied by the United States Census Bureau about each of the 83 counties in Michigan was utilized. The individuals living in a county were considered as living in rural areas if, according to the Census Bureau, less than 15 percent of the inhabitants lived in urban places, between 40 and 60 percent lived in rural, non-farm residences, and more than 40 percent lived on farms. Under these criteria 11 counties were identified as rural counties in Michi-

gan, none of which had a settlement with more than 6,000 inhabitants.

The individuals living in a county were considered as living in villages if between 32 and 40 percent lived in urban places, between 16 and 40 percent lived in rural, non-farm residences, and between 16 and 48 percent lived on farms. The 15 counties identified in this manner contained only two settlements between 20,000 and 25,000 in population; four with between 10,000 and 20,000 inhabitants; and 14 with less than 10,000 but more than 6,000 inhabitants.

The two counties that include Flint and a part of Detroit were taken as the urban counties, and together they had less than 6 percent of their population living on farms in 1950, less than 25 percent living in rural, non-farm residences, and more than 72 percent living in urban places.

Although these three categories were defined arbitrarily and some overlap in two dimensions could not be avoided, they did permit us to identify the 11 counties in Michigan with the greatest percentage of farm residents and the smallest percentage of urban residents; the 15 counties with moderate percentages of both farm and urban residents; and the two counties with the highest percentage of urban population. The remaining 55 counties in Michigan were not so unimodal in their character.

Once the rural, village, and urban delinquents had been identified in this manner, they were broken down further in terms of their sex, their offense patterns, and their family structure. Two types of offense patterns were defined in the following way: first, those delinquents who committed the offense of Auto Stealing, Other Stealing, Damage to Property, Carelessness, or Mischief were considered to be property offenders; while those who were Truant, Incurable, Disobedient, or had Run Away were considered as offenders against authority. Non-whites were not included in this investigation because they were concentrated in the urban counties almost exclusively.

The results of the analysis to be presented below suggest several major conclusions. First, as the community type becomes more urban, family disorganization becomes increasingly more prominent in the history of male property delinquents. Male offenders against authority and female offenders, however, fail to exhibit this same pattern.

Second, many of the differences between male and female offenders stem largely from the different

⁷MICH. DEP'T OF SOCIAL WELFARE, MICHIGAN JUVENILE COURT REPORTING (1959).

mix of delinquent types they include and not from any intrinsic differences the two sexes may exhibit. Third, there is a clear preference of rural delinquents, both male and female, for property offenses, while the delinquencies of urban offenders are more evenly balanced between property offenses and offenses against authority. These, then, are the major findings to be reported below.

In order to get a more detailed picture of the results, however, let us turn directly to the findings. In Table I male delinquents are analyzed in terms of their-community type and family structure, and a strong positive relationship between

urbanization and the percentage of delinquents from voluntarily broken homes is apparent. Moreover, the significance of the father in the rural household seems to be considerably greater than in the urban home, since the percentage of families broken by the death of the father in rural areas is more than double that in urban areas. This finding may suggest that while the father in rural families plays a key role in forestalling delinquent behavior among his sons, in urban areas he is not quite so indispensable in this regard. These findings are supported and extended somewhat by the results reported in Tables II and III. Here we see

TABLE I
MALE JUVENILE OFFENDERS ACCORDING TO THE MARITAL STATUS OF THE PARENTS AND COMMUNITY TYPE^a

Community Type	Marital Status of Parents									
	Married & Together		Separated, Divorced or Deserted		Mother Dead ^b		Father Dead ^b		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Rural.....	65.8	127	19.2	37	2.0	4	13.0	25	100.0	193
Village.....	70.3	295	21.4	90	1.4	6	6.9	29	100.0	420
Urban.....	63.6	432	25.9	176	4.4	30	6.0	41	99.9	679
All Groups.....	66.0	854	23.5	303	3.1	40	7.3	95	99.9	1292

^a The frequency matrix yields a chi-square of 23.68 with 6 degrees of freedom and a probability less than .01. Yates' correction for continuity was applied where appropriate.

^b The matrix of these two columns above yields a chi-square of 10.71 with 2 degrees of freedom and a probability less than .01.

