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SOME DELINQUENT BOYS AT SCHOOL

A study of the school progress and behaviour of a group of boys brought to official notice on charges of delinquency.
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CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

1. Aim of the Study.

The object of this study is to investigate the extent to which the boys who come before the Children's Court as delinquents, show signs of maladjustment at school, to show what behaviour problems they manifest, and how they compare in school-work, games, and personal relationships, with what the teacher judges to be the "ordinary child". The aim in each case has been to gather data as complete as possible concerning the school history of each boy, to present an estimate of his present level of achievement and development, and to interpret these facts. An attempt will be made to show what happens to these children at school and what provision is made to enable them to achieve some degree of adjustment.

2. Choice of the Problem.

Very little investigation has been carried out in New Zealand concerning delinquency in general, and, to the
writer's knowledge, none at all concerning the school careers of delinquent children. So far, not much attention has been given to this problem. The worst cases that come before the Courts, and those children who appear to have little opportunity of improving in their present environment are removed to institutions; but New Zealanders, as a whole, do not concern themselves as to what happens to the delinquents who are not placed in institutions. It is hoped that by showing what these children are like at school, what is done for them, and what methods are employed abroad in the treatment of delinquency, attention may be drawn to the needs of this section of the New Zealand juvenile population.

3. Scope of the Study.

No girls have been included in the study. Apart from the normally much lower incidence of delinquency among girls than among boys, the local police officials avoid bringing girls before the Children's Court. Of the boys who have appeared before the Children's Court in Christchurch during four months of 1937, by-law offenders have not been included in the study; but no other selection of cases has been made. Those children not

1. Owing to the use of different age-grouping, strictly comparable data between England and New Zealand are not available.

Criminal statistics, England and Wales, 1933,
About 7.5% of the offenders under 16 are girls.
New Zealand, 1936, about 12% under 18 are girls.
(E-4 Fifty-ninth Annual Report of the Minister of Education).
attending schools controlled by the Canterbury Education Board have in most cases had to be excluded, owing to difficulty in obtaining information. With these exceptions, the cases which have been studied represent all the children who have appeared during four months before the Christchurch Children’s Court, for offences such as theft, truancy, wandering, breaking and entering, wilful damage, mischief, all of which are officially judged to be significant delinquency.

4. Sources of Information.

Through the courtesy of the presiding Magistrates, the Court records of the children were available, and also any information which was produced as evidence during the Court hearing, from the report of the Child Welfare Officer. All other material has been obtained through the co-operation of the Canterbury Education Board, from the headmasters and teachers of the schools attended by the boys.

5. Difficulties.

Permission to make further inquiries in the homes of the children studied could not be obtained from the Child Welfare Branch of the Education Department. This is in accord with the general policy of the Branch, of concealing the identity of juvenile offenders, and of
permitting only officers of the Department to interview parents and children, or to inspect the records of the Child Welfare Branch.

In cases where a boy has attended several schools, it has been very difficult to trace his school career, and sometimes examination records have been the only data available from the schools previously attended. Where a boy has attended only one school, the records other than scholastic, depend chiefly on class teachers who have remained at the school long enough to remember the boy at various ages. This is also true of boys who have left school. In cases where a boy has been placed in an institution as a ward of the State, his record card, showing his class levels at different ages, and the schools he has attended, has gone with him, and was not available.

Owing to the requirements of the Child Welfare Branch, Court evidence, and the knowledge possessed by headmasters and teachers, were the only sources of information concerning the homes of the children.

In no case was it possible to administer standardised tests to the children, and in only a few cases had a test already been given; the estimation of achievement of children depends on the judgment of the teachers.
6. The Strategic Position of the School.

The school is only one of many social agencies functioning in the life of a child, but of all social agencies it is in the most strategic position to cope with the problem of delinquency. Although the school in itself cannot be expected to assume the sole responsibility for character development and for the prevention of delinquency, it can possibly do more than it has been doing up to the present. Dr. Peysen, stressing this fact, writes,

"To me it seems that the school system, the united school organization of the community, is the ideal instrumentality. In the last analysis, the problem of preventing delinquency is its problem. The school is the one agency which reaches into every home in the community. It has the advantage of entry into each home through its most sensitive spot, the child. It has the confidence and respect of parents and other citizens. As it is nonsectarian, it does not carry with it prejudices and antagonisms; it has the confidence of all groups. It has the cooperation and support of social and public agencies. It is enduring. It is regarded as an integral part of the community, not as an interloper, an outsider. To it there attaches no atmosphere of private philanthropy."
It is guided and administered by socially minded and professionally trained men and women who have made the educational care of children their life work. It possessed the support of the city and the State, and the background of whatever authority may be needed to further its purposes and achieve its objectives.  

CHAPTER II
MODERN VIEWS ON DELINQUENCY

A. Modern Theory.

1. Definition.

The Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences defines delinquency as the legal status of a child who has offended against the law.

"Delinquency is a symptom of maladjustments of the child's personality. These maladjustments usually result from an abnormal environment for the normal range of childish activities, or from a warping of the child's personality through fear, antagonism, and a sense of inadequacy." 1

Delinquency is a personal matter; but to a much greater degree it is a social concern. Society suffers the consequences of individual delinquency, and on the other hand is largely responsible for provoking the delinquency. The young delinquent does not represent just his own failure, but the failure of home, school, church, social and industrial organisation, friendships, - indeed, of humanity itself. It seems appropriate that the school, the one institution devoted primarily to children, should extend its activities to include the

prevention and treatment of delinquency.

There is no reason why school authorities should hesitate to deal with children whose social relationships are defective. Perhaps it is regarded more in the nature of a slur to be considered socially maladjusted than to be mentally defective. A certain percentage of the population, possibly less than 1%, are mentally defective. They cannot be cured so far as science at present knows. But at least they can be helped. The school authorities recognise this, and provide special educational facilities for them. On the other hand, it has been shown that it is comparatively easy to help the maladjusted to a more normal state, and yet the Education authorities wait until the maladjusted child has become delinquent before specific action is taken. Although there is a higher incidence of mental deficiency among delinquents than among non-delinquents, some delinquents are highly intelligent, and it would seem worth while to convert these at least into good citizens.

2. Delinquency and Maladjustment.

Juvenile delinquency appears as a symptom, or a set of symptoms of some sort of personal anti-social maladjustment. But there is no rule of thumb for the interpretation of maladjustment. Precisely the same
delinquent act may have a vastly different significance and set of causes in different individuals. It is possible to imagine a child whose delinquency can be correctly attributed to highly moral motives, just as many extremely immoral persons never commit crime; and there are infinite variations between these two extremes. It is often difficult to decide in a given instance which of the contributing factors is most significant in provoking delinquency. Determining the relative significance of the various factors may present the chief difficulty in measures aiming to achieve readjustment.

3. Incidence and Causation.

"A child who is above the average for general intelligence will probably be above the average in height, in weight, in physical health, in length and strength of limb, in size of skull in quickness of perception and movement, in attention, memory and reasoning, in emotional stability, and even in moral character as well". 1

Thus states Cyril Burt. But the reverse is equally true, and unfavourable characteristics are just as likely to occur together as the favourable characteristics, and as unfavourable qualities tend to occur together in an individual, no unfavourable social circumstances tend to occur together. There is a correlation between poverty and ill-health, between delinquency and mental deficiency,

between neurosis and poor physical condition, between social maladjustment and broken family life. Whenever a social order is established, there will be a group of individuals labouring under one difficulty or another, and usually more than one. When unfavourable factors occur together in certain ways, the individual is unable to adjust to society, and anti-social or delinquent behaviour results. Unfortunately, it is extremely difficult, and perhaps impossible, to foretell exactly which factors, and in what ratio, will produce delinquency. This is evidenced by the fact that delinquent children have lived all their lives in ostensibly the same environment as their non-delinquent siblings. A delinquent may live in ostensibly ideal conditions. The apparently most unfavourable environment may produce a saint. However, it seems that there are definite groups of factors which tend to occur, and which in conjunction tend to set the stage for delinquency. Such factors are bad family relationships, broken homes, poverty, unsuitable or inadequate education, mental and physical abnormality or shortcomings, overcrowding, clash of cultures, lack of opportunity for wholesome and creative leisure occupation, too loose or too rigid discipline, undesirable friendships. Reduction of the incidence of delinquency is attendant on providing against the social
evils which appear in many cases to cause or to provoke delinquency.

In the introduction to the symposium "Preventing Crime", Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck sum up the causal factors of delinquency-

"--------- the interplay of biologic handicaps, subtle human motivations, and often immeasurable social and economic factors, poverty, mental deficiency, residence in a slum area with opportunity for and tradition of anti-social conduct, distorted home life, culture, conflict, badly occupied leisure."


Perhaps in no sphere has the vexed question of heredity and environment, nature versus nurture, been more debated than in connection with delinquency and crime. It is easy to say "It's in him. His father was a thief". But if the parents provide the heredity, they also provide the environment for a number of years, and just as good a case can be made for environmental influence from the same data in a number of instances. If delinquency were to be explained chiefly in terms of heredity, the laws governing that heredity would need to be incredibly complex to account for the fact that only 10% to 20% of delinquents

have delinquent or criminal relatives, as has been shown by various investigations. Delinquency differs from ordinary hereditary features in being neither distributed equally between the sexes, nor exclusive to one, nearly 90% being boys. It seems that, other things being equal, boys are more exposed to the environmental factors which produce delinquency. Hereditary differences in nature, between boys and girls do not in themselves cause delinquency, apart from the environment in which they find expression.

Cyril Burt writes:

"Heredity appears to operate, not directly through the transmission of a criminal disposition as such, but rather indirectly, through such constitutional conditions as a dull or defective intelligence, an excitable and unbalanced temperament, or an over-development of some single primitive instinct. Of environmental conditions, those obtaining outside the home are far less important than those obtaining within it. And within it, material conditions, such as poverty, are far less important than moral conditions, such as ill-discipline, vice, and most of all, the child's relations with his parents. Physical defects have barely half the weight of psychological and environmental. Psychological factors, whether due to heredity or to environment, are supreme both in number and strength over all the rest. Intellectual conditions
are more serious than bodily; and emotional than intellectual. While psycho-analytic complexes everywhere provide a ready mechanism for the direction of overpowering instincts and of compressed emotional energy into open acts of crime. 1.

Many of the factors which tend to produce delinquency are due to faults in the social organisation. It is difficult to provide against sporadic outbursts of delinquency, but it is reasonable to expect that where the environmental conditions are improved, delinquency will tend to become less frequent. From the point of view of the educator, it is important that although less control can be exerted over hereditary factors than over environmental, the former appear to carry considerably less weight in the causation of delinquency.

L.B. Blades, Director of Long View Farm for Boys, Acton, Massachusetts, puts forward the point of view that juvenile maladjustment must increase as adults allow civilisation to escape control:

"The intricacy of the modern mechanical social order does not appal the children born into it, but it does appal their parents who have been unable to adjust to the increasing intensity and speed. Thus, the most that can

be said of maladjustment in the modern child is that it is often derived from parents or from environments which have been least able to adjust to the modern world. Nor can this be interpreted as showing any inferiority of character or capability in such children. There is too much truth in the old proverb which declares that adversity develops strength. It may even be significant to ponder whether or not maladjustment of the modern child may not ultimately prove to be his revolt against adult incapacity to deal with the mechanism it has created and called 'civilisation'.

It is perhaps a reflection on the condition of a society when children who live in it become delinquent. It would appear a further reflection if having once transgressed, the young offenders are left to continue in their delinquency. Since social conditions set the stage for delinquency, society must accept the responsibility for it and apply itself vigorously and unceasingly to the difficult task of preventing and treating delinquency. The same technological developments which have complicated modern life may perhaps be employed to check the difficulties which uncontrolled civilisation tends to cause. Miriam van Waters sums the situation thus:

"The conclusion is that delinquency is correlated

with the maladies of an industrial, competitive social order, and can best be combated by changing the goals of civilisation itself. 1.

5. Prevention and Treatment.

Measures aimed at the prevention of delinquency take the form of improving social conditions, providing recreational facilities and medical services, educational and vocational guidance. These activities usually occur in society as desirable in themselves, not specifically as means of preventing crime, but rather to improve conditions which are considered undesirable. The reduction in the rate of criminality which may ensue is incidental. This indirect method is probably the best, because the concept of crime is not held in the minds of the persons involved. Sometimes, however, where a district has an exceptionally high rate of delinquency and crime, it may be necessary for the various social agencies to take concerted action with the specific object of reducing delinquency.

Prevention merges into treatment in the cases of individuals who have some slight problem of maladjustment which has not yet manifested itself in delinquent behaviour.


2. The Italian criminologists of last century noted that certain areas were prolific in respect to crime. Dutt planned an analysis of crime in London by districts (See "The Young Delinquent", P. 73). The idea was further developed by Clifford Shaw ("Delinquency Areas").
Treatment proper consists in measures aimed at achieving readjustment after the child has committed delinquent acts. Treatment varies tremendously with individuals, but there is fairly general agreement that it should take into account in every case such factors as physical maladies, environment, home conditions, occupation, etc. Psycho-therapeutic treatment depends on the individual.

Direct means of reducing delinquency should probably be restricted to treatment, except in cases where a district with a high incidence of delinquency requires rapid improvement. In New Zealand, the Child Welfare Act provides for treatment measures which are sound as far as they go. Full account is taken of environmental factors; but what provision there is for treatment of the delinquent as an individual personality is in the hands of persons who are not required to have had any professional training. Rather more than half the adult criminals have begun their career of crime before the age of sixteen. On the treatment measures may depend whether the delinquent becomes readjusted, or whether he develops in an anti-social direction. A Court is primarily for the purpose of maintaining justice, either for a wronged person or an institution. In the Children's Court, however, consideration is paid to the child rather than to the delinquency. It is realised
that the child has been unfortunate, and the retributory attitude has given way to one of treatment. The Child Welfare Officer is a servant of the Education Department, and it is maintained that his work is as truly educational as that of any teacher. But while the Education Department insists that its teachers be subjected to a course of professional training, it does not require or make provision for any training of its officers in the Child Welfare Branch. Treatment requires the advice and guidance of an expert. Even though the Child Welfare Officers under whose control the delinquent children come, may do excellent work, there is no reason to believe that their work might not be even more efficient if they had been specifically trained for it.

The necessity for individual treatment has been pointed out by all the modern investigators. A survey of interest in this connection is that conducted by William Healy and Augusta Brenner, described in "New Light on Delinquency and its Treatment". In this investigation, they employed the device of having a non-delinquent control for each delinquent studied, the control consisting whenever possible of a twin, or an elder sibling of the same sex. The book emphasises the necessity for a new orientation of attitude towards delinquency and its treatment. Healy found that in 91% of his cases there
were maladjusted and unsatisfying personal relationships in the home, and that before recidivism could be prevented, or a reasonable progress achieved, reconstruction of relationships within the immediate environment was necessary. An important feature of the programme was parent education, although only the most sympathetic and intelligent could be expected to take proper advantage of parent education schemes.

