



National Library  
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Services des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada  
K1A 0N4

## CANADIAN THESES

## THÈSES CANADIENNES

### NOTICE

### AVIS

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

THIS DISSERTATION  
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED  
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ  
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE  
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

A STUDY OF POLICE DISCRETION  
AS IT RELATES TO YOUTH  
WHO ABUSE ALCOHOL

JACQUELYN M. FOUGERE

SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH  
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA,  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS  
IN CRIMINOLOGY

1983

© Jacquelyn M. Fougère, OTTAWA, Canada, 1984.



UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA  
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to express gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. J. Ciale for his direction and advice. I would like to thank the Ottawa high school principals and students who participated, for without their assistance, this study could not have been possible. As well, I would like to give special thanks to Dr. C.H.S. Jayewardene for his time and advice, and my husband, Robert, for his understanding and patience.

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Chapter I      Police Discretion: Its Implications For Youth	6
A) The Role of Police in Society	6
B) The Effects of Public Pressure	11
C) Police Discretion	15
a) Its Definition	15
b) Its Evolution	16
c) Its Necessity	18
d) Its Subjectivity	26
e) Its Low Visibility	27
f) Its Effect on Juvenile Justice	29
D) Alcohol Use Among Youth	38
a) Its Effects	38
b) Its Socio-Cultural Context	39
c) Its Widespread Use	41
d) Its Consequences	44
Chapter II      Methodology	60
A) Introduction	60
B) Objective of Study	61

C) Method Used To Achieve Objective	61
a) Schools	61
b) Subjects	65
c) Questionnaire	69
d) Hypothesis	78
e) Reliability and Validity	78
D) Administration of Questionnaire	84
E) Compilation and Analysis of Data	86
Chapter III The Results	90
A) Introduction	90
B) Testing of Hypothesis	95
C) Testing of Objective	103
a) What Type of Youth Abuses Alcohol	103
b) What Type of Youth Gets Arrested For Alcohol/Alcohol And Drug Abuse	110
D) General Youth Attitudes and Behavior	118
Chapter IV Discussion of the Results And Conclusions	131
Bibliography	
Appendix "A"	
Appendix "B"	

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE I	TOTAL HIGH SCHOOL POPULATION IN OTTAWA BY GRADE (1980 - 1981)	63
TABLE II	GRADE BY AVERAGE AGE IN TWO ONTARIO SCHOOLS AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL	64
TABLE III	SAMPLE HIGH SCHOOL POPULATION IN OTTAWA BY GRADE (1980 - 1981)	66
TABLE IV	GRADE BY AVERAGE AGE IN SAMPLE HIGH SCHOOL POPULATION IN OTTAWA	67
TABLE V	FREQUENCY BY VOLUME OF ALCOHOL USE AMONG HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS	91
TABLE VI	TOTAL SAMPLE POPULATION BY SOCIO- ECONOMIC STATUS	94
TABLE VII	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS BY ALCOHOL ABUSE	96
TABLE VIII	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS BY ARREST FOR ALCOHOL ABUSE	97
TABLE IX	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS BY ARREST FOR ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE	98
TABLE X	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS BY ARREST FOR ALCOHOL/ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE	99
TABLE XI	SUMMARY OF TABLE X	100

TABLE XII	ALCOHOL ABUSE BY FAMILY LIFE	104
TABLE XIII	ALCOHOL ABUSE BY PHYSICAL APPEARANCE	106
TABLE XIV	ALCOHOL ABUSE BY DEMEANOR	107
TABLE XV	ALCOHOL ABUSE BY FREQUENCY OF CRIMINAL ACTIVITY	108
TABLE XVI	ALCOHOL ABUSE BY ARREST	109
TABLE XVII	ALCOHOL ABUSE BY POLICE ATTENTION	110
TABLE XVIII	ARREST BY POLICE ATTENTION FOR ALCOHOL/ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE	111
TABLE XIX	FAMILY LIFE BY ARREST FOR ALCOHOL/ ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE	113
TABLE XX	PHYSICAL APPEARANCE BY ARREST FOR ALCOHOL/ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE	114
TABLE XXI	DEMEANOR BY ARREST FOR ALCOHOL/ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE	115
TABLE XXII	FREQUENCY OF CRIMINAL ACTIVITY BY ARREST FOR ALCOHOL/ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE	116
TABLE XXIII	PREVIOUS RECORD BY ARREST FOR ALCOHOL/ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE	117
TABLE XXIV	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS BY ARREST	121
TABLE XXV	ARREST BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS BY FAMILY LIFE	123

TABLE XXVI	ARREST BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS BY PHYSICAL APPEARANCE	124
TABLE XXVII	ARREST BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS BY RESPECT FOR THE POLICE	125
TABLE XXVIII	ARREST BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS BY NARCOTIC USE	127
TABLE XXIX	ARREST BY POLICE CONTACT	128



## INTRODUCTION

The first encounter that an individual has with the police gives him not only his first, but also a profound and lasting impression of the Criminal Justice System (Ouimet, 1969). As this impression affects his future behavior, it is a matter of major concern to him, to the general community, and to those who work in the field of corrections. The purpose of this study is to examine the factors which influence police interaction with youth.

It is argued that police dispositions toward youthful offenders involve a variety of extra legal considerations such as social class, race, and demeanor (Davis, 1975; Ferdinand and Luchterhand, 1970; Cicourel, 1968; Gold, 1966; Skolnick, 1966; Matza, 1964; Piliavin and Briar, 1964). Piliavin and Briar (1964) state that a number of cues emerge from the interaction between the officer and the youth. These cues include the youth's group affiliations, age, race, grooming, dress, and demeanor. The youth's demeanor, however, appears to be the most important cue. Others have arrived at a similar conclusion (Black and Reiss, 1970).