TABLE II
MALE JUVENILE OFFENDERS AGAINST PROPERTY ACCORDING TO THE MARITAL STATUS OF THE PARENTS AND COMMUNITY TYPE^a

Community Type	Marital Status of Parents									
	Married & Together		Separated, Divorced, or Deserted		Mother Dead ^b		Father Dead ^b		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Rural.....	67.0	120	17.9	32	1.7	3	13.4	24	100.0	179
Village.....	72.0	262	19.2	70	1.4	5	7.4	27	100.0	364
Urban.....	67.4	348	22.7	117	4.3	22	5.6	29	100.0	516
All Groups.....	68.9	730	20.7	219	2.8	30	7.6	80	100.0	1059

^a The frequency matrix yields a chi-square of 21.14 with 6 degrees of freedom and a probability less than .01. Yates' correction for continuity was applied where appropriate.

^b The matrix of these two columns above yields a chi-square of 13.57 with 2 degrees of freedom and is significant beyond .01.

that the relationships exhibited in Table I are almost entirely due to the characteristics peculiar to the property offender. The relationship between family disorganization and community type is specific to the property offender only. Moreover, the father of the property offender is more likely to be absent through death in rural areas than in urban areas, while among offenders against authority this pattern does not emerge at all. In addition, the mother seems to assume a slightly greater significance in preventing delinquency in the families of urban property offenders since her absence through death is somewhat more common there than among the families of rural property offenders. As before, this pattern does not appear in the data describing male offenders against authority.

In general, then, it would seem that the incidence of offenses against property among males is associated with a complex relationship between family disorganization and community organization. In rural areas, male property offenders are more likely to derive from families broken by the death of the father, but conversely in urban settings they are likely to be from families broken voluntarily by separation, divorce, or desertion or by the death of the mother.

The male offender against authority, however, does not seem to be so responsive to changes in the social organization of his environment. Although he is more likely to be found in disorganized families than the property offender, this likelihood is fairly constant for all types of family disorganization regardless of the surrounding community.

In order to examine the relationship between

these same variables in a different context, it was decided to extend our analysis to female delinquents. Accordingly, female offenders were broken down in terms of their place of residence and type of offense, and the family structure of each examined. Unfortunately the number of cases was too few in some instances to enable even rather sharp trends to be statistically significant. The pattern that emerges, however, is quite distinctive and deserves further comment.

First of all, it is apparent from an examination of Tables IV, V, and VI that the summary data on female delinquents presented in Table IV below fails to exhibit any regular trends primarily because it combines data on 78 property offenders who do exhibit some interesting tendencies, with data on 240 offenders against authority who do not. The property offenders were not sufficiently numerous nor their characteristics sharply enough drawn to counterbalance the lack of regular trends in the offenders against authority.

One relationship that does manifest itself in Table IV, however, is the relationship between the sex of the delinquent and the manner in which the family structure was ruptured by death. If we compare Table IV with Table I, we see that 10.4 percent of the female delinquents came from families in which the father was removed through death, while 7.3 percent of the male delinquents were exposed to similar circumstances in their families. In contrast, 3.1 percent of the males and 1.2 percent of the females came from homes in which the mother had died. Apparently the death of the father prejudices the girl's chances of avoiding delinquency more so than the boy's, while

TABLE III

MALE JUVENILE OFFENDERS AGAINST AUTHORITY ACCORDING TO THE MARITAL STATUS OF THE PARENTS AND COMMUNITY TYPE^a

Community Type	Marital Status of Parents									
	Married & Together		Separated, Divorced, or Deserted		Mother Dead		Father Dead		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Rural.....	50.0	7	35.7	5	7.1	1	7.2	1	100.0	14
Village.....	59.0	33	35.7	20	1.8	1	3.6	2	100.0	56
Urban.....	51.5	84	36.2	59	4.9	8	7.4	12	100.0	163
All Groups.....	53.2	124	36.1	84	4.3	10	6.4	15	100.0	233

^a The frequency matrix yields a chi-square that is not significant.

conversely the death of the mother is more significant in this regard for the boy than the girl. When these two patterns were compared statistically, the chi-square was 5.46 with 1 degree of freedom and a probability of having occurred by chance of less than 2 percent. It should be noted here, however, that abstracting columns from separate tables and comparing them statistically is likely to capitalize on chance fluctuations and, hence, does not always yield reliable estimates.