The need for individual consideration and treatment is indicated by the fact that all members of a family are not delinquent, and indeed, that a delinquent child is frequently the only law-breaker in his family. Changes in environment and economic status which affect the whole family may help to relieve the situation, but there must be some other special factor or factors affecting the child alone, when his brothers and sisters remain non-delinquent. Healy shows that there is a higher incidence of neurosis and psychopathic conditions of varying degrees of intensity among delinquents than among non-delinquents, and this fact should be borne in mind in planning for the prevention of delinquency and recidivism. In America, trained psychiatrists are being employed more and more extensively in connection with Juvenile Courts and Guidance Clinics.

6. The Detection of Delinquency.

Once children have come to official notice for
offences they are usually humanely treated. The Child Welfare Act of 1925 expresses a fairly advanced stage of social philosophy. However a most striking fact about the New Zealand Courts is that they deal with so few cases of delinquency. In 1936 2273 children appeared in Children's Courts. That figure includes by-law offenders, indigent and neglected children, as well as delinquents. Of that number, 616 were dealt with further by the Child Welfare authorities, either being placed under the supervision of a Child Welfare Officer, or becoming wards of the State. Of that number, 410 were charged with an offence, and 111 were considered delinquent. The New Zealand Year Book does not give the age distribution of the population, but at a rough estimate there would be between 150,000 and 200,000 children between the ages of 10 and 17. In England, the number of persons under 16 found guilty of indictable offences in 1935 was 1523 per 100,000 of the population. Although the social conditions in the two countries are not strictly comparable, yet there seems to be a wider discrepancy in the figures than could be explained on these grounds alone. It is perhaps not desirable that all juvenile offenders should appear in Court, or even come to official notice. But it is the duty of the State to make provision for the reclaiming of delinquents, and the State has admitted this duty. It may be that the State is not sufficiently vigilant in the detection of delinquency. It seems
expedient that the maladjustment of a delinquent should receive attention as early as possible. When he has arrived at the status of long sentence criminal, the State has ultimately to support him, and in its own interests should exert more effort to detect and convert him in the earliest and easiest stages into a socially adjusted person.

7. **National Variations.**

The conditions contributing to delinquency vary in different countries and societies. Truancy as a problem is almost non-existent in Switzerland. Finland shelters in its State homes many juvenile homicides, giving evidence of the survival of the ancient and no doubt honourable practice indigenous to Finland, of fighting with knives.

The chief problem in America and England is theft. It will be interesting to observe delinquency trends in Russia. The attempt, theoretical at least, to achieve a more or less equal distribution of material goods may affect the incidence of stealing. For property loses relative significance, either for its own sake, or as a means of compensation, when its possession is equalised. Change of social philosophy in Italy and Germany will probably be reflected in the incidence of delinquency, although it is too early for prognosis as to the variations
which will occur.

New Zealand has its distinctive features to be considered. There is not such wide deviation from the economic mean as there is in older societies, and there is much legislation to provide against indigence. That in itself, however, may be producing fresh problems, for the realisation that there will be assistance forthcoming from the State may have the effect of paralysing initiative. This country has not the really bad living conditions which exist in old European cities; increasing provision is being made for maintaining the health of school children, and for remedying malnutrition. Since material factors are favourable in comparison with many other countries, it is reasonable to expect that the rate of delinquency would be lower.

A concurrence of English and American evidence, as shown by Lord Chief Justice Rewitt, and Fulton, Hopkins, Keltner, Lorrin, Reynolds and Thompson, supports the view that a majority of criminals have shown definitely anti-social tendencies of behaviour and attitude before the age of sixteen, and crime preventive programmes should take this evidence into account. The line of action advocated throughout "Preventing Crime" is an attack on the sources of delinquency and crime by the combined constructive efforts of the social agencies affecting
potential delinquents - the juvenile Courts, the State, the community, home, school, church, recreational centre and welfare agency. The book "Preventing Crime" is a symposium of descriptions of such experiments carried out in various parts of the United States under the auspices of one or other social agency - co-ordinated community programmes, school programmes, police programmes, intramural and extramural guidance programmes, boys' club and recreational programmes.

The people who have been conducting the programmes described, consider that undiscriminating mass treatment of delinquents must be avoided, and that in the treatment of individual children it must be borne in mind that they have plastic personalities, that the symptoms they reveal do not always indicate the root of the trouble, that an insight into the child's world as opposed to the attitude and prejudices of parents is essential. Various authorities, including the well-known American investigators, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, stress the importance of taking an experimental attitude towards the problem of devising a variety of experiments and programmes, and of awakening citizens to the urgency of the problem, and to the recognition of the need for technically trained leaders in the work.
B. Recent Development of Prevention and Treatment in relation to School Programmes.

It has been pointed out by Dr. Peyser\textsuperscript{1} that in the war against delinquency, the schools are in a particularly strategic position. Not only do they constitute the sole institution which has education as its specific objective, but they have practically undisputed rights during the very formative years of childhood. No reasonable efforts should be spared to ward off delinquency, for measures taken early, which have a chance of converting the potential delinquent into an efficient citizen, are preferable to frequent and long imprisonments later in life, even if expense is taken as the sole criterion. Treatment which makes the delinquent feel that he is different from other children may have only limited success. If the treatment is conducted through the schools, there is less risk of the child feeling that he has been singled out as abnormal.

\textsuperscript{1} New York.

Dr. Peyser has described the programme conducted in a New York public school. The school had a bad reputation for scholastic work, was situated in a very poor area:

\begin{itemize}
\item Preventing Crime, Loc. cit.
\end{itemize}
"in the heart of what was then the most serious delinquency zone in the greater city."

There were about three times as many cases of delinquency as in any other district of like size. There was much truancy in the school which enrolled 1315 boys. During the years 1914 to 1917, various surveys of the district and its recreational opportunities were made. An Adjustment Bureau was set up; play-grounds were opened, extra-curricular activities were organised, and the children received medical attention. Within less than a year the incidence of delinquency dropped considerably, and the scholastic record showed signs of improvement.

2. Cincinnati.

The public schools of Cincinnati employ visiting teachers: -

"Visiting teacher work in the study of individual school children who give evidence of lack of success in some of their life relationships." 2.

The children may be failing in school, they may present serious behaviour problems, or show obvious personality deviations; they may be day-dreamers, or negative in their attitude. They may be handicapped by environmental conditions. These children are brought to the attention of the visiting teacher by some school official, a parent, or sometimes by the children themselves.

Intensive case-work treatment follows. There is in Cincinnati an increasing demand for consultation service by principals, teachers and parents. Ethel Reynolds, the Director of the Visiting Teacher Division of the Cincinnati Education Department, says:—

"The majority of children with whom the visiting teacher works are not, and perhaps never will be, delinquent. The way in which the visiting teacher contributes to the prevention of delinquency is to promote in all children a better adjustment—habits of achievement, the ability to face difficulties, the skill to get along with others, the freedom to engage in suitable self-expression. To provide constructive treatment for all children, rather than special programmes for the delinquent, is the trend of education and of social work to-day." 1

3. Detroit.

In Detroit there is a Psychological Clinic to which children from the public schools are referred. There is a well-equipped special day-school for three hundred of the most difficult boys. These children are required to remain at the special school until the age of sixteen, and many stay longer. The boys may be returned to regular schools after several terms, but many prefer to remain in the special school. Classes are smaller, and

pupils are given much individual attention; but the teachers are not confronted with the problems of discipline and behaviour that might be expected in a special school for children who are behaviour problems in ordinary schools.

4. Chicago.

In Chicago there is a special school for five hundred problem boys. The age range is from ten to seventeen years. About 65% have been truants, 30% delinquent, and 5% are more serious cases of abnormality. 60% are from foreign-language-speaking homes. The boys are in school 6½ hours a day, 5 days a week, 46 weeks a year. Transport is provided for all who live more than a mile from school. The boys have lunch at school. Careful studies are made of every boy on admission, and he receives what medical and dental attention he requires. The boys are bathed regularly at school. A psychologist has charge of the placement of pupils, and directs the course to be followed by each. The costs of education for these boys are necessarily high, but the Chicago authorities feel that the additional costs are more than justified by the results achieved.

C. The Problems of the Teacher in New Zealand.

In the New Zealand schools there is a number of delinquent and "difficult" children, some of whom come
before the Children's Courts. Teachers are agreed at least in principle that the school is not merely a scholastic institution, but is in addition a training ground for character. It strives for the scholastic growth of its charges, but it also pays attention to their health, their educational and vocational guidance, their social adjustments, their emotional stability and character trends. The ideal is to develop each child to the maximum of his potentialities, for his individual benefit, but also having regard for the ultimate advantage of society.

Doubtless the teacher can and should do something to prevent and treat delinquency, but if the experience of other countries can be taken into account, the teacher cannot be expected to undertake the whole responsibility, either in prevention or treatment. She has not the time, even if she has had the requisite training. Frequently she does not realise the gravity of the case, or misjudges its cause. As her prescribed duties do not lie within this sphere, she is not altogether to be expected to know very much of the problems involved. If a child is persistently troublesome, and the teacher has no expert advice as to what causes his naughtiness, or how to remedy it, she must resort to whatever methods lie within her power, and rely on her own judgment. Most teachers will admit that punishment is often an undesirable method of
dealing with a difficult child, even if it is effective. The teacher represents justice in the classroom. The delinquent children in a class are in a very small minority. No teacher could possibly devote to them the extra time that they require, to the neglect of the remainder of the class. Someone has said that although there may be rejoicing over the one sinner that repents, the ninety and nine are entitled to at least some consideration.

On the other hand, many delinquent children are quite well behaved in school, and frequently the teacher is not aware of their misconduct. It must be remembered, also, that delinquency is nothing more than one symptom, or set of symptoms, of maladjustment, and if the maladjustment is sufficiently grave, it must inevitably affect the child in a variety of subtle ways which evade the notice of the teacher. If the clever child from a comfortable home suddenly begins to do unsatisfactory work, the teacher, without detailed knowledge, may assume laziness, or self-satisfaction. She has time to make only limited inquiries concerning the home relationships which are perhaps the underlying cause of the child's unhappiness, especially if she does not know the parents, and has no history to which to refer. However, when the school is aware of a problem, the teachers are usually confined to
"We cannot understand the child", and "We do not know what to do". Sometimes a despairing teacher will simply make allowances for a difficult child, and not interfere more than is necessary for the well-being of the other children.

The teacher has to face other difficulties. She may for instance be aware that a truant child is bored at school, and cannot do the work which is expected of him; but she may be unable to provide him with more suitable work. However, such problems of curriculum and examination do not affect delinquent children exclusively, although in some cases they may be significant.

It is hoped to show to what extent the teachers of these boys are aware of difficulties in the boy's personality, what advice is available for them, to assist them in the treatment of the boys, and what methods they have employed as treatment. The class teachers are not primarily concerned with the question of delinquency and its prevention. But in this country they frequently have to deal with delinquent children, without the substantial help and advice from experts which appears desirable in the light of modern knowledge.
CHAPTER III

A DETAILED ACCOUNT OF FIVE CASE STUDIES

1. Introductory Note.

The survey has covered the cases of twenty-five children who have appeared before the Children's Court during four months of 1937. An attempt has been made to collect sufficient data to give a fairly complete picture of each child, more especially in relation to his behaviour and progress at school. Five of the cases have been given in detail in this chapter. The other twenty are in abbreviated form in Appendix B.

2. Case A.

The boy is 11 years 11 months of age. He has been before the Children's Court twice within three months, on each occasion for stealing a bicycle. The second time he tried to sell the stolen bicycle. There are substantial grounds for suspecting that the child has committed other offences. He was placed under the supervision of the Child Welfare Officer for twelve months.

1. Home. The father is believed to be eccentric. There is an elder sister whose behaviour at school
resembled her brother's, although she was not delinquent. The home is materially quite a good one. The boy comes to school well dressed. However, there is frequent friction between the parents, and this sometimes reaches the teacher's ears. The boy has a good health record.

II. Educational Attainments and Capacity. He is at present in Standard V. The average age of the class is 12 years 9 months. He is definitely superior at his school work; and this year is doing better than ever before. He ranks among the best two or three in the class. His drawing and art work are excellent, and his handwork above the average. He plays the piano well, and sings unusually well. He gives careful attention to detail in all his work. His drill is quite good, but he displays no enthusiasm, and plays no organised games. His progress at school has always been steady and very good.

III. Changes of School. The boy has attended three schools. He was transferred to his present school two years ago because his parents moved to live in the district.

IV. Interests. The school is not aware of any great interest in anything. The teachers say he appears indifferent to his work, displays no enthusiasm in class,
and does not discuss extra-curricular activities. However, a Training College student who was with his class for a month, considered that he was very interested in his work, and frequently did extra work.

V. Significant attitudes.

To Teachers. He shows signs of being suspicious of teachers. He is very reserved in their presence. The teachers in his present school do not think they have ever given him cause for suspicion.

To Other Boys. He is aloof, pugnacious and unpopular. He never shares his possessions, and in the words of his headmaster he "lacks social enthusiasm". On the whole he gives the impression of being completely indifferent to the other children.

To Schoolwork. He always does good work, and sometimes appears absorbed in it. He displays an almost uncanny poise and self-possession, very rare amongst boys of his age; so that he performs in class without the slightest hesitation, but with apparently complete indifference as to the effects of his performances.

VI. Habits. When he first came to his present school he was always late, but after deliberate efforts on the part of the school, he is now punctual, and regular in his attendance. He is very tidy and courteous.
VII. Difficulties. His skill in verbal self-defence is uncanny. His capacity to tell lies in sequence, and without confusion amounts, in the opinion of his teacher, almost to genius. They are not the ordinary lies of fear and desperation, e.g. the accounts of his home and past life which he gives to teachers and other pupils. He used to arrive home late from school and blame the teacher for keeping him in.

One evening he was seen to go to Victoria Square, take a dozen or so acorns from a bag already placed there, throw them at the statue of Queen Victoria, collect the acorns again and put them back in his bag. He walked away without haste or confusion. The headmaster was quite unable to discover any reason or explanation for this behaviour. The child appears to be the leader of a gang of three, one of the others being Case B. The three were involved in the theft of several bicycles and torches. A was undoubtedly the "brains" of the party, and formulated the plans. A had quite a minor part, but, for some reason, the third boy who was more seriously involved, was not charged by the Police.