Studies indicate that the police develop stereotypical views or theories of delinquency with regard to the type of adolescent who is likely to be delinquent. Cicourel (1968; 67) contends in this connection that "...the officer's preconstituted typifications and stock of knowledge at hand lead him to prejudge much of what he encounters. . ." Unfortunately, this process of typification is class-linked and operating through common sense assumptions on the part of the police about where delinquent activity is most likely to be found.

The abuse of alcohol is a form of deviant activity in which youth of all strata engage (Ogbourne et al., 1978; Smart et al., 1977, 1975; Clinton, 1976; Vaz, 1971; Blum, 1969; Cicourel, 1968; Kvaraceus, 1966; Maddox and McCall, 1964; Cavan, 1962). Although this is a form of illegal behavior, not everyone engaging in it is apprehended. This appears to be particularly so in the case of middle and upper class children rather than lower class children. This study seeks to ascertain which type of youth indulges in this behavior and which type of youth is apprehended (arrested) by the police for it.

The study is essentially a self-report study on which the following information is being sought:

- 1) Demographic characteristics such as sex, age, and ethnic origin;
- 2) Socio-economic characteristics - parental occupation;
- 3) Social background such as the number of siblings and with whom the youth is living;
- 4) Relationship with parents - disciplinary action and the reaction to it;
- 5) Achievement at school - grades, etc.;
- 6) Use of alcohol - frequency of consumption at present and in the past, etc.;
- 7) Contact with the police and the Criminal Justice System;
- 8) Peer affiliations.

### References

- BLACK, D.J. and A.J. REISS (1970) Police Control of Juveniles. American Sociological Review, 35, 63-77.
- BLUM, R.H. (1969) Students and Drugs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- CAVAN, R.S. (1962) Juvenile Delinquency. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Inc.
- CICOUREL, A.V. (1968) The Social Organization of Juvenile Justice. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- CLINTON, J. (1976) Juvenile Offenders and Drug Use. Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario.
- DAVIS, N. J. (1975) Sociological Constructions of Deviance. Iowa: William C. Brown Co. Publishers.
- FERDINAND, T. and E. LUCHTERHAND. (1970) Inner-City Youth, the Police, the Juvenile Court and Justice. Social Problems, 17, 510-527.
- GOLD, M. (1966) Undetected Delinquent Behavior. The Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency, 3, 27-46.
- KVARACEUS, W.C. (1966) Dynamics of Delinquency. Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books Inc.
- MADDOX, G.L. and B.C. MCCALL. (1964) Drinking Among Teenagers. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers Centre of Alcohol Studies.
- MATZA, D. (1964) Delinquency and Drift. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- QUIMET. (1969) The Role of the Police in a Democratic Society: Report of the Canadian Committee on Corrections. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- PILIAVIN, I. and S. BRIAR. (September, 1964) Police Encounters With Juveniles. American Journal of Sociology, 70, 206-214.

SKOLNICK, J.H. (1966) Justice Without Trial: Law Enforcement In A Democratic Society. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

SMART, R., D. FEJER, D. SMITH, W.J. WHITE. (1975) Trends in Drug Use Among Metropolitan Toronto High School Students: 1968-1974. Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario.

SMART, R., M.S. GOODSTADT, I.J. SONE. (1977) Alcohol and Drug Use Among Ontario Students in 1977. Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario.

## CHAPTER I

### POLICE DISCRETION: ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR YOUTH

#### A) The Role of Police in Society

Policing, on the abstract level, is primarily a reactive function disguised as a proactive one (Kinnane, 1979; Black and Reiss, 1970; Reiss and Bordua, 1967). Police rarely fight crime as much as they clean up after it. The job maintains a proactive appearance due to the attitude on the part of the administration and the traditional concept of law enforcers as crime fighters (Kinnane, 1979).

An American field observation study by Black and Reiss (1970) suggests that police work is more reactive than proactive; the police usually do not seek out deviant behavior but more often respond to complaints about such behavior. They, in turn, suggest that there are two basic types of police mobilization; there is the citizen-initiated or reactive mobilization and the police-initiated or proactive mobilization.

Studies tend to suggest that it is the citizen of the community and not the police who most often initiates the societal response to deviance despite the image that the media portrays and the public holds (Hagan, 1977; Reiss,

1971; Black and Reiss, 1970; Reiss and Bordua, 1967). For Black (1971), the deterrence function of the criminal process to an important degree depends upon the willingness of citizens to mobilize the criminal law.

Preventing crime, detecting and apprehending offenders, maintaining order in the community, controlling highway traffic, and coping with minor or major emergencies are considered the primary functions of the police (Ouimet, 1969). However, Ouimet suggests that much of the work is clerical or peacekeeping in nature as well as community service oriented (Grosman, 1973).

Although Canadian police forces have not formally subscribed to a specified set of principles, police development in Canada has been based on similar principles found among the British police which consist of preventing crime and disorder, recognizing that the power of the police to fulfill their functions and duties is dependent on public approval of their existence, actions, and behavior, and on their ability to secure and maintain public respect, recognizing that to secure and maintain public respect and approval means also securing the willing co-operation of the public, recognizing that the extent to which co-operation of the public can be secured diminishes proportionately the necessity of the use of physical force and compulsion for

achieving police objectives, seeking and preserving public favor by demonstrating absolutely impartial service to law, using physical force only when the exercise of persuasion, advice and warning is found to be insufficient to obtain public co-operation, maintaining at all times a relationship with the public that gives reality to the historic tradition that the police are the public and the public are the police, recognizing the need for strict adherence to police-executive functions, and recognizing that the test of police efficiency is the absence of crime and disorder (Kelly and Kelly, 1976: 26-27).