In Tables V and VI, the characteristics of the female property offender and the female offenders against authority are given. Although these tables reveal no statistically significant patterns, they do exhibit some interesting trends. For example, the percentage of property offenders from voluntarily broken homes tends to decline as the community type becomes more urbanized. The

offenders against authority, however, exhibit no such trend. The difference between the types of offenders in this regard is statistically significant, giving a chi-square of 10.03 with 2 degrees of freedom and a chance probability of less than 1 percent, although, for reasons outlined above, we may not conclude definitely that the differences cited are reliable.

Female offenders against authority, like their male counterparts, exhibit no relationship between family disorganization and community type, although family disorganization generally is a much more important factor in their background than in the background of female property offenders.

It is important to note, while comparing male and female delinquents, that in spite of any difference that may exist in the way in which family structure and community organization interact to

TABLE IV

FEMALE JUVENILE OFFENDERS ACCORDING TO THE MARITAL STATUS OF THE PARENTS AND COMMUNITY TYPE^a

Community Type	Marital Status of Parents									
	Married & Together		Separated, Divorced, or Deserted		Mother Dead		Father Dead		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Rural.....	56.3	18	31.2	10	—	—	12.5	4	100.0	32
Village.....	59.6	53	29.2	26	1.1	1	10.1	9	100.0	89
Urban.....	55.3	109	33.0	65	1.5	3	10.2	20	100.0	197
All Groups.....	56.6	180	31.8	101	1.2	4	10.4	33	100.0	318

^a The frequency matrix yields a chi-square that is not significant.

TABLE V

FEMALE OFFENDERS AGAINST PROPERTY ACCORDING TO THE MARITAL STATUS OF THE PARENTS AND COMMUNITY TYPE^a

Community Type	Marital Status of Parents									
	Married & Together		Separated, Divorced, or Deserted		Mother Dead		Father Dead		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Rural.....	61.0	11	27.9	5	—	—	11.1	2	100.0	18
Village.....	62.8	22	25.8	9	—	—	11.4	4	100.0	35
Urban.....	68.0	17	16.0	4	4.0	1	12.0	3	100.0	25
All Groups.....	64.1	50	23.1	18	1.3	1	11.5	9	100.0	78

^a The frequency matrix yields a chi-square that is not significant.

TABLE VI
FEMALE OFFENDERS AGAINST AUTHORITY ACCORDING TO THE MARITAL STATUS OF THE PARENTS AND
COMMUNITY TYPE^a

Community Type	Marital Status of Parents									
	Married & Together		Separated, Divorced, or Deserted		Mother Dead		Father Dead		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Rural.....	50.0	7	35.7	5	—	—	14.3	2	100.0	14
Village.....	57.4	31	31.5	17	1.9	1	9.3	5	100.1	54
Urban.....	53.5	92	35.5	61	1.2	2	9.9	17	100.1	172
All Groups.....	54.1	130	34.6	83	1.3	3	10.0	24	100.0	240

^a The frequency matrix yields a chi-square that is not significant.

influence property offenders, the summary data on property and authority offenders is in quite close agreement for both male and female delinquents. The percent of property offenders from homes broken voluntarily, i.e., through separation, divorce, or desertion, was 20.7 and 23.1 respectively for males and females. These same statistics for male and female offenders against authority were 36.1 percent and 34.6 percent, respectively. Clearly the differences between property offenders and offenders against authority are greater than those between male and female offenders. This consistency between the sexes corroborates the finding reported by Weeks in which the commonly reported differences in the family backgrounds of male and female delinquents nearly disappears when only those male and female delinquents who have committed similar offenses are compared.⁸

The difference in family background between the sexes that appears when we compare Tables I and IV, therefore, is largely based on the fact that 82.0 percent of the male delinquents but only 24.5 percent of the female delinquents were property offenders. It should also be noted that the heavy predominance of male delinquency over female delinquency—i.e., 4.1 male offenders for every female offender—is entirely due to the large number of male property offenders. Offenders against authority appear with nearly equal frequency among male and female delinquents, as Tables III and VI indicate.