The teachers have considered this boy a problem ever since he attended the school. Although neither he nor his sister presented any behaviour problems in class, their cool indifference seemed insuperable. Very
little progress was made with the sister, and so far, after two years of patient and sympathetic treatment, the teachers feel that his punctuality is the only visible sign of success. Only on the rarest occasions does he appear more than politely attentive to what the teachers say with regard to discipline. The headmaster and teachers still hope to thaw the boy's indifference by sympathetic treatment.

Summary and Interpretation.

The boy is unusual in several ways. In the first place, he possesses definitely superior ability, and has made a superficially satisfactory adjustment in school. In fact there is an almost complete absence of overt symptoms of maladjustment in his behaviour at school. The school has had dealings with the boy and his sister during two years. Both children presented a similar problem of personality to the school — lack of enthusiasm, reserve, indifference. With the girl the school achieved nothing, so far as the teachers could judge. With the boy, the net result so far has been punctuality. The method of dealing with the children has been sympathetic treatment. The teachers have not given up hope, and are continuing the sympathetic treatment. Although the Child Welfare Officer called at the school before the Court hearing, he has not been so far, and in
his supervision of the boy he is not co-operating with the school. The teachers admit that the boy is a problem, and yet their treatment campaign extends no further than the methods which ostensibly failed with the girl, and have achieved very little with the boy. "We never give up hope" says the headmaster. This boy possesses superior ability which could be socially useful, but which might be very dangerous if he is allowed to develop in an anti-social direction. For this reason alone it would seem that more effective treatment measures should be taken. The Child Welfare Officer, whom the Magistrate says repeatedly is an "expert with boys", is not helping the school with what knowledge he has. The teachers admit that they are puzzled, but there is no one to whom they can turn for advice. They could devise various schemes and try them out on the boy, by a sort of trial and error method, but the Department has not provided a person who could suggest treatment which in the light of modern knowledge has some chance of success.

3. Case C.

The boy is 11 years, 9 months of age. He has appeared twice before the Children's Court this year; on the first occasion for truancy and sleeping out. He was placed under the supervision of the Child Welfare Officer. Shortly afterwards it was found necessary in the
interests of the boy's health to commit him to the care of the State. About a fortnight later, he was charged with another boy of wilful damage to a fence. He was admonished and discharged.

I. Home. The home is materially quite a good one. The father seemed very fond of the child, and was very disturbed when he was away. Inquiry by the school revealed that the boy and three elder siblings are illegitimate. Their mother is dead, and nothing is known of her by the school. There is a step-mother, who apparently referred frequently to the mother in the boy's presence, until she was asked by the Truant Officer to desist for the boy's sake. There are two younger legitimate children, neither of whom cause any trouble at school. The headmaster considers that the boy is very conscious of his birth.

II. Physique. A good health record. The boy was plump and rosy until his frequent sleeping out. So far his health does not appear to have suffered.

III. Educational Attainments and Ability. He is in Standard IV. He was placed there on trial when he first came to the school, and was permitted to remain there. The average age of the class is 11 years 2 months. Although he is not much above the average age, his teacher considers that his work is not up to standard. His
frequent absences from school were a handicap to progress. His drawing is poor, and the teacher is not aware of any special abilities. He played no games.

IV. Changes of School. He has attended five schools, and is now in a State Institution.

V. Significant Attitudes.

To Teachers. He appeared to like the teachers. He was friendly, and would talk without reserve. In school he caused no trouble, but had no interest in his work.

To other Children. He was quite popular and independent, apt to prefer his own company. The headmaster suspects that there was considerable unobserved friction.

VI. Habits. Tidy in school, well mannered, punctual, but very irregular in attendance.

VII. Difficulties. The teacher and headmasters felt unable to account for the child's behaviour. He would stay away from school for a week at a time, sleeping at the bottom of his father's garden, or on the verandah of the house, usually in a wet sack. He slept out in all weathers. When he returned to school he would be contrite, and make promises; but would be away again within the next few days. On one occasion he stole
another boy's new football, sold it for a shilling, and spent the money on sweets. He owned a bicycle, but was not allowed to use it because he would disappear with it for days. The father frequently came to the school to discuss the boy. The boy incidentally never went further than half a mile from his home. The father is a taxi-driver, and away most of the day. He spent as much time with the boy as he could. The Truant Officer interviewed the father at the school. The father was afraid to take the course suggested, of putting the boy in a Home for a period, because he thought the boy would not be permitted to come out until he was twenty-one. It was necessary to take action, however, in case the child's health should be impaired. It was noticed that while he was away, he stole nothing but apples, and lived entirely on apples.

Character: The teachers consider him a "nice little boy". The headmaster said he thought he would turn out well. During the Court hearing he was said to be "devoid of moral responsibility".

Summary and Interpretation.

In this case again, the headmaster and teachers were fully aware of a problem, and frankly admitted that they could not understand the child. They were kind to him, but were unable to suggest the constructive help which would probably be necessary if the boy was already devoid
of moral responsibility. He was not even making a satisfactory adjustment as far as actual school work goes, and at least this matter calls for investigation, to discuss whether the work he was doing was suited to his needs. In this case, there is no suggestion of the school appealing to the Child Welfare Officer for advise or cooperation. The school teachers were puzzled, but were unable to call upon expert advice. The evidence provides substantial grounds for the belief that the lad was suffering from some severe form of emotional conflict, in which case a trained psychologist would be the most likely person to be able to help the teacher.

4. Case D.

The boy is twelve years of age. He has appeared before the Children’s Court once this year for theft of small sums of money and sweets. He was already a ward of the State. He was removed to an institution.

I. Home. The boy was living in a foster home. Nothing is known of his own family. The foster home is reasonably good from the material point of view. The foster mother had one son of her own, and took this boy to be a companion for her son.

II. Educational Attainments and Ability. The boy is in Standard IV. The average age of the class is 11 years
2 months. He is above the average age, and with the single exception of spelling, his school work is very poor. The school is not aware of any special abilities.

III. Changes of School. He was two years in his last school before being placed in an institution. His record card had gone with him, and his school history was therefore not available.

IV. Significant Attitudes.

Home. It is suspected that there is considerable conflict at home.

To School. The boy dislikes school.

To Teachers. He is antagonistic towards the teachers, and dislikes school work.

To Other Children. He associated with weak companions, but had no partners in crime. He did not mix with children outside his own particular circle of friends.

V. Habits. Very untidy, but regular in attendance. He was usually punctual.

VI. Difficulties. In school the boy was described as a "thorough nuisance", and was a constant centre of disturbance. He was untidy, talked nearly all the time, was not attentive to his work, and did his best to distract the attention of the other children by grimacing,
foolish behaviour, etc. After school he frequently arrived home late. To check his loitering the teacher used to enter the time at which he left school in a notebook, to be signed by the foster mother and brought back, by the boy the next morning. He was never known to steal at school, but frequently stole sweets and money from shops or people whenever he could. He stole from the foster mother with impunity. He frequently left school during the morning interval, borrowed a bicycle and rode about the district until twelve o'clock. He went himself to the Child Welfare Officer and asked to be put in a Home. He said he was always getting into trouble, couldn't keep out of it, and wanted to be put in an institution. He was not taken at that time, but shortly afterwards came before the Children's Court for theft, and was then put into a Home. He sometimes complained of a pain, and on one occasion asked the teacher to allow him to go to the hospital. Permission was given, but the school were unable to discover what happened. The teachers consider that the foster-mother wanted to get rid of the boy. He was not a good example to her own son. The teachers say that the boy was amenable to discipline, and yet they consider him a criminal already, and do not expect him to improve.

Summary and Interpretation.

The school is fully aware of the problems; the
boy leaves school leaving the impression that he is already a criminal and not likely to improve. The teachers were prepared to do what they could, but they were at a loss as to what course they might take. There are indications that the boy's home life was most unsatisfactory, and there may have been feelings of inferiority. But his adjustment at school was also very unsatisfactory. His behaviour was bad, his work poor. He frequently went away during a session. Even after he asked to be put in a State Home, the Child Welfare Authorities did not appear to be able to help him until he had committed further thefts. A medical examination would have revealed the cause of the pain of which the boy complained, and at least served to prove that the complaints were groundless, if such was the case. It appears that before anything can be done for such a child, he has to commit delinquencies serious enough to demand action.

5. Case H.

The boy is 15 years 3 months of age. He has appeared only once in the Children's Court, on seven chargees of false pretences. He was placed under the supervision of the Child Welfare Officer for two years.

I. Home Life. The home life is very poor in the opinion of the school. The father was unemployed at the time of his son's delinquency, but is now working. There
are two siblings, and both children have caused much
trouble at school through bad behaviour and theft. The
mother was convicted of theft on several occasions, and
her husband divorced her for loose living. There is now
a step-mother, who in the opinion of the school is a very
similar type of woman. There are also younger children
by the second wife. The headmaster considers that both
father and step-mother are "definitely below average
mentality". The home is very dirty, and there is very
poor parental control.

II. Educational Attainments and Ability. The boy
reached Standard V before he left school in 1936. His
work was average. He was older than the average class
age, but he seemed to keep up with the work. He was
very good at handwork of all kinds, and excellent at
games, especially football.

III. Significant Attitudes.

To School. The boy seemed to enjoy being at school.

To Teachers. He appeared to respect and like the
teachers. He was certainly amenable to discipline at
school.

To Other Boys. He possessed definite qualities of
leadership. He was very popular, could be trusted by
the teachers, and was respected by the other children.
He assumed control of the class when the teacher was
away without being asked to do so.
IV. Difficulties. In school the boy was quite well-behaved, and was "not unteachable"; but he lacked attention and concentration, and did not appear interested in his work. All the teachers who have taught him consider that he might have done better if he had paid more attention to lessons. At school he was considered a really good, reliable boy, with admirable qualities of leadership. But he could not be trusted away from the school grounds. The headmaster received frequent complaints from neighbours and people in the district, of theft, bad behaviour in the evenings and on Saturday. On several occasions the headmaster appealed to the boy's father to exercise more control, but with no avail. The headmaster considered that the home environment is responsible for the boy's "lack of mental honesty".

V. Character, etc. A cheerful, well-mannered boy, with a good presence. On all occasions he was perfectly frank when asked about his misdemeanours. He was quite reliable at school, and equally unreliable away from school. The headmaster says he would become a good citizen if he had some person to take an interest in him.

Summary and Interpretation.

There seemed on the surface a fairly satisfactory adjustment in class, and very satisfactory so far as the
school as a whole was concerned. But the boy was above the average class age, and lacked attention in class. The home set anything but a good example, and the school standard of behaviour was not strong enough to carry over to evenings and after school. The headmaster called on the father for co-operation, and yet in his own opinion the father is below normal intelligence. However, it is difficult to see what other course the headmaster could adopt. It is perhaps significant that he does not appeal to the Child Welfare Officer, who is supposed to be an expert with boys. The headmaster considers that the boy must have a "hereditary taint", which could be overcome in a more congenial environment. Although it is difficult to prove the "taint"; it seems more likely that this is a social problem, and a problem of adjustment at school. However, the headmaster, in common with headmasters in the other schools, is fully aware of the problem, does not know what to do about it, and has no one to whom he can turn for advice.

6. Case E.

The boy is 15 years 11 months of age. He has appeared in the Children's Court on one charge of wilful damage, and six charges of theft. The last theft was of money, 15/-.. He was already under the supervision of the Child Welfare Officer, and after this last theft was sent to live with his grandfather. He was ordered to
appear after three months for the Court to consider whether he should be placed in a home. After three months, however, his behaviour is quite satisfactory, and he is remaining with his family.

I. Home. The parents seem weak willed and casual about the boy. He has been away from school for about a year, and has been earning 15/- a week. He is allowed no pocket money. The parents have recently been in financial difficulties. The father is a carrier, and is frequently away from home most of the day. The home is incredibly dirty. It is a big house, and the mother takes in boarders. The headmaster is not satisfied as to her integrity. The boy was frequently absent from school. The father was asked the reason, and he did not even know that the boy was not going to school regularly. It appears that the mother would allow the child to play about at home, instead of sending him to school.

II. Educational Attainments and Ability. He left school at 15 years in Standard V. He did very poor work in arithmetic, but his other subjects were about average. He played no games. The class teacher considered him dull, and was not aware of any hobbies or special abilities.

III. Significant Attitudes.

In School. He was quiet and well-behaved in class,
and indifferent to his work.

To teachers. He seemed to like his last teacher. The teacher noticed that the lad was very easily gratified by a word of praise. He would frequently stay behind at the end of a session to talk to the teacher, and to thank him for setting him some little task.

To Other Boys. He was apparently most unpopular at school. He had no friends, played no games, and kept very much to himself. The other children in his class thought he was surly. They said that he only spoke to them when he thought he would. He used to spend most of the free time at school in the classroom.

Habits. He was reasonably tidy and clean. He was very irregular in his attendance. The boys called him "stop-away".

IV. Difficulties. As far as behaviour goes, this boy never caused any trouble at school. The class teacher was quite unaware that he was committing delinquencies. The teachers considered him a very ordinary pupil, not attracting special attention in any way.

Summary and Interpretation.

There seems to be a maladjustment to school work. The boy left school at 15 years in Standard V, so that
he was at least two years retarded. Possibly he was not doing work suited to his capacities. He is tall and well developed for his age, and yet was classed with twelve-year-olds. He was disliked, had no friends, stayed by himself. While he was actually committing delinquencies and under supervision, the teacher had no suspicions, and there was no co-operation between Child Welfare Officer and Teacher. There seems to have been no attempt to discuss the cause of his "moping", and nothing was done to check it. The headmaster was quite aware of the difficulties, but was unable to suggest possibilities of constructive treatment. The child was labouring under difficulties at home, and since he left school has been allowed no pocket money. He has shown signs of improvement recently, but the facts remain that he was delinquent while he was at school, he was retarded, and manifested obvious personality deviations, and no constructive assistance was given him, except the supervision which failed to prevent recidivism. There was no co-operation between home, school, and Child Welfare Officer, and no one appointed to suggest effective measures of treatment which might go nearer the root of the boy's difficulties.
CHAPTER IV

A SUMMARY OF THE CASE DATA

1. Explanatory notes.

The cases are presented here in tabular form.

(a) The age given is the boy's age at the time of his appearance in the Children's Court.

(b) The number of appearances in Court is the total number, including the appearance which brings the boy within the scope of this study.

(c) The offence with which the boy is charged denotes the official cause of his being brought to the notice of the Court.

(d) Under the heading "Guardianship before Court hearing" is entered whether the boy is already a ward of the State, under Supervision for some previous offence, and living at home.

(e) Under "Guardianship after Court hearing" is entered the manner in which the Court has decided to deal with the boy - by admonishing and discharging, by placing under the supervision of the Child Welfare Officer, removal to an institution, or commitment to the care of the State.