The general function of the police has been the maintenance of law and order (Kinnane, 1979; Jayewardene, 1973; Skolnick, 1966), however due to the broad and abstract definition of these objectives, police have taken upon themselves duties of a social nature in the community. Although, the role of the police is seen as an enforcement role, a larger proportion of policing is spent on service activities (Grosman, 1973; Ouimet, 1969; Skolnick, 1966; Cumming et al., 1965; Banton, 1964). In poor neighbourhoods, the police provide the medical as well as legal services normally provided by specialists in more affluent communities (Kinnane, 1979).

The police are our gate-keepers of deviance, responding to all-day to day variations from the norm. This case persists because it allows the police to avoid the image as oppressive keepers of the law; the police frequently are the only twenty-four hour service agency available to respond to those in need; the police are usually the only agency willing to serve the ignorant and the poor; the police have the knowledge and access to other agencies when referrals are necessary-(Hagan, 1977; Cumming et al., 1965).

Evans' (1973: 64) Montreal study on the police indicates that 13% of the total working hours in that city were spent on anti-criminal activity. Evans (61) estimates that across Canada, the average officer brings criminal charges against only 1.25 individuals every month.

Levens (1980: 211) suggests that between 50% and 80% of the policeman's time on the job is devoted to social service activities (ie. domestic problems, health related activities, missing persons, vehicle accidents, directing traffic, etc.) as compared with the law enforcement duties usually associated with the police officer's role. By recording incoming calls over a period of 174 hours in the city of Vancouver, it was found that 46.6% of the calls and

49.3% of the patrol officer's time were devoted to service rather than law enforcement duties.

According to Whitehouse (1973), the police officer's dual function of performing law enforcement duties and peacekeeping services has been present as long as there have been police departments. He further states that some present day policemen are under the impression that their community service functions are a newly acquired activity.

According to Neill (1970), the police engage in a multitude of duties which result in ineffectual functioning. Such assignments as controlling traffic, issuing parking tickets, and providing security for buildings should not be included in the agenda of police duties.

Hayduk (1976), in a study of police behavior in Edmonton, Alberta, describes police work as involving both moment to moment sensemaking and a concern for the managing of practical situations.

A Toronto police study by Shearing and Leon (1974), observes that it is the residual access to the legitimized use of force that makes the police such a frequently summoned response for the solution of public and private troubles.

The police in a democratic society are required to maintain order and to do so under the rule of law. As functionaries charged with maintaining order, they are part of the bureaucracy that disciplined adherence to rules and regulations. By contrast, the rule of law emphasizes the rights of individual citizens and constraints upon the initiative of legal officials.

(Skolnick, 1966: 6)

It is, therefore, suggested that we consider the police as an omnibus service agency (Clark and Sykes, 1974), that we understand the activities of the police officer as peacekeeper (Bittner, 1967), and that we examine the police officer in his or her role as philosopher, guide, and friend (Cumming et al., 1965).

#### B) The Effects of Public Pressure

Police operate under a number of pressures which influence their success on the job. The lack of public support is one of the primary concerns facing police today due to their reactive as well as ambiguous role in our society (Wexler, 1974; Jayewardene, 1973; Ouimet, 1969; Wilson, 1968; Skolnick, 1966; Becker, 1963; Westley, 1953).

In certain crisis situations, the police have turned to the media as a means of communicating with the public. For example, advertising was the weapon chosen by Metropolitan Toronto Police to battle the barrage of charges

resulting from the shooting death of A. Johnson in Toronto August 26, 1979. The ad placed in Toronto newspapers said, "We can't do it without you" and used the slogan, "We're proud of us." The ad drew an overwhelming show of support from the Torontonians and achieved exactly the results for which the police had hoped (Marketing, 1979: 2).

Police perceive themselves as rejected by the public (Black and Reiss, 1967). McNamara (1967) states that the police consider their work important while citizens do not conceive it as highly. Due to the problematic interaction patterns, the public has by and large rejected and isolated the police socially. The result is a closed culture, highly cohesive and secretive (Wexler, 1974; Reiss, 1971; Wilson, 1963). Rookies learn the attitudes, philosophy and biases of their new group, and in turn adopt a general suspicion of the public. The police subculture becomes a protective shell of mutual understanding, uniting police as it isolates them from a public that does not understand and which treats them with little respect (Kinnane, 1979: 60-61).

A rough sample of 20 lawyers, 14 social workers, 35 prominent Negroes, and 8 union stewards indicated a

general condemnation of the police and characterized them as ineffectual, brutal, corrupt, and ignorant (Westley, 1970: 105).

The policeman's attitude toward the public and his definition of its attitude toward him is clearly substantiated in a survey of a representative sample of 85 policemen; 73% believed that the public hated the police and was against them, and only 12% believed that the public liked the police and supported them. The explanation for thinking this way was basically that the public was ignorant of the nature of police work (Westley, 1970: 107).

Police believe that the public fails to realize the difficulties inherent in the duties of the average policeman and therefore, become frequently subject to criticism (Ouimet, 1969).

Buckner (1974) observes that almost all societal institutions need the police to carry out their dirty work, but that these same institutions seldom value police services.

Police are reported as being suspicious (Dodd, 1967; Skolnick, 1966), cynical (Fortier, 1972; Toch, 1965), isolated from both personal friends and the public (Fortier, 1972; Rokeach, 1971), suffering from a feeling of

powerlessness (Chwast, 1965), as perceiving themselves in positions of low esteem (Wilson, 1968; Becker, 1963), and preoccupied with obtaining respect from the public (Rokeach, 1971).

A study conducted by Courtis and Dussuyer (1970) in Toronto suggests that the quality of police-community relations was only thought to be moderately satisfactory. The tendency was to attribute the lack of good relations between the police and the public to a lack of sensitivity on the part of the police in handling face to face relations. It was also found that the attitudes of the public toward the police ranked below a number of other factors as to the influence they were thought to exert on the work carried out by the police.

The policeman regards the public as his enemy, feels his occupation to be in conflict with the community, and regards himself to be a pariah. The experience and feeling give rise to a collective emphasis upon secrecy, an attempt to coerce respect from the public, and a belief that almost any means are legitimate in completing an important arrest.