The final analysis in this study compares the offense patterns displayed by delinquents in rural,

⁸ Weeks, *Male and Female Broken Home Rates by Types of Delinquency*, 5 AM. SOC. REV. 601 (1940).

village, and urban communities. In Table VII the ratio of property offenders to offenders against authority is presented according to community type, family structure, and sex. Although there is considerable variation in the magnitude of the ratio, it decreases markedly as the community becomes more urbanized for nearly every type of delinquent. In other words, the number of offenses against authority generally increases much faster than the number of property offenses as urbanization proceeds. It would seem, therefore, that property offenses are nearly typical of rural delinquents, but that urban delinquents are more inclined to commit both types of offenses.

In sum, then, these findings suggest that the family structure of male and female property offenders is likely to vary considerably, depending on the nature of their community. Male and female offenders against authority, however, are not so variable in this regard. There does not seem to be any general hypersensitivity on the part of females to family disorganization, since male and female delinquents who have committed similar offenses tend to resemble each other also in the likelihood of their coming from broken homes. Male delinquents, however, appear to be peculiarly allergic to the death of the mother, while the death of the father seems to be particularly traumatic for female delinquents. And finally, delinquents in rural areas seem to be predisposed to commit property offenses, while urban delinquents are relatively more inclined to commit offenses against authority.

The pattern of these findings suggests several hypotheses regarding the nature of delinquency. First, it would appear that property offenders

TABLE VII

THE RATIO OF PROPERTY OFFENDERS TO OFFENDERS AGAINST AUTHORITY ACCORDING TO THE MARITAL STATUS OF THE PARENTS AND COMMUNITY TYPE FOR MALE AND FEMALE DELINQUENTS

Community Type	Marital Status of Parents									
	Married & Together		Separated, Divorced, or Deserted		Mother Dead		Father Dead		Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Rural.....	17.1	1.57	6.4	1.00	3.0	—	24.0	1.00	12.8	1.13
Village.....	7.9	.67	3.5	.53	5.0	—	13.5	.80	6.5	.65
Urban.....	4.1	.18	2.0	.07	2.7	.50	2.4	.18	3.2	.15
All Groups.....	5.9	.39	2.6	.22	3.0	.33	5.3	.37	4.5	.32

and offenders against authority constitute two rather distinctive types of delinquents. Property offenders, for example, are somewhat less likely to have experienced family disorganization than offenders against authority. When it does appear in his environment, however, the significance of family disorganization is much more closely conditioned by his place of residence and sex than with authority offenders. All of this probably indicates that property offenders, as a type, have become delinquent largely through their experiences in extra-family groups, i.e., as a result, perhaps, of an intensive exposure to a delinquent subculture or a subjection to systematic class discrimination. It would seem that if they had lived in a beneficent, conventional environment, many of them might have avoided delinquency altogether.

We do not mean to imply that property offenders all follow similar paths in their development nor that the same constellation of factors is operative in the history of every property offender. We are asserting, however, that in most cases the family has performed its function of shaping the child's personality in a reasonably adequate way and that if it is deficient in any regard, it has failed primarily to insulate the child sufficiently from external, deleterious influences.

The offender against authority, however, probably presents a rather different etiology. First, his offense is directed at persons and institutions that are ubiquitous and irresistible as far as he is concerned, i.e., his parents and the public school system. This fact suggests that the likelihood of detection and ultimate punishment carries little weight in affecting the child's course of action; he must register his protest against authoritarian

structures no matter what the cost. It would seem, therefore, that offenses against authority express rather deep-seated antipathies for conventional social structures and that these attitudes are supported by motive structures integrally woven into the personalities of the children involved. We might suggest, then, that offenses against authority signal fairly severe personality disturbances when they appear in delinquents.