(f) Unofficial bad conduct is the anti-social behaviour of the boys of which teachers or police are
aware, but with which the boys have not been officially charged.

(g) Owing to the requirement of the Child Welfare Branch that none but their own officers enter the homes of delinquent children, it was impossible to set up objective standards for rating the material conditions of the homes. However, the Child Welfare Officer in his report to the Court gave his opinion, the teacher and a social worker in most cases were able to give an opinion, and the rating given represents the subjective estimate of Child Welfare Officer, teacher and social worker. The range is from A to E, A representing excellent, B good, C fair or average, D below average, and E very unsatisfactory.

(j) Wherever possible a note has been made on home life, more particularly with regard to unusual conditions pertaining in the home.

(k) The class entered is the class the boy is in this year, unless otherwise stated in cases where the boy has left school.

(l) The average class age is taken wherever possible for the middle of the year - i.e. to be as strictly comparable as possible with the age of the boy at the time he appeared in Court.

(m) Retardation represents simply the number of years by which a boy's age exceeds the average age of the class in which he is placed. It is recognised that there
are various causes for retardation, and in this summary none of the causes are taken into account or implied.

(n) Under the heading "Special Abilities and Interests" has been entered those abilities which the teacher knows a boy possesses. No standardised tests have been taken, and what is recorded represents the teacher's subjective estimate.

(o) The Boy's school work has been rated from A to E on the basis of record cards, examination marks and teacher's estimates - A represents very good, B good, C average, D unsatisfactory and E very poor.

(p) The number of schools entered is the total number of times the boy has changed his school, and includes the school he is attending at present, or the school he last attended before leaving school. Changes of school have been recorded rather than the number of schools attended, because frequently a boy leaves a school, and then goes back to it later.

(q) Relations to other children indicate the teacher's estimate of how a boy is adjusted to his school companions.

(r) and (s) Behaviour at school and behaviour away from school represent the teacher's opinion in either case.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Appearances</th>
<th>Offence with which charged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Theft (bicycle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>12-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Theft (bicycle &amp; torch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>11-9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Theft, truancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Theft, money, sweets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>15-11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Theft, 15/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Theft, truancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>15-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Appropriating bicycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>False pretences,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7 charges)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>15-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Converting car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to unlawful use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>15-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mischief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>15-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mischief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Theft £6, wilful damage, receiving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stolen goods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>16-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Theft, 7/6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>14-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Theft, 37/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>15-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Theft £5, goods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Theft 15/-, cake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Theft, watch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Theft, £1-4-0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>15-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Theft medal, bicycle, arson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>13-8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mischief &amp; entering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>14-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Theft, mascot &amp; lamp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>15-7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Theft, 10/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>14-7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Theft, 10/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Underward supervision at home</td>
<td>Living</td>
<td>Admon. &amp; Disch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care of State =</td>
<td>Committed to care of State.</td>
<td>Admonished and discharged.</td>
<td>Committed to an institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misconduct other than delinquency</td>
<td>Condition of home</td>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft, mischief</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft, mischief</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Strabismus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft, truancy, wandering</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft, truancy</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft, mischief</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft, wandering, lying</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft, truancy, mischief</td>
<td>C, E</td>
<td>3 FB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft, mischief</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>deaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>goitre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untruthfulness</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>deaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft, truancy, mischief</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft, truancy, mischief</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft, mischief</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(good behaviour)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mischief</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft, mischief, bullying</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Weak heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft, mischief</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft, mischief, bullying</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching cars, lying</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft, mischief</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Caries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft, mischief</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FB = foster-brother
O = illegitimate
X = half-sibling.
Eccentric parents, friction in home.

Dirty home.

Illegitimate, friction in home.

Foster home - bad example to foster brother - friction.

Friction and immorality.

Mother away, woman in her place - friction.

Foster home, foster brothers "peculiar".

Mother divorced, step-mother in home, dirty.

Satisfactory.

Satisfactory.

No mother in home, sister 19 years in charge.

Father unemployed and drunkard, mother invalid, dirty home, friction.

Father unemployed and drunkard, mother invalid, dirty home, friction.

Unknown.

Immorality, causing removal of child.

Very satisfactory.

Friction in home.

Immorality, mother a widow.

Dirty home - immorality - very unsatisfactory.

Satisfactory - father an invalid.

Illegitimate - foster home - father in geol.

Illegitimate - dirty home.

5 families living together.

Bad home environment.

Bad home environment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Average class age</th>
<th>Retardation</th>
<th>Special abilities and interests</th>
<th>School work</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>12-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Music, art,</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>11-8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>11-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>11-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>12-6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>9-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Games</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>8-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Games</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>13-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mechanical ability</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>13-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Drawing, music</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>13-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Games</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>11-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Football, drawing,</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>15-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>primary &amp; secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>11-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Drawing, work,</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>9-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>9-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>13-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Art, music, handwork,</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>11-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Games</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>13-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Games, drawing,</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>12-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Games</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>12-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Games</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately six months has been allowed either side of the average class age in calculating retardation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relations with other children</th>
<th>Behaviour at School</th>
<th>Behaviour away from School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent, non-social</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower, friendly</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly, independent</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Wandering, lack of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak companions,</td>
<td>Bad behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloof, unpopular</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-social</td>
<td>Bad behaviour</td>
<td>Lack of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-social</td>
<td>Bad behaviour</td>
<td>Lack of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader,</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>Mischief, frequent complaints,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily led</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily led</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily led</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Lack of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-social</td>
<td>Bad behaviour</td>
<td>Lack of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-social</td>
<td>Bad behaviour</td>
<td>Mischief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very popular,</td>
<td>Inattentive,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Lazy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Good behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily led</td>
<td>Not attracting</td>
<td>Lack of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>notice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily led</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Mischief,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak companions,</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Lack of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying, unpopular</td>
<td>Bad behaviour</td>
<td>Lack of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpopular</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>difficult to control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying, aggressive</td>
<td>Bad behaviour</td>
<td>Mischief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily led</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Lack of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily led</td>
<td>Bad behaviour</td>
<td>Lack of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily led</td>
<td>Bad behaviour</td>
<td>Lack of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Analysis of the Data.

Case studies A, C, D, E, H, are given in Chapter III. The others are in appendix B.

There are 25 cases, and they have been drawn from 17 schools. While the number of cases is too small from which to draw conclusion in this matter, it is noticeable that the data concern no single school.

(a) Age.

The limits set by the study have kept the age range narrow. With the exception of F, who though dealt with through official channels was not brought formally before the Children's Court, the youngest boy is M, aged 10 years. O, aged 16 years 5 months is the oldest. O and K are the only boys who have been away from school for more than a year. With these exceptions, such cases have not been included in the study, because of the impossibility of tracing the school history.

(b) Number of Appearances in Court.

With six exceptions, the boys are first offenders. C appeared twice within a very short time; A, K, X and Y had all appeared once before. E was making his seventh appearance; he presents the only case of serious recidivism. It is unsafe to generalise from so few cases, but there is at least an indication that recidivists are usually boys who have left school; or in other words, delinquents still at school appear in Children's Court on
their first charge.

**TABLE I. - Age Distribution.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>8 to 9</th>
<th>9 to 10</th>
<th>10 to 11</th>
<th>11 to 12</th>
<th>12 to 13</th>
<th>13 to 14</th>
<th>14 to 15</th>
<th>15 to 16</th>
<th>16 to 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Cases</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average age - 15 years 5 months.
Median Age - 14 years.

**TABLE II. - Number of times in Court (including present appearance)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Appearances</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Boys.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average - 1.36
Median - 1

{(c) Offence.}

Theft is the offence which occurs most frequently. 18 boys were charged with theft. Of the others 1 boy, D, was charged with false pretences; 3 boys, I, J and K, with converting a car to their own use; 3 boys, L, M, and U with mischief. In addition, 4 boys, C, F, L, M, were habitual truants. C also wandered frequently from home;
TABLE III - Offences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>Identification of Cases.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truancy,</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C, F, L, M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mischief,</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L, M, V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converting property</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I, K, J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilful damage.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving stolen goods.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Pretences,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U was charged with arson, N, wilful damage and receiving stolen goods, V, entering premises unlawfully.

Boys who commit such offences as mischief are usually in company with others. Some thefts are committed by one offender alone, others, such as A and B, Q, W, X and Y, in company with others.

(d) Guardianship before Court hearing.

Three boys, D, G, and K, were wards of the State, living in foster homes. Five boys, C, E, K, V, Y, were already under supervision for a previous offence, C for a short time only, prior to being committed to the care of
the State. All the children, with the exception of D and G, were living in their own homes.

(e) Guardianship after Court hearing.

Six of the offenders were committed - C, for his own safeguard. D, a State ward, was removed from his foster home. L and M were sent to a denominational orphanage, B to a State institution because of poor home environment; Y to a State institution because of his home environment, and the gravity of his offence.

K was placed under supervision for two years; Y had his period of supervision extended six months; P was admonished and discharged because of his good record and satisfactory home life. All other offenders were placed under supervision for one year. It will be seen that children are committed only as a last resort, and that at the same time they are not discharged unless there is every indication that the home environment is such that adequate control will be exercised in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Removed from home,</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision, 2 years,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision extended,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision, 1 year,</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admonished &amp; Discharged,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(f) Bad Behaviour other than Delinquency.

As far as can be gathered, F is a well-behaved child, both at school and at home. The teachers are not aware of serious misconduct of I and J. Apart from these, all the children have committed thefts which did not come to official notice. Fourteen boys have committed the offence of mischief. There are five truants, C, D, G, L, and M. Two boys, C and F, wander away from home. Two, T and V have been described as "bullies", and five, A, F, T, V and U are noted for untruthfulness.

Since delinquency may be regarded as a symptom of maladjustment, it is reasonable to expect that if the maladjustment is serious enough it will manifest itself in ways which escape official notice. There is the further consideration that if one offence is serious enough to warrant the child being placed under supervision, it is not necessary to charge the child with other offences, except in cases of theft, etc., where restitution is asked for.

However, it may be seen that most of the boys present behaviour problems other than the offence for which they

have been brought into Court.

TABLE V - Unofficial Behaviour Problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offences</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mischief</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandering</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untruthfulness</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(g) The Home.

Economic Conditions. The writer was not permitted to visit the homes of the children, and the estimate of their economic condition is made on the basis of information supplied by the teacher and the report submitted by the Child Welfare Officer to the Court.

None of the homes were considered to be above the average. Eleven boys¹ belong to homes which may be considered average homes. Of these, D and G were living in foster homes. The homes of 3 boys² are below average, and the homes of H, L, M, O, and S are very poor indeed. The twenty-five children come from homes

of which thirteen can be described as below a reasonable standard of comfort. All the "E" class homes are reported to be dirty, and two "D" class homes.

It would of course be foolish to assume from this evidence that young law-breakers come only from the poorer classes. Since the word "delinquent" is used by the Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences as a technical term to describe a child who appears in Court charged with an offence, we can perhaps say that as a rule the "delinquent" children come from poor homes. There is no way of counting the number of law-breakers in better class homes. Since their parents are in a better position financially and probably socially, their offences are frequently not reported to the police, and their parents are able to arrange privately for remedial treatment or restitution. This is especially true when the person who suffers happens to be a family acquaintance. It is probable, too, that poorer people report such matters as theft and wilful damage to the police more readily than other people, because the loss they suffer is proportionately more serious to them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of home.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A very good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D below average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E very poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers of homes.</th>
<th>A very good</th>
<th>B good</th>
<th>C average</th>
<th>D below average</th>
<th>E very poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Siblings.

C and V each have 3 illegitimate siblings, and several legitimate half-siblings. U has illegitimate half-siblings. H has siblings and half-siblings. W has 3 siblings and 6 half-siblings. In some cases the exact number of siblings is not known, and the number known to the teachers is entered. D had 1 foster-brother, and G has 3 foster brothers. S has 9 siblings, R and T have five siblings, I, J, K, and T each have two, A has 1.

TABLE VII - Number of children in homes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Children</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Homes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unknown 6.
Average for 19 families, 5.75.

In New Zealand the average number of children born to mothers of legitimate children is 2.64. It may be seen from Table VII that the average size of family from which these children are drawn is considerably larger. The presence of a large number of children in a family does not in itself cause delinquency, but coupled with poverty and friction, it may aggravate the maladjustment of a child.
(i) Health.

The children do not live in homes where they would receive frequent medical attention, and the medical record is dependent in every case on the routine examinations made at school. One child, B, has weak eyesight, G is not considered robust, I is slightly deaf, J has a slight goitre, K is very deaf, T had a weak heart, but he is now improving. A and Y had serious dental caries. All the other children are considered healthy and free from defects.

(j) Home Life.

Nowadays there is a strong tendency to stress the home situation in such matters as delinquency and abnormal conduct generally. Healy found in a survey of delinquents that 91% of his cases came from homes where there was friction, or unusual circumstances. The home has had practically undisputed control of the child during his first five years, and after that has still played the major role in his life. Very unsatisfactory homes have produced good citizens, and bad citizens come from what are ostensibly ideal homes; but it is safe to say that, other things being equal, the child who comes from a "broken home" is less likely to achieve a social adjustment than the child who comes from a home where the human
relationships are normal and satisfying.

Only one home, that of P, is considered satisfactory and normal from the point of view of family relationships. The homes of I and J are satisfactory, except that the father is sometimes out of work. Two children, C and V, are illegitimate, and have illegitimate siblings and legitimate half-siblings. Three boys, D and G and V were living with foster-mothers. H had a step-mother. The father of L and M is a habitual drunkard, and their mother is an invalid. A's parents are described as being eccentric. T's father is an invalid, V's father is a convict. P's father is deceased, and his mother has to depend largely on charity to support six children. K's sister, aged 19, is in charge of the home. The homes of B, H, L and M, S and V are especially mentioned as being very dirty. The mothers of nine boys are said to be immoral. In D's home there was serious rivalry between the boy and his foster-brother. In the homes of A, C, E, F, L, and M, G, there is friction between the parents, and involving the children. The homes of B, N, G, are unknown to the school. O's, however, was bad enough to necessitate his removal from it. Lack is control is mentioned of the homes of nine boys.1 In W's home there are three groups of siblings, and the father is unemployed.

X and Y are said to live in a very unsatisfactory home environment. Of the 22 homes, 2 are foster homes, 3 are satisfactory and normal, 1 boy has a step-mother, 1 has an invalid father, 2 boys have a drunken father and an invalid mother, 1 boy has no father, 3 boys are illegitimate. In 7 homes there is said to be lack of control, 5 homes are said to be dirty, 9 boys have immoral mothers and there is friction in seven homes. 3 homes were unknown to the schools.