(Westley, 1953: 35)

Police morale may not suffer only because citizen attitudes are thought to be hostile, but in addition because the other elements in the system by which society deals with crime are defective (Wilson, 1963).

The legal system is not a seamless web of tightly articulated rules and roles, but a loose-jointed system held together at many points by a microsystem of antagonistic co-operation and discretionary decisions.

(Reiss and Bordua, 1967: 26)

### C) Police Discretion

The respect for private ordering that is formal in civil law is informal in criminal law. This informal practice allows the police to vary their relationship to the many private dispute settling procedures available. Although the police are formally organized to enforce both law and order, it is apparent that they are involved in enacting justice, better known as police discretion (Wexler, 1974; Westley, 1970; Cicourel, 1968; Reiss and Bordua, 1967; Skolnick, 1966).

#### a) Its Definition

Pound (1960: 925) describes police discretion as "...an authority conferred by law to act in certain conditions or situations in accordance with an official's or an official agency's own considered judgement and conscience." Judge Breital (1960: 427) defines it as "...the power to consider all circumstances and then determine whether any legal action is to be taken. And if

so taken, what kind and degree, and to what conclusion." For Goldstein (1963: 140-141) "... the exercise of police discretion suggests that the police are required, because of a variety of factors, to decide overtly how much of an effort is to be made to enforce specific laws, that actions short of arrest may achieve the desired goal, that a police officer may decide not to make an arrest even in those situations in which an offence has been committed with evidence at hand, and that policemen are not robots but reasonable men whose judgements are essential."

b) Its Evolution

The police are plagued with the dilemma of choice and decision which is bound in the criminal law but goes unrecognized by the legal code (Grosman, 1973). In turn, the police are thrust into what Pound (1960: 925) has called "the twilight zone between laws and morals."

The police have come to possess such discretionary power through the evolution of law enforcement practices. According to Barrett (1962), justices were established in England to keep the peace in the early 14th century; these justices of the peace had the power to arrest and were the over-riding police authority in each county. This English practice was then brought to colonial America where it became

adopted in Massachusetts; however, not all American colonies adopted the practice. With the formulation of the first police force in 1829 in England, the justices soon resigned their positions and it became the role of the police to assume the responsibility of investigation. Although the law was never clearly stated whether the police could exercise the same powers as the justices (better known today as magistrates), the police came to bear the full responsibility for securing the evidence that would justify holding the defendant for trial when presented to a magistrate. Today, both in the United States and in England, the theory of the law has continued to be that the primary responsibility of the magistrate is to determine whether a person shall be taken into custody, and the police are just to bring the individual promptly before the magistrate.

That this is not the case in reality is obviously clear. Due to the lack of magistrates in our society, police have taken over most of the investigative and screening functions; the decision whether to take a suspect into custody is almost always made by the police except where a warrant is issued by the magistrate. Recognition of the disparity in law and practice shows that neither the courts nor

legislators have faced up to the problem and consequently, police continue to be subjected to ever-increasing criticism for conduct regarded by many, as a higher-order obligation, as well as being left with little in way of definitive and realistic rules governing their enforcement activities which allows for the likelihood of abuse (Barrett, 1962).

Although our legal ideals demand that all laws should be equally and fairly enforced regardless of the personal preferences of law enforcers, in practice there exists priorities (Skolnick and Woodworth, 1967).

c) Its Necessity

Full enforcement consists of the investigation of every disturbing event which is reported to or observed by the police and which they have reason to suspect a possible violation of the criminal law; following a determination that some crime has been committed, an effort is made to discover its perpetrators; a presentation be given to the prosecutor, of all information collected by the police, for his determination of the appropriateness of further invoking the criminal process (Goldstein, 1960: 558-560).

From this synopsis, it is clear that full enforcement is not a realistic expectation; it is somewhat a myth

(Grosman, 1973; Goldstein, 1960). It is neither feasible (Wexler, 1974) nor tolerable (Breital, 1960).

Experts in the field have implied that some police discretion is necessary in the everyday performance of police work (Grosman, 1973; Wilson, 1968; La Fave, 1965; Breital, 1960). That this is the case has been both investigated and explained by such experts.

In interpreting the legal mandate, the exercise of police discretion is necessary because ambiguities exist in the definitions of both substantive offences and due process boundaries. No legislation has succeeded in formulating a substantive criminal code which clearly encompasses all conduct intended to be made criminal and which clearly excludes all other conduct. Poor draftsmanship and a failure to revise the Criminal Code to eliminate the obsolete provisions, have much to contribute to the existing ambiguities that police face in their daily activities. This is a result of both limitations upon language effectiveness and the inability of legislators to envisage the day to day problems that police encounter (Goldstein, 1963: 141-142); La Fave, 1962: 112-113).

The police officer is confronted with a specific situation, not a general legal clause and must, therefore,

fit the specific to the general; this mental process of matching involves choice (Wexler, 1974).

The generality of criminal legislation and procedure is often used by both police officers and administration to justify the implementation of their own values in their performance, and this can be accomplished without violation of law or procedure (Grosman, 1973).

The enforcement of moral behavior, however, affects the capacity of the police to operate within the constraints contemplated by the rule of law. Given the task of enforcing "unenforceable laws" often makes it nearly impossible to avoid wide discretion on the part of the police (Skolnick, 1966).

Due to the dilemma created by limited resources and lack of established priorities for law enforcement, police discretion becomes the tool to acquire maximum efficiency (Grosman, 1973; La Fave, 1962; Wilson, 1962; Breital, 1960; Goldstein, 1960). Limitations of manpower, money, time, and investigating devices prevent the police from arresting and presenting to the prosecutors all offenders; there are just not enough resources allocated to allow for full enforcement of all laws against all offenders (La Fave, 1962).