Secondly, the fact that family disorganization in one form or another appears in the history of nearly half the authority offenders suggests that the source of the severe disturbance centers right in the home. The relationships between the parents apparently were not sufficiently wholesome to enable even an adequate socialization of the child. Thus, while the property offender's difficulties may arise as a result of the inability of the family to protect him from delinquency pressures in the community, the offender against authority probably could not avoid some form of anti-social activity even in the most healthful of community environments.

Using this typology and the assumptions underlying it, we can explain several other relationships that appeared in this investigation. For example, the fact that authority offenses are much more common among urban delinquents is consistent with what we know about the incidence of family disorganization in urban and rural areas. There is considerable evidence that divorce, separation, and desertion are somewhat more common among urban families than among families in villages or rural areas.⁹ Apparently, the greater incidence of offenders against authority in urban areas is a

⁹ Cannon, *Marriage and Divorce in Iowa, 1940-1947*, 9 MARRIAGE AND FAMILY LIVING 81 (1947).

reflection of the fact that seriously disorganized families, which are unable to socialize their children adequately, are more likely to appear there. It should be noted that this interpretation supplements the view commonly held that delinquency is largely an urban phenomenon because delinquent values and techniques have taken root in some adolescent groups which in turn sponsor its spread through their success in recruiting new members.

This typology would also suggest that, although characteristic differences in the incidence of homes broken voluntarily should distinguish property offenders and offenders against authority, homes broken through death should occur with equal frequency among the two types of delinquents. Presumably death strikes the families of both types of delinquents with approximately the same frequency. The data supplied in Tables II, III, V, and VI indicate that 10.6 percent of the property offenders came from homes in which one parent had been removed by death, while 11.0 percent of the offenders against authority came from similar homes. This in spite of the fact that 20.0 percent of the property offenders but 35.3 percent of the offenders against authority came from homes broken voluntarily by separation, divorce, or desertion. Apparently the mere fact of a disrupted family is not enough to induce the children to defy authority; rather the circumstances under which the family was disrupted seem to be the crucial factor.

One finding reported above, however, that defies explanation in terms of this typology, at least, is the fact that the percentage of voluntarily broken homes among property offenders increases among males but appears to decrease among females as the community type becomes more urban.

This finding may simply reflect the fact that separation, divorce, and desertion generally are more common among urban populations. Thus, male property offenders in this instance may be just mirroring trends implicit in the larger population. If this explanation is correct, however, we should note that there are some rather strong counter-pressures operating on these same data to swing them in the opposite direction. For example, we have already noted that fathers in

rural families play an instrumental role in training and disciplining their children. Hence, when divorce or death removes the father, his loss in rural areas is keenly felt and is probably reflected in the fact that 13.4 percent of the male property offenders residing in rural areas, but only 5.6 percent of those in urban areas, had lost fathers through death. In this case this factor apparently was not sufficiently strong to counterbalance the fact that considerably more disorganized families are available in urban communities to produce property offenders than in rural areas.

This interpretation, however, could not explain why female property offenders fail to exhibit the same pattern. It may be, however, that the slight trend depicted in Table V is a reflection of nothing more than accidental factors and, hence, not worthy of serious consideration.

In conclusion, then, we have attempted in this study to provide some information concerning some questions that are relatively unexplored in the study of delinquency. We have demonstrated that delinquents who commit property offenses and delinquents who commit offenses against authority exhibit two distinctive sets of characteristics. We have shown that urban and rural delinquents also tend to differ systematically in the offense patterns they display. And, finally, we have suggested that male and female delinquents tend to differ principally in the frequency with which they elect offenses against property and that their overall differences stem mainly from this fact.

We have based these observations entirely on data generously supplied by the Michigan Department of Social Welfare and, consequently, any inaccuracies or distortion that official data suffer from probably affect these data, too. These biases are well known and need not be described here. One difficulty, however, which this researcher felt acutely that has not been so widely commented upon is the fact that in working with official data, the investigator has no access to the individuals represented by the data cards, and hence is completely cut off from the kind of first hand involvement that often provides the most insightful and sophisticated hypotheses. Thus, when paradoxes appear in the data, there is no experience from which pregnant hunches might be drawn.