**TABLE VIII - Condition in home.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition in Home</th>
<th>No. of Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster homes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of control</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirty Homes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immorality in Home</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friction</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step-mother</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid father</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunken father</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid mother</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased father</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad home environment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccentric father, and mother</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the facts and opinions about the homes of these children we may not necessarily assume that the home environment has been the cause of delinquency, but at least we can say that there is a high incidence of unsatisfactory conditions among the homes of the twenty-five children.

(E), (I), (M). Educational Attainments.

In five cases only were the results of standardised tests available. On the Otis Test, I scored an Intelligence Quotient of 70, K, 101, X, 95, Y, 93 and S, 78. In all other cases the estimate of ability depends upon the teacher's opinion and examination results. Eleven of the boys have left school, and their class attainment has been considered on the basis of their age and the class they were in when they left. A is below the average age of his class. C, K, Q, R, W, can be considered in the normal class for their ages. All the others are in a class of which the average age is at least a year less than their own. C, I and S are three years 1. retarded, nine boys are two years retarded and seven boys are one year retarded.

2. B, D, F, G, J, N, O, V.
TABLE IX - Retardation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retardation</th>
<th>No. of Boys.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not retarded</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retarded 1 year,</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retarded 2 years,</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retarded 3 years,</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average - 1.5 years
Retarded children in N.Z. schools,
- 6.1%

It appears that with four exceptions, all the children are in classes lower than the usual class for children of their age. There has been considerable discussion in recent years as to the wisdom of allowing children to drop behind their contemporaries. About 6% of the children in New Zealand primary schools are retarded; about 83% of this group of delinquents are retarded. We cannot conclude that therefore in these cases mental deficiency has been a cause of delinquency. However, from various studies of the problem there is evidence of a significant correlation between various degrees of mental dullness and retardation in school; and it may be that in a given case the cause of retardation has been associated with the cause of delinquency.
(n) Interests and Indications of Special Abilities.

Nine boys were considered good at games. None of the others were even considered interested in games. A and N can sing, and both have considerable aptitude for music generally. A, G, N, P, R, V, and W can draw. N is mentioned as having mechanical ability. G and H are good at woodwork. 7 boys are considered to have ability in directions other than for games or scholastic work. Of these seven, A does good work in school, and behaves well, G does poor work and behaves badly, H keeps up with his work and behaves well, N does average work and behaves badly, P and W do poor work and behave well; 3 do satisfactory work, 4 do not; 2 behave badly, 5 behave well.

On the whole it can be said that among the boys studied there are fewer with special abilities than without, and that boys such as A and N who had one marked ability had others as well. Of the boys without special abilities, E, J, K, O and Q did satisfactory work, and J, K, B, C, and E behaved well in class.

On the basis of these figures, it will be seen that the boys who have abilities other than for games or school work tend to do slightly better school work and to behave more satisfactorily than boys who have no such abilities.

This is in accordance with Cyril Burt's findings that gifted children tend to be gifted in several ways, and that lack of abilities in different directions tend to be associated.

(o) and (r). School work.

A, the only child in a higher class than the usual for his age group, is the only child who does excellent work in school. All his scholastic subjects are good, and he ranks very high in his class. He did satisfactory work, but was retarded two years. N and O did satisfactory work and were retarded one year. E, J, K and Q did average work, E being retarded 2 years and J one. All the others did unsatisfactory work, and the work of eleven boys¹ was exceptionally poor. Of these, I and P were the only ones whose behaviour was satisfactory. Of the eleven children² whose behaviour in school was unsatisfactory, only one, C, did satisfactory work.

It can be seen that there is a high correlation between very poor work and very bad behaviour in class. Of the six boys who did D class work, B, C, F, R, V, W, F behaved badly, R and W behaved well, and the others were negative in their attitude. E, J, K, and Q did

average work and were indifferent and negative. Of the more satisfactory from the scholastic point of view, 0 behaved badly, K, H and A behaved well. Of the eight who did average or above average work, 4 behaved well, 2 were indifferent and 2 behaved badly. Of the 17 who did unsatisfactory work, 3 behaved well, 5 were negative, and 9 behaved badly.

On the whole, among the boys studied the ones who do good work tend to behave well in class, and those who do poor work tend to behave badly.

(p) Number of Schools attended.

In many cases, for reasons already stated, the school history was not available, and the minimum number of schools attended has been entered. On this basis of calculation, 4 boys, C, T, X and Y have attended 5 schools, F and W have attended 4 schools, A and B 3 schools, nine boys at least two schools. The average number of schools attended by each member of the group is at least 2.5. Of the children who have attended more than one school, A is the only one who does even satisfactory work. However, it is interesting to notice that S, three years retarded, has attended only one school, G is also three years retarded, but his school history is not available.

1. D, G, I, K, L, M, Q, U and V.
Of the group studied, more than half have attended at least two, and probably more than two schools. It would be expected that change of school would increase retardation. However, two of the most retarded have attended only one school. Their failure to achieve in school cannot be attributed to frequent changes of school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE X - Changes of School.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Cases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average No. 2.4.

(q) Relations with other children.

A normal child can as a rule "make friends" fairly easily. For his normal development it is desirable that in his play, opportunities should arise for him both to lead and to be led. Children who do not make friends easily, and who appear to have no friends, children who become aggressive when they are not leading, children who never attempt to lead, will arouse the suspicion that their social adjustment is not progressing satisfactorily. It has been pointed out that if the child's maladjustment is serious, it is unlikely to manifest itself in ways other than delinquency.
The writer feels that the child's adjustment to his social group is probably the most important feature of the information about him. But for the purposes of this study, opinions of the child's adjustment are all those of teachers, who may never see the child playing under normal circumstances, and who may be obliged to form their opinion on the evidence of one or two incidents. The opinions given are not considered sufficiently reliable to form the basis of generalisations. R is said to be very popular, P is friendly, H is definitely a leader. There seems to be a group of boys who "get on" well with the others, but are easily led. There is a group who are aggressive and bullying in their attitude, O, T and V. There is another group who are indifferent to the other children, or independent of their friendship.  Of these, C appears independent of his friends, E and K are unpopular and the others range between these extremes.

Although the evidence is not considered by the writer as final or reliable, there is an indication that this group of delinquent children have not on the whole achieved a satisfactory adjustment to their social group. There may be a close relation between the causes of their maladjustment and the causes of delinquency.

1. B, D, I, J, Q, R, S, E, X, Y.
2. A, C, E, F, G, L, K, M.
(3) Behaviour away from school.

It has not been possible in every case to obtain information as to the boy's behaviour away from school. Usually such knowledge is possessed by teachers in cases where boys are reported by neighbours to the school - i.e. C, G, N, S, T, and V. The Child Welfare Officer in his report usually mentions such a situation as lack of control, and this is said to be true in the homes of twelve boys. T and V are said to go to the pictures too frequently. K is said to spend much time on the street.

The evidence is incomplete, but at least a half of the children are troublesome away from school. An interesting case is that of H, whose behaviour at school appears entirely satisfactory, and yet away from school he is just as unsatisfactory.

To generalise roughly, about the group, it may be said that most of the boys commit theft, that most of them live at home and have been placed under supervision, that most of them live in poor homes, with rather more siblings than the usual, that the home environment is usually unsatisfactory, that the boys tend to be retarded in school do poor work, and behave badly, and that few of them appear to have achieved a satisfactory adjustment to their social group.

CHAPTER V - CONCLUSION

A. Modern Conceptions of Adequate Treatment of Delinquent Children.

Since the beginning of the century an increasing degree of attention has been paid to the problems of delinquency. The study of such problems can be said to have emerged from the purely descriptive stage, and to have become at least partially scientific. Of the English and American investigators who have distinguished themselves in this field, Dr. Cyril Burt can fairly be taken as representative; he has outlined the standards of treatment which in the more advanced centres in England and the United States are aimed at, and to an appreciable degree, achieved. Dr. Burt says:

"The delinquent himself must be approached individually as a unique human being with a peculiar constitution, peculiar difficulties, and peculiar problems of his own. The keynote of modern educational thought is individuality - self-realisation - to be sought and attained, not by collective instruction, nor by imposed uniformity and repression, but by separate adjustments and readjustments for each particular child. If this is needed for the normal, how much greater must be the need for the abnormal, the neglected, the delinquent. The Court, therefore, and whatever authority has to grapple with such cases, must
at all times regard not the offence but the offender. The aim must not be punishment, but treatment; and the target not isolated actions but their causes. Since these causes seldom float conspicuously upon the surface, such authority must have access to all available information and possess means to make for every case intensive investigations of their own. On each main aspect, they must have expert help. A social investigator must report upon home circumstances; a medical officer must inspect the child for physical defects; a psychologist must be at hand to apply mental tests to assess temperamental qualities and to analyse unconscious motives. A psychological clinic, embodying all these different workers studying the same cases scientifically side by side, is the most pressing need of all.  

Standards in New Zealand.

A New Zealand investigator, Miss D. K. Potter, discussing this passage from "The Young Delinquent" remarks that in the light of its demands, our New Zealand system appears to be "almost obsolete." It is noteworthy, however, that the principal enactments in this country pertaining to children, the Child Welfare Act of


1925 and the Child Welfare Amendment Act of 1927, are of a very enlightened character. Miss Potter has drawn attention to, and condemned, the "indefiniteness and incompleteness"¹ of these Acts. The writer does not concur with Miss Potter on this point. If the legislation is vague, it at least allows of considerable latitude in interpretation. It is true that the treatment of young offenders in New Zealand falls short of the standards set in some parts of the United States and England, but it is also true that the legislation covering the treatment is of an enlightened nature, and its indefinite wording permits of a wide measure of freedom to those who actually deal with the children. The spirit and the technical skill with which the work is carried out within the framework of the law is of greater significance than the actual wording of the law.

B. Indications of Weaknesses that the Study has revealed.

Evidence has been brought forward of weaknesses in the methods of dealing with "problem" children commonly used in New Zealand schools.

1. Insufficient Individual Attention. The study has been based on the cases of children who have come before the Court, but probably only a small proportion

of young law-breakers and "problem" children appear there. The teachers have to deal with a much wider group of "problem children". At least, there is a wider group of "problem" children in the schools, but they are frequently not recognised as such. Children such as E and Q are sometimes not recognised by their teachers as being unusual. Children such as B and S do not appear to rouse the suspicions of their teachers. There does not seem in some cases to be sufficient individual attention to reveal the abnormalities and difficulties which call for special help. This is probably explained in part by the fact that the teachers may not be watching for abnormalities, and assume that children are normal until their maladjustment is too obvious to be overlooked. Due allowance should be made for the fact that classes are often large. However, it seems to the writer that if teachers were made more fully aware of the educational significance of individual differences, they could do more preventive work even under existing conditions.


In the majority of cases studied, teachers have been fully aware that they had to deal with a "difficult" child, and they were prepared to do what they could to help him. Sometimes, as in the cases of A, G, and G, the teacher tried methods, or persisted with special
methods, apparently without success. Sometimes the teachers admitted frankly that they did not know what measures to use in dealing with a child, as for instance, with D, H, L, M, V. When the class teacher and headmaster had exhausted the ideas and possibilities which present themselves readily, there appears to be no arrangement whereby they may obtain the help of some expert. The teacher has to think of his class as a group, as well as of the children as individuals, and for that reason frequently feels obliged to persist with treatment which he knows is only a palliative measure, and which he does not expect to effect a permanent cure. In some cases, as with G, the teacher or headmaster persisted with punishment which produced little effect, on the grounds that he could not make an exception of one child. It is not suggested that an educational psychologist would be able to treat adequately and successfully every "problem" child referred to him, but there are at least indications that teachers and headmasters are sometimes in need of advice, and there is available neither advice about how to deal with "problem" children, nor an agency to which they may refer difficult cases for treatment.1. There are also indications that the teachers would be glad to accept advice

1. A certain number of "problem" children are referred by schools to the Educational and Psychological laboratories of the local University College. However, none of the cases in the present series had been so referred.
from a reliable source, if there were any forthcoming.


At present, the Child Welfare Officer and the teacher function more or less independently of each other. Each possesses knowledge which might be useful to the other. Sometimes the teacher is aware of misdemeanours or character deviations which are unknown to the Child Welfare Officer - as in the case of R. Sometimes the teachers are quite unaware that the child has been before the Court and is under supervision - as in the cases of Q and S. Q's case can be explained by the fact that he attends a secondary school, and it is thought possible that he might run the risk of expulsion if the school should learn of his delinquency. There is among the cases an instance of co-operation which is formal only. Q's teacher was asked to write a quarterly report of the boy's conduct for the Child Welfare Branch, and in each report he stated that unless action was taken the boy would become delinquent. The teacher received no acknowledgement, and no special action appeared to have been taken.

In cases where the Child Welfare Officer does interview the teachers of children under his supervision, it appears to be solely for the purpose of obtaining a
report on the child's progress and conduct, and not with the additional aim of helping to work out a constructive plan of treatment. In more than one school, the writer found that the headmaster was not altogether willing to look to the Child Welfare Officer for advice and help, maintaining that Child Welfare Officers are untrained. The teacher knows the individual children better than the Child Welfare Officer, and feels more competent to deal with problems of adjustment.

From evidence gathered by the writer, part of the treatment of supervision consists in placing upon a child conditions and restrictions, which regulate, for example, the time he may spend away from home. However, it seems necessary to make certain that he has suitable occupation at home, and possibly this is a sphere where the teacher's more intimate knowledge of the child's tastes and interests might be of use. The large number of cases, as well as the lack of professional training, must doubtless limit the diversity and thoroughness of the treatment which is attempted under the system of supervision.

The children studied nearly all came from homes where there is conflict, or which are unsatisfactory in some other way, and parents in such homes may be unwilling to co-operate with teachers, and may resent what appears

1. See Tables VI and VIII, Pages 64 and 68.
to be inquisitive interference. Possibly it is not the teacher's function to attempt to establish relations with such homes. But satisfactory home relationships provide a so much better environment for a child, and parents are often willing to modify their behaviour and attitudes if they are approached tactfully; so that it would seem worth while for there to be some person to undertake this work. It may be simply a matter of putting the family in touch with the social agency most likely to be able to help them. As it is, any attempt the teacher may make involves working in his free time, is voluntary, and in addition, is directed solely by his own judgment, in a field where specific knowledge is important. Teachers possibly should be, and frequently are, prepared to sacrifice time for establishing contact with parents, but they might do this more profitably under guidance.

In view of the standards of investigation and treatment set out by Burt and other authorities, and in consideration of what has been achieved by the co-ordinated programmes being conducted in parts of the United States, it seems desirable that there should be more co-operation than is at present evident, between Child Welfare Officer, school and home, and the other social agencies which may have a direct influence in the life of a particular child.