The growth in the number of criminal and regulatory offences without a corresponding growth in police manpower has led to the selective enforcement of laws. Given the increasing total number of crimes in the community and the fairly stable police manpower, the concept of full enforcement gives way to the realistic application of police resources to those areas where they are most needed.

(Grosman, 1973: 46)

The police concern for clearance of crimes through arrest is another pressure placed on the police officer by police management (Reiss and Bordua, 1967; Skolnick, 1966; Wilson, 1962). Griffin (1958) suggests that the clearance rate is the most important indication of the efficiency of the police force as a whole, and it is often used to evaluate individual police officers. The departmental arrest figures may define the policeman's success, but the acquittals in court may define his failures (Reiss and Bordua, 1967).

What the policeman does in order to amplify clearance rates may have such consequences as weakening both the validity of clearance rates and the legality and aims of law enforcement. Everytime a complaint is filed as a suspicious circumstance instead of as a reported offence, the clearance rate rises since it is based on the ratio of cleared to actual offences. Such a system often tempts

police officers to report a complaint as a suspicious circumstance even when it is clear that the offence has occurred, so that they will appear as efficient officers who have managed to keep the crime rate in check (Skolnick, 1966).

Although the clearance rate may appear to be the best measure when the function of the police is to detect and apprehend criminals (Jayewardene, 1973), it is not free of flaws and is therefore, susceptible to police discretion (Skolnick, 1966).

The individual policeman is production oriented; an arrest indicates success and an acquittal indicates failure. When he does not receive support from the judicial system, he tends to take the law into his own hands often by making a decision not to arrest, or by making an arrest where there is no intention on his part to prosecute. Such behavior is interpreted by Reiss and Bordua (1967) as sanctioning the judicial system for what the police officer defines as its failure to make him a success; the police desire an outcome that signifies their effort has been appreciated and in turn, morality has been upheld.

The police exercise their own expertness and abilities in making judgements as to the guilt and innocence of

suspects. In turn, law enforcement agencies and courts are expending increasing amounts of energy in fighting each other (Barrett, 1962), instead of co-operating toward a common goal. Due to their previous experiences, the police acquire the attitude that in particular circumstances there is no need to arrest since the person will be, without doubt, acquitted by the judicial system (La Fave, 1962).

Police feel that criminal procedure has been unfairly weighted against them...The policeman finds it difficult to fathom and to justify a system which on the one hand requires that he be increasingly knowledgeable and competent in general areas as well as those relating specifically to police work and on the other hand, sometimes nullifies his best efforts by interposing seemingly irrational requirements and procedural delays.

(Skolnick, 1966: 199)

Special circumstances that apply to the individual make impossible the administration of justice by mere application of rules. The justification given is that innovation would cause more harm than good; the cost of arrest to the offender and his family would outweigh the risk which would be created by not subjecting the offender to the criminal justice system (La Fave, 1962). The criminal justice system could lose respect, especially if these individuals would likely not repeat the action and the offence is one of a minor concern.

Once a person is convicted, the state deprives the offender of life, liberty, dignity, and property. The stigma becomes operative upon the offender's release and impedes his "rehabilitation" (Goldstein, 1960).

Usually trivial offences produce an action short of arrest since it is both a waste of time, money and effort to bring the suspect to court. Conduct that does not deviate from the sub-group standards in the community is usually unenforced, as well as those offences where the victim does not wish to prosecute. Preventing the loss of public support and respect often places pressure on police officers to nonenforce certain conduct in particular areas of the community. In rare occasions, the victim's own conduct disentitles him to prosecution (La Fave, 1962).

Goldstein's (1960: 554) American study of municipal police forces presents three police programs of non-enforcement. 1) Non-enforcement of narcotic laws against certain violators who inform, against other more serious violators; 2) non-enforcement of felonious assault laws against an assailant whose victim does not sign a complaint; 3) non-enforcement of gambling laws against persons engaged in the numbers racket, but to instead provide harassment.

Police are in an excellent position for bargaining, and in turn, use it as a means for catching more serious crimes which they believe will generate more public support and respect. The same explanation can also be given as to why the police refuse to take a person into custody whose victim refuses to sign a complaint. Because gambling is one activity where conviction is almost impossible, the police use harassment as a tool to keep it in check (Goldstein, 1963; Goldstein, 1960).

Although the non-enforcement aspect of police discretion is the most often cited (Grosman, 1973; Skolnick, 1966; Goldstein, 1960), police discretion can be exercised in the area of law enforcement.

La Fave (1962) suggests that police sometime arrest to avoid a strain upon available resources (to avoid future calls for police action); they arrest to maintain respect for the police as a whole; they arrest to maintain the public image of full enforcement; they arrest because of the opportunity to punish (unenforced criminal laws left on the book are often used to apprehend suspects in order to interrogate them on some other serious offence). Finally, police arrest to aid in the investigation of an offence.

d) Its Subjectivity

Although police discretion is recognized as a necessary function, it may result in inequality of treatment; not all police officers act in the same way under similar circumstances (Ouimet, 1969). Police discretion is sometimes perceived as improper because it contemplates decision-making not strictly governed by legal rules, but with a significant element of personal judgement, where the consequences of official action may directly affect a citizen's freedom and property (La Fave, 1962).

The police decision to arrest is not only a response to criminal law requirements, but it also consists of the individual officer's social and personal values combined with his assessment of what he believes are the policy preferences of the police organization (Grosman, 1973; Westley, 1970; Wilson, 1968).

The police, like all members of society, operate with background expectancies that enable them to transform an environment of objects to recognizable displays. The police come with their own expectancies to each scene, and according to these expectancies, make their own practical decisions (Cicourel, 1968).

Stebbins and Flynn (1974) propose a model for studying police encounters with citizens. Police enter the scene with one or more goals in mind, they perceive what is happening (ie. they see, hear, feel what is occurring), they interpret, give meaning or define these perceptions, and they ultimately perform their duties on the basis of the definition they formulate.

Discretionary decisions, whether made by the lowest ranking officer or by the commanding officer through the police organization, are crucial not only to the suspect and his rights, but also to the public as a whole . (Grosman, 1973).

e) Its Low Visibility

That the police do exercise discretion in their duty is both a well known and accepted fact of life (Kinnane, 1979; Davis, 1975; Wexler, 1974; Grosman, 1973; Westley, 1970; Cicourel, 1968; Schur, 1968; Skolnick, 1966; La Fave, 1965, 1962; Goldstein, 1963; Breital, 1960; Goldstein, 1960). How they use it is the more pertinent question to be asked. Since police decisions often escape review by the courts as well as the public, the discretionary power allotted to the police can be abused (Cicourel, 1968; Skolnick, 1966; La Fave, 1962).

Police discretion has rarely been recognized by the law because of the low visibility of such decisions and the limitations on the means for challenging specific instances of inaction.

(La Fave, 1962: 104)

This extremely low visibility continues because of police reluctance to acknowledge that such discretionary power is exercised. By acknowledging such discretion, it would place them in a predicament of accounting for every act or failure to act, and in turn, could leave them open to charges laid by the public, since their performance sometimes varies with their moods or prejudices (Kinnane, 1979). To acknowledge discretion belies the very image in which the police officer takes pride, and it would further set back the possibility of ever securing good police-community relations (Goldstein, 1963).

The courts do not acknowledge the exercise of police discretion (Wexler, 1974; Banton, 1964; La Fave, 1962), and neither does the public (Wexler, 1974; Curtis and Dussuyer, 1970), despite the intolerance of full enforcement and its high financial cost (Breital, 1960). A study conducted in Toronto by Curtis and Dussuyer (1970) suggests that in the majority of cases, citizens refuse to acknowledge the exercise of discretion by police except for minor offences (ie. traffic), yet associate the image of

the "Good Cop" with characteristics that are associated primarily with the exercise of discretion; the result is further ambiguity for law enforcers.

Society, as a whole, in its continual refusal to acknowledge police discretion and to recognize the fact that police are just ordinary men in extraordinary circumstances, has laid the foundation for the continual abuse of justice. One assumed form of abuse is discrimination, especially against the lower class (Cicourel, 1968; Werthman and Piliavin, 1967; Gold, 1966).

f) Its Effect On Juvenile Justice

Because of the philosophy and practices of our juvenile justice system, the extent of discretionary power resting with police officials is greater in juvenile cases than in those dealing with adult offenders (Cicourel, 1968; Piliavin and Briar, 1964; Kitsuse and Cicourel, 1963).

With industrialization and urbanization in the 19th century, a growing concern about environmental influences resulted in the desire to rescue children and restore them to a healthful life. This child-saving movement began in Chicago by a group of feminist reformers who helped to pass special laws and new reformatory institutions for young

offenders. This movement was basically a middle-class one, since it was this class that had an excess of leisure time and were wanting to further their careers. This group defended the importance of the home, family life, and parental supervision with respect to the child. As parental authority, home education, rural life, and the independence of the family as a social unit were being threatened by urbanism and industrialism, children became the objectified victims. Thus, the feminist movement was primarily dedicated to helping children of the poor, the immigrant, and the broken family (Platt, 1968).

The fact that this union tended to imply that children of slum dwellers were the most prone to delinquent activity is clearly obvious, and this, in turn, has come to dominate our way of thinking today (Cicourel, 1968).

A juvenile delinquent under section 2(1) of the Juvenile Delinquent's Act is defined as the following:

Any child who violates any provision of the Criminal Code or of any federal or provincial statute, or of any by-law or ordinance of any municipality, or who is guilty of sexual immorality or any similar form of vice, or who is liable by reason of any other act to be committed to an industrial school or juvenile reformatory under any federal or provincial statute.

(Greenspan, 1978: 737)

Juvenile delinquency under Section 3 of the Juvenile Delinquent's Act refers to the following:

(1) The commission by a child of any of the acts enumerated in the definition of 'juvenile delinquent' in subsection 2(1), constitutes an offence to be known as a delinquency, and shall be dealt with as hereinafter provided:

(2) Where a child is adjudged to have committed a delinquency, he shall be dealt with, not as an offender, but as one in a condition of delinquency and therefore, requiring help and guidance and proper supervision.

(Greenspan, 1978: 738)

The Juvenile Delinquent's Act as well as the juvenile legislation in the United States allow for considerable discretion on the part of authorities in their handling of delinquents, which in turn can be influenced by the organization of the police department (Wilson, 1968).

The official justification for the exercise of discretion by juvenile bureaus is that each juvenile offender should be dealt with on the basis of what is best for him or her (Piliavin and Briar, 1964), while keeping in mind that stigmatization resulting from arrest and detention could possibly reinforce deviant behavior (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960).

Due to the philosophy that more weight should be given to the juvenile's character and life situation than

to his actual offending behavior, prejudicial practices by police officers can escape notice more easily in their dealings with juveniles than with adults (Piliavin and Briar, 1964).

Police develop stereotyped views or theories of what causes delinquency and what types of adolescents are likely to be delinquent. "Thus, the officer's preconstituted typifications and stock of knowledge at hand leads him to prejudge much of what he encounters ..." (Cicourel, 1968: 67).

This process of typification is class-linked, operating through common sense assumptions on the part of the police about where delinquent activity is most likely to be found. Each encounter, beginning with the initial police-juvenile contact, produces a dialogue whereby all events are interpreted, given meaning, labeled, and categorized (Cicourel; 1968).

The juvenile officer exercises a good deal of discretion in deciding how to process offenders, a discretion that far transcends the measure of ambiguity ordinarily involved in legal assessments of motivation and intent.