The more difficult behaviour problems can hardly be approached successfully without expert knowledge and training. It is not necessary for every Child Welfare Officer and every teacher to be a trained expert, but it does seem desirable for both to be able to call upon professional advice. Some "problem" children do not present serious difficulties, and can be, and are assisted quite effectively along commonsense lines by dealing with conspicuous faults and difficulties of maladjustment.

But there are children such as A and E, whose behaviour and general attitudes seem to suggest that there are more deep-seated causes which could be reached only by psychological examination. There is no provision at all made for these children, except the rare cases which are referred to the Clinics attached to a University College. There is another group of children, such as C and D, whose maladjustment is obvious, but inexplicable to teachers or Child Welfare Officer. All these cases are dealt with in more or less the same way, by supervision of committal, not so much because the authorities consider they are all alike and should be treated alike, but rather because there is no provision made for them to be treated in any other

1. See Table IV, p. 61.
way. There is, however, substantial evidence from the work of such outstanding people as Burt, Healy and the Cluecks, to show that some delinquents require very intensive individual treatment.

A summary of the evidence provided by the 25 cases studied, indicates weaknesses in the methods of dealing with "problem" school children - some children with deviations of personality or adjustment are not noticed by the teachers sometimes the teachers are fully aware of a problem, do what they can, and on occasions admit frankly that they are perplexed; there is no expert advice available; there appears to be insufficient co-operation between the schools and the Child Welfare Officer, and the Child Welfare Branch does not include on its staff a person qualified to deal with more serious cases of maladjustment.

C. Suggested Lines of Improvement.

It is suggested that minor alterations might be made in the schools and in the Education Department, which would be worth trying, to contribute towards preventing delinquency, and to facilitate the treatment of "problem" children.

1. Cumulative pupils' records.

In most of the cases studied it has been very difficult to trace the child's history. In very few cases were the
results of standardised tests available. A more comprehensive cumulative record than the record card used at present, would be of value to teachers, when they meet a pupil for the first time. In addition, the more careful observation of each child and the periodic assessment of progress and adjustment, which the compilation of such a record would necessitate, might lead to the earlier discovery of personality deviations, unusual home conditions, etc. At present, knowledge possessed by nurses, doctors and teachers is frequently lost, when the child goes to another school, as many of these cases have done, or to another teacher. It is realised that a detailed record card which is not filled in, or only partly filled in, is worse than useless; but it seems desirable that there should be some way of recording significant facts about each child, for the reference of his future teachers, and in the case of a maladjusted child, of the person who undertakes the treatment.

2. Reduction of the age disparity in classes.

It has been shown that nearly all of this group of delinquents have been retarded in school. The opinion

1. The records advocated in the new edition of the Board of Education's "Handbook of Suggestions to Teachers" indicate the trend of enlightened opinion on this point in England.

2. See Table I, p. 74. The 25 boys are entered 60 times on school rolls.

3. See Table IX, p. 70.
is widely held, and strongly urged by such authorities as Sir Percy Meadon, that children should not be in a class where there is too great a discrepancy between their age and the average age of the class. This principle forms the basis for the modern ideal of secondary education for all children, beginning at the age of 11 plus. There are various causes for retardation; the child may be dull, or suffering from some specific disability, such as for reading; the child may be physically handicapped, or be frequently absent from school. He may be faced with work that is too difficult, or not suited to his particular abilities; he may not be working up to capacity; as a result of past failures, he may have developed a failing attitude. In any case, he is associating with children who are not his contemporaries, and this is generally agreed to be undesirable. Further, retardation suggests that the child is not making a proper adjustment to his school work. Teachers have to consider the possibility that mere attendance at school may be a factor in provoking delinquency.

There are considerable difficulties of administration and expense in the way of providing the education really suited to the needs of each child, but it is possible that the facilities which exist could be used to greater advantage than at present, as for instance, in re-arranging classes, and providing remedial instruction for backward
children who are not dull, etc. It may be that head-
masters have not explored the possibilities of their
schools. Many headmasters say that they could do more
if they had time, perhaps by being freed from routine
clerical work.

3. The school nurses might be given a wider function.

Even among the few cases studied there are several
children who habitually come to school dirty, and the
home environment is in nearly every case unsatisfactory.
Teachers frequently notice children who are in need of
special attention, children who do not appear healthy,
who are failing, or not making a satisfactory social
adjustment. The teachers either have not the time or
the qualifications to deal with these children. Sick
children can be referred to the school nurse, who has
access to the homes. It seems possible that if the
school nurses were to receive training in professional
social work, they could do work along the lines of the
Visiting Teacher Division in Cincinnati. Perhaps there
could be added to the ranks of the school nurses, special
teachers who would have access to homes, and who would
co-operate in studying and helping children referred to
them by class teachers, for personality deviations, and
unsatisfactory school work.
4. There is a strong case for the appointment of educational psychologists.

Probably the most urgent need of all is for expert advice and guidance. Some children suffer maladjustments of such a kind that a trained educational psychologist could make an invaluable contribution to diagnosis and treatment. Those boys who sit passively inattentive in school may require educational guidance, or the solving of some emotional conflict. Some children who misbehave in school have practically exhausted the resources of their teachers, and the teachers frankly admit that they do not know what to do. Some children leave school, who in the opinion of their teachers will develop into criminals, and the teachers are powerless to prevent delinquency. Although the psychologist is not a magician who could solve every problem, there is substantial evidence, in the light of experiments carried out in the United States and Britain, to show that the psychologist could achieve much by giving advice and treatment.

5. There is an urgent need to provide professional training for Child Welfare Officers.

It is suggested that as the Child Welfare Officer has the special care of children considered delinquent by the Children's Court, he should be professionally trained for his work. He is in charge of the children placed under
supervision, and he is virtually responsible for the treatment measures which are undertaken. Of the cases that were studied, most were placed under supervision. Various writers have pointed out the constructive possibilities of supervision as a treatment measure. Informed opinion abroad considers that supervision should be carried out by men and women who in addition to being carefully selected, have received professional training in social work. Miss Potter has outlined the advantages of the supervision system:

"Its advantages are obvious, especially when considered in relation to the needs of the delinquent child. It provides an opportunity for further study of the child's reaction to varying aspects of his normal environment, which is impossible if he be removed from his usual surroundings by committal to an institution or to a foster home. It permits of experiment in adapting that environment, removing certain features and substituting others until the child is able to develop properly. During the period of such supervision the child may be brought into touch with such agencies as will help him to develop a sane attitude towards society. Such a process cannot be left to the child alone, or even to his parents, but must be closely supervised by one who has sufficient insight into the child's mind to realise his most urgent needs, and a knowledge of all the resources that are
available to satisfy them.\footnotemark[1]  

It can be seen that if supervision is used so frequently,\footnotemark[2] and is valued so highly as a treatment measure, the Officer in charge of supervision has an onerous position, and it is reasonable to expect that he should be trained for his work. A trained Officer would be in a better position to co-operate with the schools. Co-operation in itself is no guarantee of success, but if it is employed under the directions of a qualified person, there is more chance of success than if treatment is left to haphazard methods. Provision is now made in the University of London and elsewhere in England for training social workers. The Home Office has of recent years attached greater importance to securing professionally trained workers. Many who take the course in professional social work hold a University degree as a preliminary qualification.

Miss Potter has suggested that education should be a branch of Child Welfare, and not Child Welfare a branch of education. The present arrangement is, in the writer's opinion, more ideal, if by education is understood every influence brought to bear on a child throughout his life, and if the minority who require special attention in

\footnotetext[1]{Potter, D.K., op.cit. P. 147.}

\footnotetext[2]{Eighteen children of the 25 were placed under supervision.}
one way or another, are cared for by the Child Welfare Branch. The "problem" children form probably the largest group of abnormal children, and so far, their needs are not recognised, except in cases where it is considered necessary in the interests of the community. The inevitable question of finance presents itself, but it is probable that the returns on expenditure to provide facilities for advising on, and treating, problems would be high, if better adjusted and better educated citizens, fewer criminals and unstable persons could be considered adequate returns. The need for such a development as was suggested in 1933 by Dr. Kandel is to-day increasingly felt: -

"The organisation of national systems of education involves more than the mere provision of schools. It must include the provision of such services as will enable the pupils to derive the greatest profit from their attendance at school.

The change in emphasis from teaching subjects to teaching the child, the outstanding characteristic of current educational theory, has brought with it an increasing interest in the mental growth of the child, and with it a more intensive study of the specific difficulties which present themselves in the process of instruction. Already psychological clinics have begun to be established to deal with what are known as problem
children. The probability is that out of this small beginning more widespread provision will be made for the school psychologist. It may be expected that a completely organised system of education will include, beside the social services, the services of experts in the scientific aspects, and that both services will link the school more closely with the home. A movement with which the development of parents' associations and parental education, which are also in their initial stages, will be associated. A better and more scientific understanding of the child will give reality and concreteness to the demand for better adaption of education and instruction to the child as an individual.\textsuperscript{1.}

\textsuperscript{1.} Kandel, I.L. "Comparative Education". P. 92.
APPENDIX A - The Treatment of Juvenile Offenders.

The children who come before the Children's Court are brought there either by the Child Welfare Branch of the Education Department, or by the Police Department. The Child Welfare Officer may bring children who in his opinion are indigent or neglected, not under proper control or delinquent. He makes a survey of the child's home circumstances, interviews parents and teachers, and then presents his report before the Children's Court, recommending the course to be adopted. Usually the presiding Magistrate acts on the advice of the Child Welfare Officer. The police bring children for infringement of by-laws, or for delinquency. In the cases of delinquency, the Inspector of Police notifies the Child Welfare Branch before the child is to appear in the Children's Court, and the Child Welfare Officer investigates the circumstances as before. Treatment is regulated by the Child Welfare Act of 1925, and includes punishment and admonishment of parents, removal of children to foster homes or State institutions, or placing under the supervision of the Child Welfare Officer.

Delinquent children under the age of eight or nine are usually dealt with outside the Court. Employers of delinquent children are interviewed at the discretion of the Child Welfare Officer, to guard against summary dismissal.
The Children's Court is not open to the public. Children do not hear one another's cases. A Magistrate and one or two Justices of the Peace preside. By-law offenders are usually ordered a small fine, or are admonished and discharged. Delinquent children are most frequently placed under supervision. Only as a last resort are children committed, and then they are placed in foster homes rather than in institutions.

In the case of older children, the Child Welfare Officer co-operates with the parents or guardian in suggesting opportunities for recreation, methods of treatment, finding employment, etc. Young persons over the age of seventeen are tried in the Magistrate's Court, although in special cases a Magistrate may refer a young person of eighteen from the Magistrate's Court to the Children's Court.

The aim is to make the Court as informal as possible, but at the same time to instil in the young offenders a wholesome respect for the law. The child is not present while the Magistrate discusses the case with parents or guardian. Children are never detained at the Police Station, except in occasional instances, until his parents call for him.

Defective children as a rule profit by being placed
in the institution most suited to their needs. In New Zealand there are various types - Otakaik takes retarded boys, Richmond, retarded girls. Templeton is for more extreme cases, who have to be certified as Feebleminded before admission. Wererua is a training farm for delinquent boys. The Burwood Home takes girls not under proper control. In each centre there is a Receiving Home, where children may be held on remand, or looked after prior to being sent to an institution. Children committed to the care of the State are wards of the Superintendent of the Child Welfare Branch until they attain their majority; but at any time they may be returned to their parents if their behaviour appears to warrant it; and if the parents or guardian seem capable of looking after them; if they are sent home they automatically cease to be wards of the State. In most cases the Superintendent endeavours to discharge young persons before their majority, so that their discharge does not appear to be merely a consequence of their age, but a reward for good conduct. In cases where it appears desirable that a person be detained beyond the age of twenty-one, an order must be presented to a Magistrate six months before the date of majority.

It is a praiseworthy feature of the New Zealand Child Welfare Branch that no efforts are spared to mitigate social stigma. Conviction in the Children's Court involves practically no disgrace at all.
APPENDIX B - CASE STUDIES

Cases A, C, D, E, H are given in Chapter III.

Case B. The boy is 12 years 9 months of age. He has appeared only once in Court for the theft of a bicycle and a torch. He was placed under the supervision of the Child Welfare Officer for twelve months.

Home: Little is known of his home by the teachers. It is materially poor. The child's clothes are warm enough, but they are ragged and dirty.

Physique: The boy is pale and thin, and has a marked strabismus.

At School: He is at present in Standard IV. The average age of the class is 11 years 3 months. He is weak in all subjects, and shows no aptitude for art or handwork. He dislikes schoolwork, games and drill. The teachers consider that he is a dull child, with little aptitude for school work. The boy has attended three schools, and was transferred to his present school two years ago, because his parents were dissatisfied with his progress. When he first came he appeared thoroughly afraid of the teachers. They consider him rather an unhappy child. He appears to "get on" well with other children. He is unselfish and always prepared to follow
some one else's lead. He rarely asserts himself, except for an occasional fight, which the teachers consider "a reaction to inferiority". In his delinquency he was the cat's-paw of A, who thought out the scheme. A is younger than this child, but bigger, and bullies him occasionally. B is very dreamy in class, and seems in the opinion of his teacher to be mentally and physically weak. He does not concentrate, he is negative and unresponsive.

However, he is a likeable boy. He has a pleasant manner, and a smiling, rather "spineless" attitude. The headmaster considers that he belongs to "quite a common type, rather dull, weak, sociable, and easily led; that he needs and will need supervision." He has never caused any trouble in school, and there is no previous record of bad behaviour.

Summary and Interpretation.

The boy is small, pale, weak, dirty and untidy, and yet the school are not aware of the home conditions. The headmaster considers that supervision is necessary, but there is little evidence of co-operation between the school and the Child Welfare Officer. The boy is obviously not succeeding in school, but no provision has been made for careful assessment of his potentialities by tests and other means, as a basis for remedial work and educational guidance. There is a lack of suggestions for treatment, and this may be partly because of the extremely limited possibilities.
Case F. Age 8 years 4 months. The boy was not required to appear in the Children's Court because of his extreme youth. He was brought to the official notice of the Police and the Child Welfare officials for theft of small sums of money and for frequent truancy, and by Court order was placed under the supervision of the Child Welfare Officer.

Home: The father is unemployed, and in the opinion of the headmaster "clamorous for his rights, and silent with regard to his duties". He seems reasonably fond of the child, but anxious to place him in an institution "for the boy's own sake". The mother does not live with the family and there is another woman in her place. The headmaster says "His home life is such that he has no reason to expect sympathy from adults, or to trust them, or to confide in them".