(Werthman & Piliavin, 1967: 72)

Policing of juveniles often follows an informal processing or harassment model rather than a formal

processing model of control. Juveniles are rarely arrested when there is little evidence, however, when strong evidence is available, formal enforcement becomes a privilege of the arresting officer. This privilege provides an opportunity for discriminatory practices (Davis, 1969).

When an arrest is made, complex personal interactions come into play. The definition of criminal is not based so much on behavior in obvious violation of a specific criminal law as it is on circumstances present in the encounter between policeman and suspect.

(Quinney, 1969: 119)

Kitsuse and Cicourel (1963: 135, 137) suggest that deviant behavior is behavior which is organizationally defined, processed, and treated as strange or abnormal and therefore, what our official statistics reflect are the specifically organizational contingencies which condition the application of specific statutes to actual conduct through the interpretations, decisions, and actions of law enforcement personnel. Hence, official statistics fail to reflect the decisions made and discretion exercised by the police (Davis, 1975; Ouimet, 1969; Cicourel, 1968; Schur, 1968; Kitsuse and Cicourel, 1963; Barrett, 1962; Goldstein, 1960).

It is argued that police disposition of juvenile offenders involves a variety of extra legal considerations. These cues include the youth's group affiliations, age, grades, race, grooming, dress, and demeanor. The youth's demeanor, other than his or her prior record, was considered the most important cue (Cicourel, 1968; Werthman and Piliavin, 1967; Skolnick, 1966; Piliavin and Briar, 1964; Goldman, 1963).

According to Werthman and Piliavin (1967), the factors influencing the disposition of youthful offenders consist of the following: the seriousness of the offence, the previous record of the offender, parental control or discipline, and the child's demeanor. They tend to view parental control as a more important factor than any of the offence related criteria; one concern of the police officer is the likelihood of future offences, and this largely depends upon the kind of parents a youth happens to possess. If a house appears messy, a parent is missing, or a mother is on welfare, the probability of arrest increases. Similarly, a youth with a father or sibling in jail is considered a risk.

The most important factor, according to Cicourel (1968), is the child's attitude toward the police.

Although a truant may not be totally responsible for his behavior, he may be a touch rebellious or acting in willful disregard for the law; the nature and intent of the crime is not as important as the attitude of the offender towards the idea of law itself. Those individuals who are contrite about their infractions, respectful to police officers, and fearful of sanctions that might be employed against them, tend to be viewed by police as basically law-abiding and therefore, would be most likely to receive a warning about the consequences of committing the particular crime again. The police officer might feel that contact with the juvenile justice system could possibly damage a positive attitude toward the law and conventional behavior. In contrast, the offenders who show disrespect toward the police, who are fractious and persistent troublemakers or punks, tend to generate a harsher response from law enforcers. Not only has the individual violated a legal rule, but he has also rejected the normative basis for conforming to it; a perfect candidate for arrest, detention, and eventual incarceration. There is a tendency to let the respectful offender off easily, but to give the works to the disrespectful offender (Kinnane, 1979; Black, 1971; Black and Reiss, 1970; Cicourel, 1968;

Werthman and Piliavin, 1967; Skolnick, 1966; Piliavin and Briar, 1964; Goldman, 1963; La Fave, 1962; Westley, 1953).

Although black and native offenders tend to have a higher arrest rate when compared to white offenders, there is no evidence to suggest that police discriminate on the basis of race (Black, 1971; Black and Reiss, 1970; Reiss, 1968; Skolnick, 1966; La Fave, 1965; Piliavin and Briar, 1964; Stinchcombe, 1963). It is suggested that black offenders are arrested at a comparatively high rate primarily because they show greater disrespect for both the law and its enforcers (Black, 1971; Piliavin and Briar, 1964), they tend to commit more serious crimes based on departmental statistics (Black and Reiss, 1970; Piliavin and Briar, 1964), and because black offenders tend to encounter complainants who demand severe dispositions (Black and Reiss, 1970; Werthman and Piliavin, 1967).

Since most research on juvenile delinquency implies that delinquency is a lower class phenomenon (Haskell and Yablonsky, 1978; Tribble, 1972; West, 1969; Eysenck, 1964; Mackay, 1963; Bloch and Geis, 1962; Gluecks, 1962; Trasler, 1962), it becomes harder for a juvenile to avoid criminal detection not for what he did, but for who he is. As a result, middle to upper class delinquency has had a much shorter history (Cicourel, 1968).

Bordua (1969) suggests that class bias does not show up in statistics because police must reserve the use of court referrals for only the most severe cases due to the overcrowding of court calendars, and the lack of institutional space for juveniles.

Gold (1966) estimates that if results were complete and unselective, the present ratio of five to one, favoring the selection of lower status offenders would be actually closer to one and one half to one; delinquency is relatively distributed evenly throughout all social ranks, but the bias infiltration in police dispositions operate to concentrate official violations in the lower strata.

The police can see only what the structure of their beats make it possible for them to see and therefore, lower class neighborhoods become the target for police interrogation (Werthman and Piliavin, 1967).

However, not all studies confirm these findings. The study results of McEachern and Bauzer (1967) and Bodine (1964) suggest that the offence type, arrest record, probation status, age, police officer, and department affect the police official's disposition, as well as in Terry's (1967) and Goldman's (1963) study where the offence and previous record appear to be the most securely established.

Where legal factors are taken into account, the relationship between socio-economic status and police disposition usually is either weak or removed (Hirschi, 1980; Green 1970).

#### D) Alcohol Use Among Youth

This study will look at one form of deviant activity, the abuse of alcohol by youth in which all levels of strata engage (Smart et al., 1979, 1977, 1975; Ogbourne et al., 1978; Clinton, 1976; Vaz, 1971; Blum et al., 1969; Cicourel, 1968; Kvaraceus, 1966; Maddox and McCall, 1964; Cavan, 1962).