At School: He is in P.4; the average age of the class is 7 years 2 months. While he is retarded, the class teacher and headmaster feel that this is not due to inabilit or dullness, so much as to frequent changes of school. The teachers are not aware of any special abilities. He can perform quite well at games and drill, but he shows little interest. He is indifferent to the teachers, reserved in their presence, "neither friendly nor evasive." He is definitely not a leader. He remains rather aloof from the other children, and does not seem either to seek friendship nor to respond to it. He is very given to pugnacious
outbursts and does not "get on" well with the other children.

He is clean and tidy in appearance, and tidy with his possessions, well-mannered, self-possessed and reserved. He is very unpunctual, and his teacher says that he appears to have no idea of time. He has played truant frequently ever since he began school. He frequently takes small articles and sums of money. But he is quiet and negative in school, and causes no trouble in class. The headmaster considers that the boy will have a delinquent career.

Summary and Interpretation.

Although this child is so young, he has already gained a "criminal" reputation at school. The headmaster and teachers feel that they are unable to prevent this boy from committing further offences. He has already lost ground at school; and will probably never catch up to the class level indicated by his age and the teacher's estimate of his ability: so that he faces six years of retarded school life. There is little evidence of the cooperation between home, school and Child Welfare Officer which would be essential to any remedial programme. If, as the headmaster says, his homelife is such that he has no reason to expect sympathy from adults, or to trust them, it seems that whoever attempts the readjustment of this little boy has a difficult task in spite of the fact that he is so young.
The facts and opinions concerning him seem to indicate the need for a careful and comprehensive study of the boy, and the working out of a guidance programme along the lines followed by educational psychologists and child guidance clinics in England and the United States.

Case G. The boy is 15 years of age. He has appeared once only in the Court, for taking a bicycle. He was placed under the supervision of the Child Welfare Officer for twelve months.

Home: This boy is illegitimate and lives in a foster-home where he has been for four years. He has been in several previous foster-homes. His mother visits him frequently, gives him presents, and appears very fond of him. There are three other boys in the foster-home, all brothers. The foster parents are elderly, and although the payment for keeping the children is an important consideration, they take a pride in doing their best for the boys. The boys do most of the housework. The house is comfortable, and moderately clean, and religious influence is brought to bear on the boys. The three brothers are considered "low-witted and peculiar". G is apparently troublesome at home. He tells lies with impunity. The foster-mother used to write notes to the teacher asking him to punish the boy.

At School: He left school at the end of 1936 in Std.IV.
As is customary, the Child Welfare Authorities wrote to the headmaster to inquire whether the boy could profit by further attendance at school, and the headmaster replied that he was a hopeless case. His school work was consistently poor. However, he had definite ability for woodwork and painting. His teacher used to take him to woodwork with the Stds. V and VI boys, and his work was always fast and accurate.

**Behaviour:** The boy was always troublesome in class. He was slow with his work, behaved badly, and was a constant centre of disturbance. He was "utterly obnoxious" to use his teacher's words. The teacher said that he had no powers of self-criticism; he would do anything for admiration, and yet a word of praise made him objectionably self-satisfied. He had a babyish fluctuation of attention. At the same time, he had an almost uncanny knack of anticipating the needs of adults.

He was most unpopular with the other boys and girls. He would trip them, stick pins in them, etc. His teacher feels sure that he has no future ahead of him other than Police Courts. Incidentally, because the boy was a ward of the State, the teacher had to send quarterly reports to the Child Welfare Branch. On every occasion the teacher pointed out that the boy was developing into a criminal, that he was good at woodwork, and that if special provision
was made for him along these lines, he might become a useful citizen. The Child Welfare Branch never replied.

The chief problem out of class was the boy's almost fanatical desire to ride bicycles. He would borrow a boy's bicycle, and ride it home for lunch, or take it after school and ride about for an hour. He never did any damage, and never failed to return the bicycle. On the occasion for which he appeared in Court, he took the bicycle in town, and probably had not had time to return it. He was always frank finally, although he frequently told lies when first accused. Apparently the headmaster strapped the boy frequently, and he said that although the boy bore no resentment, he did not allow the prospect of punishment to deter him. He smoked frequently and played truant.

The teachers were fully aware that the boy presented a problem. They "tried all sorts of ways" of dealing with him. One teacher took him for excursions, and tried by kindness to win over his co-operation. However, she lost hope before she had achieved much success. The headmaster considered that he was a most unattractive boy, not likeable in any way, a hopeless dullard with no possible future ahead of him but Police Courts.

Summary and Interpretation.

This boy does not appear to have achieved a
satisfactory adjustment at school in any way. He was a problem to the school. The teachers tried all the schemes they could think of. He was retarded and not likeable. He was allowed to leave school, his headmaster feeling sure that there was nothing but crime ahead of him. Apparently the headmaster persisted with punishment, although this method of treatment did not produce any improvement. There was no active co-operation between the school and the foster mother, who on one occasion would take the boy's part in an unreasoning fashion, and on the next would ask the school to punish him. At least there is an element of experimentation in the school, and the teachers tried what schemes they could. However, there was no expert advice of any kind available. It cannot be said that from an educational guidance point of view everything possible was done for the boy.

Case 1. The boy is 15 years 9 months of age, and has no previous Court record. He comes before the Court for converting a car to unlawful use, in company with J and K. He was placed under the supervision of the Child Welfare Officer for twelve months.

Home: The boy's home is considered satisfactory by the Child Welfare Authorities. It is unknown to the school. There are three children. A younger brother is considered by the teachers to be more intelligent, better behaved, and of more attractive personality. I is thought by his
teacher to be slightly deaf.

At School: The boy has attended two schools, and has repeated three standards. He left school in 1936 in Std. IV. According to the Otis Intelligence Scale, his intelligence quotient was 70. His work in all subjects was very poor. His writing was bad, and his teacher does not know of any special abilities, except that he could play games fairly well.

Behaviour: As a rule he behaved well in class, but occasionally caused trouble. His teacher considered that he had "no mind of his own" and that he frequently did "silly" things. He was very easily led. On the occasion for which he appears in Court, he was with two other boys, one of whom is very deaf. As a condition of his supervision he was forbidden to associate with the other boys.

Summary and Interpretation.

Delinquency did not occur until after the boy had left school. There is evidence that the boy is dull, and has been placed in sharp contrast to a brother who is younger, and achieving a better adjustment in every way. The boy was three years retarded, and possibly was doing work unsuited to his capacity. His deafness may have handicapped him. His "silly" behaviour may have been the
consequence of low intelligence. He was recognised by the teachers as a problem, though not a very serious one. As such, however, he was obliged to pass through school without examination by a qualified psychologist, and without the constructive help which might well have been influential in bringing about a better adjustment, and as a result, in preventing delinquency.

Case J. The boy is 15 years 2 months of age. He appeared in Court for the only time, for accompanying I and K in converting a car to unlawful use. He was placed under the supervision of the Child Welfare Officer, for twelve months.

Home: The home is considered satisfactory. There are two siblings, and the father is a labourer.

Physique: The boy’s medical record states that he has a slight goitre. At seven years he was poisoned by sweets. He suffers from frequent colds, causing absence from school.

At School: He left school in 1936 having obtained a Proficiency Certificate. He had repeated Std. IV. He did work of average level, in most subjects, but the teacher does not know of any special abilities. He attended the same school throughout his career. His teacher considered that he has average intelligence. He was absent 31 half-days in 1936, and 76 half-days in 1935.
Behaviour: His behaviour in class and at school was good. His teacher considered that he was easily led, but would not have suspected that he would become delinquent. It seems that on the occasion for which he appears, he may have been led into mischief. J was a cheerful boy, and seemed to "get on" well with the other children.

Summary and Interpretation.

Delinquency did not occur until after the boy had left school. At school he did not arouse concern as a problem. His behaviour and his school work were satisfactory. He may have been handicapped by physical defects. The offence for which the boy appears was not of a very serious nature. It seems likely in this case that the delinquent behaviour was a more or less isolated episode, and the prospect is not unfavourable.

Case K. The boy is 15 years 11 months of age. He has appeared once before in Court for theft, and on this occasion appears for converting a car to unlawful use. He was placed under supervision for one year.

Home: There is no mother in the home. The teacher is unable to say whether she is dead or not. The household consists of the father, a brother of 17 who caused much trouble at school, and a sister of 19. The sister is in charge of the home. In the teacher's opinion, she did
her best with the boys but was unable to control them. They had "an absolutely free hand to do as they liked, although the sister tried her best to guide them". K spent much of his time roaming about the streets.

At School: The boy obtained a Competency Certificate at the age of 14. His I. Q. rating (Otis) was 101. His grade on the Detroit Mechanical Ability Test was C. His arithmetic was weak, but all other subjects were fair. The teacher saw no sign of special abilities or interests.

Habits and Behaviour: K was very untidy and very dirty. He was nearly always late for school. He used to say he had to help at home, but his sister used to report to the headmaster that he had plenty of time to do his tasks, but that he was lazy and would never hurry. He never caused trouble at school, but was easily led, and "spineless".

Summary and Interpretation.

K appears to be a mediocre boy - he did average work, and caused no trouble in school. But his general attitude of laziness, his unpunctuality, untidiness, and dirtiness, were sufficiently marked to warrant investigation and special remedial measures. There is substantial evidence that he needed guidance out of school hours. There was co-operation between the teachers and the boy's sister, but little evidence of co-operation between the Child Welfare Officer and the teachers, during the first period
of supervision.

Cases L and M. The two boys are brothers, they are 11 years and 10 years old respectively, and have appeared once in Court for delinquency, officially described as "mischief". They were both ordered to be sent to a denominational orphanage, with the condition that if their father attempted to interfere with the orphanage authorities, the children would be committed to the care of the State.

Home: The provision made by the Court is an indication of the home life of the children. The father is a habitual drunkard and morphia addict. He has been unemployed for ten years. The mother is an invalid. The home is incredibly dirty, and there is no control over a large family. The father wanted the children to be placed in an orphanage. An elder brother had been in the orphanage, and the father complained of the way in which he had been treated. It was for this reason that the Court made a condition to the order for the two younger children to be placed in the institution. Even the physical needs of the children were not properly cared for in the home. They were very dirty.

At School. The boys were in Stds. II and I respectively, and were about two years above the average class age. Their work was very poor in all subjects, with the
exception that the elder boy was fairly good at arithmetic. They were both good at games, but otherwise they appeared to have no special abilities.

Behaviour: Both children were described by the teachers as "thorough nuisances". Their teacher said they wouldn't settle to anything. They were always slower than the other children in beginning their work. They frequently spilt their mid-morning milk. They stole small articles, and on one occasion had at school a large pig-knife with which they threatened the other children. The elder boy was a little quieter than the other, and the teacher was sometimes able to hold his interest. But the two children gave her the impression that they were always "on edge". They were not together in school, because they distracted the other children. They were quite unable to co-operate with the others. The teacher said they were troublesome most of the time they were in school.

Prior to their appearance in Court they ran out of class one day. They were punished and on the first opportunity they cut up the teacher's strap. After that they did not reappear in school. They had both played truant frequently.

Summary and Interpretation.

These two boys present probably the most obvious case of maladjustment of all those studied. Their school
work was very poor, they were thoroughly troublesome all the time they were in school and their home environment was deplorable. Their teacher said that she did not know what to do with them, and was in fact relieved when they stayed away. The children were retarded two years, and there is inadequate provision made for such children. The school nurses are not numerous enough to be able to cope with all the children who habitually come to school dirty. The teacher felt that she had to grapple with the problem alone.

Case N. The boy is 15 years 3 months of age. He comes before the Children's Court for the first time, on six charges of breaking and entering and theft (£5), one of wilful damage (£1/-) and one of receiving stolen goods. Restitution of £9-10-0 was asked for. The boy was placed under the supervision of the Child Welfare Officer for twelve months.

Home: Nothing is known of the home, except that it is probably a poor one materially.

At School: The boy obtained his Proficiency in 1936, after spending two years in Std. IV. His class work was about average. He had a distinct mechanical aptitude, and could draw well. He seemed to enjoy being at school, and was friendly towards the teachers. He was very popular with the other boys, being able to play the mouth
organ and entertain them. He was punctual and regular in attendance, very tidy and careful of his appearance.

**Behaviour:** He was inattentive in class, being described as "lazy, indifferent and careless." Otherwise his behaviour at school was good. The headmaster said he had no reason to suspect delinquency - all of which occurred after the boy had left school. He was friendly and cheerful. The headmaster said he supposed the boy didn't get congenial work.

**Summary and Interpretation.**
This boy would appear to have made a superficially satisfactory adjustment at school. He had failed only once, and obtained his Proficiency. His personal relationships seemed satisfactory. However, his lack of attention, indifference and laziness in class were allowed to pass without investigation; not that this is a reflection on the school, because there is no one who could have investigated the case. It would seem desirable that the school should have at least some knowledge of the parents and home if such a child is to be properly understood and guided.

**Case 6.** Age 16 years 5 months. The boy was charged with the theft of 7/6 from a shop. This is his first appearance in Court. He was committed to the care of the state.
The Child Welfare Officer found that the home is a very poor one. The teacher had no information as to the home condition. The boy was not under proper control and for that reason was committed to the care of the State, although his offence was a relatively minor one.

At School: He left school in 1935 in Std. VI without obtaining Proficiency. His teachers considered that he was not dull, and did quite average work in school. He played football well, but had no other marked abilities. He liked school and frequently came back to the school after he had left. He was friendly towards the teachers and aggressive with his friends.

Behaviour: He used to behave badly for the other boys' amusement. During the lower standards he was thoroughly troublesome in school, "I had to sit on him all the time" said one teacher. Later he was not quite so troublesome. He was tidy, but grubby, punctual and regular in attendance.

Summary and Interpretation.

The home environment must have been very poor when the boy was at school, but nothing was known of it by the teachers. Possibly earlier detection of home conditions might have shown how help could have been given to the boy. However, he was always troublesome at school, and was obviously maladjusted as far as work is concerned. He committed no delinquency while he was still at school.
However, the school is in a poor area, and, since many or most of its pupils come from poor homes, it should perhaps make an earlier check on the homes of children who give trouble at school. In this case the home was considered by the Court to be bad enough to necessitate the removal of the boy.

Case E. The boy is 14 years of age. His only appearance in Court is for the theft of 37/- in money from cars parked near golf links. Restitution was ordered at the discretion of the Child Welfare Officer, and the boy was forbidden to associate with the other boys involved in the delinquency. He was admonished and discharged.

Home: This boy is the youngest of a family of six. The home is poor, but very clean. The father has occasional wharf work. The teachers have a good opinion of the home and of the parents.

Physique: The boy is small, but has a good health record.

School Work: He is at present in Std. IV; the average class age is 11 years 7 months. He is retarded two years. His work generally is very poor with the single exception of drawing, at which he excels. He plays a good game of football.

Behaviour: The boy is very well-behaved and helpful both in class and on the playground. He causes no troubl
at home. On this occasion he was apparently led astray by several much older boys. Since then the teachers have been endeavouring to build up his self-respect by making much of his drawing. He is a likeable boy, on good terms with both the teachers and the other boys. The head-master considers that he was unfortunate on this one occasion, and should not get into further trouble. On the strength of the good school report and satisfactory home conditions, he was not placed under supervision.

Summary and Interpretation.

Assuming that his relations with his tempters being broken off, the boy will be strong enough to resist future temptation, there is the more immediate problem of his retardation. Although the boy is well-behaved and works hard, he doesn't achieve much. His spelling is particularly poor - investigation by means of diagnostic tests might reveal a special difficulty capable of remedy, but there is no provision made for such as he. Probably under the circumstances the school has taken the wisest course in making much of the boy's drawing ability. He will leave school this year, and may be able to attend an Art school.

Case 1. The boy is 15 years 7 months of age. His only appearance in Court was for assisting in the theft of goods to the value of £20. He was placed under the
supervision of the Child Welfare Officer for twelve months.

Home: The Child Welfare Officer's report states that the boy comes from a materially good home, but that there was little control exercised over him. His parents seemed anxious to co-operate with the Child Welfare Officer in helping the boy.

At School: He is at present in his second year of secondary school work. During the two years his work as judged by examinations has been very erratic, his position in a class of thirty-two varying in some subjects as much as twenty-five or twenty-seven places in a term. The teachers consider that his work is about average, and they are not aware of any special abilities.

Behaviour: His behaviour in school does not attract attention for any reason. One teacher considers that he is "a little too reserved." His delinquency is not known at the school. (The Child Welfare Officer does not visit secondary schools because boys are sometimes expelled for delinquency). The teachers do not consider him a problem.

On the occasions of the thefts for which the boy appeared in Court, he was the accomplice of two older boys, one of whom worked on the premises where the thefts took place. He has spent much time with the older boys
in the past. All three are suspected of being under the influence of a man recently convicted for sex offences. As a condition of his supervision, Q is forbidden to associate with the other boys.

Summary and Interpretation.

The teachers are not aware of a problem in this case. It is perhaps true to say that they seem hardly aware of the boy as an individual at all. The wide variation in his marks and term placements seems to indicate either that the examinations were not reliable, or else that the boy is not adjusted to his work. The fact that he associates with older boys who had left school indicates that he was not "fitting in" with his social group. But these problems, which seem to call for investigation, do not appear to have been noticed by the teachers. In his school there is apparently no one on the staff who is responsible for supervising the boy, as is done by Housemasters in many residential schools. There seems to be a vicious circle, for if the staff were made aware of the boy's problems, and his recent delinquency, he would run the risk of expulsion.

Case R. The boy is 13 years of age, and appeared in Court for the first time, for the theft of 15/- in money, and cakes, raising, etc., from a neighbour's pantry. He was placed under supervision for twelve months.
The Home: The mother is a widow in very poor circumstances. There are five siblings, all living at home. There is a poor moral example set in the home. The children always look well fed and clothed, but there is no discipline in the home. He is considered by the school to be the most intelligent of a dull family.

Progress at School: He is at present in Std. IV. Until last year he did average work, but this year his work has been unsatisfactory, with the exception of arithmetic. His writing and setting out of work is exceptionally neat. He enjoys illustrating, and draws well.

Behaviour: In school the boy is always quiet and well-behaved. In the playground he is definitely not a leader, but gets on well with the other boys. About six months prior to his appearance in Court he converted to his own use £4.5.0 which his mother had given him to pay the rent. He told his mother he had lost it. The matter was dealt with by the headmaster, but was not reported to the Child Welfare Authorities. He discovered that the key of his home opened the door of the neighbour's house, and on several occasions he entered the house and took small sums of money and food. The teacher says that he can be trusted within limits, and if rightly handled and well treated, he should avoid further trouble.
Summary and Interpretation.

It would appear that in this case there has not been much constructive co-operation between the Child Welfare Officer and the school, if the Child Welfare Officer has not been informed of the theft of the rent; it is difficult to say who the teacher considers would be the person to advise and manage the boy so that he avoids future trouble. The boy is not doing well in school. In fact, his work has “slumped” this year but under the present arrangement he cannot be singled out for individual attention.

Case 8. The boy is 12 years of age. His first appearance in Court is for the theft of a watch valued at £2-4-0. No restitution was ordered. He was placed under the supervision of the Child Welfare Officer for twelve months.

Home: The boy is one of the younger children in a family of ten. The mother does not stand high in the opinion of the headmaster. The father frequently thrashes the children, and threatened to kill this boy. At the time of the delinquency, the mother was away from home taking care of another woman’s family for a fortnight. She protested when the Magistrate suggested that she was neglecting her own children, and insisted that they were fed and clothed, and were therefore not neglected. The
headmaster said that the children could never be sure whether they would get a meal or not, and were all afraid of their parents. They were all dirty and ragged and untidy. One older boy than S has been sent to a special class for defectives.

At School: The boy has already had six changes of school. He is now in Standard II, and does poor work. He scored 78 on an Otis test. However, the class teacher says he has been working harder lately and doing slightly better work than previously. His attendance was poor in 1936, owing to frequent colds, but in other years it has been good. He causes no trouble either in school or in the playground. He plays football in what the teacher describes as "a brainless sort of way". He is quite liked by the other children, but the headmaster says he does not fraternise with the better type of boy. He has been proved untruthful on several occasions. He has no special abilities. Even his handwork is very poor. His delinquency was committed in company with another boy, T, who attends a different school. The headmaster and teachers are lenient with the boy, because of the deplorable home in which he lives. However, he is liable to get into mischief if he is not watched. On one occasion he was found with other boys stoning a glass house near the school.
Summary and Interpretation.

This case presents still another instance of a boy who is passive and well-behaved at school, but who is retarded and not achieving a satisfactory adjustment to school work. He is obviously handicapped by his home circumstances. His low Otis rating suggests the need for special teaching. He is untruthful and unreliable; he does not seem to have made a satisfactory adjustment, and he is classed with children several years younger than himself. But there seems no provision for remedying such a state of affairs. The boy's circumstances had not even been carefully investigated.

Case T. Age 11 years. His only appearance in Court is for the theft of £1-4-0. He has been placed under the supervision of the Child Welfare Officer for twelve months.

Home: The father is unemployed, and suffering from miner's phthisis. There are three children. An elder sister has given much trouble at school. The mother is not known to the teachers, but the home is considered fairly satisfactory. There seems to be little home life, and the boy gives evidence of being suspicious of his parents.

Health: The lad has spent several summers in health camps, and, according to the medical report, his heart is irregular, otherwise he has a good health record.
At School: The boy is in Std. II, and is retarded two years. The headmaster says he has not a high mentality, but should do better now, if he can settle down - he entered school at 6 years 4 months, and has attended four schools (none in the Canterbury Education district) before the present one. He is negative in his attitude at school, but quite friendly towards the teachers. He appears to "bully" the other children considerably, and is not liked. He is untidy, but punctual and regular in attendance.

Behaviour: He behaves very badly in school. He is much bigger than the other children in his class, and is a frequent cause of trouble in the class room. His delinquency, stealing money from a garage, was committed in company with a boy from another school. He is a rather friendly boy and quite frank. The headmaster considers that the boy would keep out of trouble if the parents would take more interest in him and try to provide occupation for his leisure time.

Summary and Interpretation.

As long as the boy is at school he will be bigger and older than his class mates, unless some special provision is made for him. There are obvious signs of maladjustment at school, and yet there seems to be no solution to the difficulties. Although the Child Welfare Officer is making provision for leisure activities, it
would seem desirable that he should co-operate with the school in this matter.

Case U. The boy is 15 years 8 months of age. He has appeared in Court once, for the theft of a medal (15/-), and a bicycle (£17-5-0) and for arson (burning completely a house valued at £500). He was committed to the care of the State.

Home: The boy's father was in prison at the time of the boy's delinquency. The home was not considered a suitable environment, and U and his two younger brothers were placed in a foster home, where they appeared to be well cared for. The foster mother was apparently very devoted to U. All three children caused considerable trouble at school, and the class teachers of the younger boys sent unfavourable reports to the Child Welfare Branch. The younger boys were accordingly removed from the foster home, but U remained. His mother saw him frequently. U is said to be a "difficult" boy, but always able to be controlled by his mother. Immediately after his delinquency he was removed to an institution, and returned there after his Court hearing.

At School. The boy obtained his proficiency at the end of 1936, but his school work was not good. He was especially poor at English and arithmetic; but excelled at Art and handwork. He has musical ability, but was
not interested in games.

**Behaviour:** His behaviour in class was satisfactory, although one teacher said that she felt that he just managed by cunning to keep within the letter of the law. He was considered by the staff generally to be the best of the family, but one teacher considered that he appeared better than the others by concealing his misdemeanours. On one occasion he was unusually troublesome and unmannerly to the teacher. He usually behaved well in class. The teacher considered that he was unsportsmanlike in his play and consequently was not popular with the other children. He was tolerated by them rather than accepted as one of them. The teacher had to forbid him playing a game of darts with the other children because of the indiscriminate way he threw the darts about. He and his brother had to be constantly watched in the play-ground and kept separated from each other. U was always careful to cover up evidence of bad behaviour whenever he could. On the occasion of his delinquencies, his foster parents were away from home. He wandered into a neighbour's home, picked up a medal, then noticed his footprints, and set fire to some papers, etc., burned the house down to conceal the footprints, and then rode away on a stolen bicycle. The teacher said that the boy had no idea of relative values, and that he could quite understand the boy's anxiety to conceal his footprints.
Summary and Interpretation.

The boy presents a flagrant case of maladjustment. His school work was barely satisfactory, and although he caused no trouble in class, he required constant supervision in the playground. His impulsive action in setting fire to the house indicates a lack of balance which requires investigation. His secretive attitude, the constant efforts to conceal his behaviour, and his frequent untruthfulness suggest the need for psychological examination and intensive individual treatment.

Case V. Age 13 years 8 months. The boy appeared on his first charge for mischief, and unlawfully entering premises. He was placed under supervision for twelve months.

Home: The boy and three siblings are illegitimate. There are other half-siblings. The home is most unsatisfactory from a moral point of view. It is dirty and untidy, but the children are well fed.

At School: The boy is in Standard IV, and was put there solely because he caused so much trouble in Standard III. His work is very poor, and the headmaster considers he should be in a special class. He is poor at all subjects, including music and handwork.

Behaviour: He was sent away from his last school. His
present headmaster considers him "a thorough nuisance". His teacher says he is "a pest"; he cannot concentrate, and is thoroughly annoying in class. He is a constant centre of disturbance, and is recognised by the other children as the source of most trouble. He "bullies" the small children, but is quite liked by his own class mates. He is good at games, and always very helpful to the teacher. In fact he makes himself a nuisance by his persistent endeavours to be helpful. He always wants to be the centre of attention. The teacher thinks that part of his helpfulness is a ruse to escape his lessons. He is a cheerful, attractive little boy, but his teacher and the headmaster recognise him as a problem. The headmaster says he is a storm centre, always trying to shift the blame to others; that he has not learned to co-operate with his fellows, but that if he were studied properly and helped he should not cause further trouble.

The neighbours frequently complain of his bad behaviour. The offence for which he was placed under supervision was committed in company with three other older boys. He also entered a private house and was accused of taking small change. However, the householder is reported to have called him a derogatory name, and on this charge, the boy was admonished and discharged.
Summary and Interpretation.

The boy is retarded and doing poor work, and his general adjustment is anything but satisfactory. The headmaster says that he has possibilities. Although the Child Welfare Officer comes to the school and sends for reports of conduct, there is no sign of co-operation for the purpose of constructive treatment. The child is troublesome, and a problem to the school. But there is no provision for such as he, and the headmaster is unable to call upon expert advice, because there is none available.

Case W. The boy is 11 years 2 months of age. His only appearance in Court was for the theft of a bicycle lamp and an aeroplane mascot valued at 15/- and 1/6 respectively. He was placed under the supervision of the Child Welfare Officer for twelve months.

Home: The boy belongs to a large household, consisting of his father and mother, three siblings, three children of his father's by a former marriage, and three of his mother's by a former marriage. The father is unemployed, and the mother is having a struggle to keep the home together.

At School: The boy left school at the end of 1936, with a certificate of Competency. He had four changes of
school. His school work was below average, although English and arithmetic were satisfactory. His drawing and handwork were very good. He played cricket well, and represented the North Canterbury Schools in outside matches.

Behaviour: On the whole his behaviour in school was satisfactory. At times he was, according to his teacher, "inclined to be stubborn under reproof". However, he was usually willing to take his share of extra work allotted to the boys. He was a "good mixer" and easily led. On the occasion for which he appeared in Court, he was accompanying two older boys. They gave false names and addresses to the police; on another occasion they were found by the police searching cars. As a condition of his supervision he was forbidden to associate with the other boys.

Summary and Interpretation.

The boy was not delinquent until he had left school. He was not retarded, although his work was not altogether satisfactory. He was not a serious behaviour problem. However, he did cause trouble at times. Possibly some such person as a visiting teacher could have helped him to adjust while he was still at school. It appears that in this delinquency he was influenced by older boys. A constructive plan of treatment under expert direction might help him to build up social attitudes.
Cases X and Y. The boys are brothers, 15 years 7 months, and 14 years 7 months respectively. Both have appeared in Court once before. On this occasion the boys were charged with the theft of 10/-. X was placed under the supervision of the Child Welfare Officer for twelve months, and Y, who was already under supervision, had the period extended by six months.

Home: The boys are members of a family of fourteen. The father is unemployed, and the home is considered most unsatisfactory, although the report of the Child Welfare Officer was good. A younger brother has recently been found guilty of theft at school. There are six children at school, and they are all retarded.

At School: X left school in 1936 in Std. V. His school work in all subjects was poor. Y failed twice, in Std. III and Std. V. and is to leave school shortly. The teachers do not know of any special abilities in either boy other than for games. They scored 92 and 95 respectively on an Otis scale. They have had five changes of school.

Behaviour: Both boys were troublesome in class and in the playground. The teachers consider that they are both likely to have delinquent careers, and they attribute the boys' maladjustment to bad home influence. On the occasion for which they appeared in Court, they were
accompanied by a younger boy, to whom they gave part of
the stolen money. As a condition of their supervision
they were forbidden to associate with the younger boy.

*Summary and Interpretation.*

The boys did unsatisfactory work, and were a
source of trouble at school. They belonged to a large
family which might call for investigation by a school
nurse with training in social work. There is no official
way for the headmaster to cope with such a family
situation. The teachers expected that the boys would
have delinquent careers, but they themselves were unable
to suggest treatment, and there is no one to whom they
could refer the boys, or from whom they could seek advice.
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