In Canada, it is illegal for youths under 18 or 19 years (depending on the province one resides), to drink or possess alcohol; this law does not apply to those over the respective age. However, studies of teenage drinking behavior indicate that the liquor laws fail to deter early experimentation with alcohol by large numbers of minors.

##### a) Its Effects

Alcohol is a depressant chemical that slows the responsiveness of the central nervous system; that is, with mild doses, alcohol mildly depresses the actions of the nerves, heart muscles, and skeletal muscles. It also lowers

the blood pressure and slows down the heart and breathing rate. Although alcohol is a physiological depressant, it can also be a psychological stimulant or social lubricant in mild doses; small amounts make the user relaxed, sociable, and good humored. Alcohol can also be an anesthetic when taken in sufficient doses; anesthetics deaden sensation and in sufficient quantity, they can kill pain and produce sleep. The ability to think, concentrate, and work is impaired; emotional control is weakened. With habitual and excessive alcohol use, the result can be death (Nettler, 1976; National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 1972; Love, 1971).

b) Its Socio-Cultural Context

It has been established that one's drinking history depends at least in part on the socio-cultural context. For example, the French alcoholic does not exhibit the "bender drinker" pattern so common in our North American culture. The North American alcoholic is thought of as one who has lost control of his drinking while the French alcoholic is thought of as one who is unable to stop drinking; the object is to maintain a relatively low alcohol level in the blood continuously, rather than to achieve a state of periodically acute intoxication. In our

North American society, morning drinking is considered an absolute sign of alcoholism; such is not the case in France. Alcoholism in Italy is a rare phenomenon; very few individuals in Italy consume alcohol independent of their meals. Jews rank among the lowest of all groups where alcohol consumption is concerned, and the Irish among the highest due to the different attitudes (ie. religious) toward alcohol consumption (Popham, 1959).

Snyder (1958) found that the prevalence of drunkenness among the Jews tended to increase the further the group was removed from orthodoxy; this trend could be seen as partly a function of changes in attitudes toward the larger gentile population due to assimilation in secular groups.

Alcohol consumption by the Irish is characterized by utilitarianism; the utilitarian attitude places greater emphasis on the drug's physiological effects as a means to an end (Popham, 1959).

Cavan (1962) states that adolescents who drink reflect the culture of their ethnic group. In groups where drinking is a normal part of food consumption, drunkenness is rare. In the lower class, if drinking is not integrated as part of the culture, a certain amount of male

drunkenness may be accepted. In lower class communities where heavy drinking is tolerated by the mores, taverns often serve adolescents or sell bottled goods to them; the pattern of drinking is a symbol of adulthood and masculinity.

Therefore, what tends to be labelled alcoholism, including the symptoms of that condition, the type of problem it is considered to be (ie. medical versus psychiatric) and even the approach to treatment are in part determined by the socio-cultural situation in which the drinking takes place (Maddox and McCall, 1964; Cavan, 1962; Popham, 1959).

c) Its Widespread Use

Alcohol consumption has become both completely permissive and widespread in our society today; the situation continues to be tolerated despite the adverse consequences associated with its use (Wittenborn et al., 1969).

According to Dr. M. Chafetz, director of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, it is not uncommon to see severe alcoholism problems in children nine, ten, eleven and twelve years old. One study in this article has indicated that there are as many as 450,000 cases of alcoholism among children and teenagers in the United States (Hammond, 1973: 5).

The use of alcohol is related to delinquency in two ways:

- 1) Directly; when the use of alcohol is an offence for a minor where state laws do not provide penalties for such behavior, county, municipal or other local laws usually do;
- 2) Indirectly; when the excessive use of alcohol contributes to the commission of serious crimes like homicide (Haskell and Yablonsky, 1978: 342-343).

Violation of liquor laws is an offence of the young; purchase of alcohol is permitted to adults but is made illegal for youth. The concern for youth drinking is not limited to the disorderly conduct that may follow, but to a fear of future adverse consequences that could result, such as alcoholism (Cavan, 1962).

According to Maddox and McCall (1964), alcohol consumption by youth is behavior that is learned through interaction with adults and to a lesser extent with their peers. Therefore, what young people think about and do with alcohol reflects their perception of the behavior and attitudes of adults and often peers who are important to them. It is, therefore, suggested that alcohol use is a socially and culturally defined pattern of behavior to which almost all teenagers are exposed and with which they sooner or later experiment.

Consequently, there exists a relationship between the drinking behavior of parents and their children (Pearce and Garrett, 1970; Maddox and McCall, 1964; MacKay et al., 1963; MacKay, 1961). Results also support the view that alcohol offences are more likely to be found in the upper and lower classes, with the non-abusers in the middle class (Kvaraceus, 1966; Maddox and McCall, 1964).

The first theme on why adolescents drink is due to identification with social groups and sociability. If one is not drinking when others are, one is not partying and hence, is not a full-fledged member of the group; emphasis is on alcohol as a social beverage. A second theme is that of self-expression or fulfillment; another facet of this theme is the possibility of saying something about oneself that one wants said. The third theme is anxiety or tension reduction; alcohol is viewed as a convenient tranquilizer for adults who have family, financial, or social problems.

(Maddox and McCall, 1964: 82-84)

One important source of motivation for drinking lies in obligatory relationships to other peers; if an individual is a member of a peer group which has institutionalized drinking behavior, he or she may be obligated to convey this type of behavior at particular time periods (ie. parties, social gatherings, etc.) (Orcutt, 1978; Friedman et al., 1975; Hamburg et al., 1975; Wechsler and Thum, 1973; Widseth and Mayer, 1971; Forslund and Gustafson, 1970;

Pearce and Garrett, 1970; Alexander and Campbell, 1968; Maddox and McCall, 1964; MacKay, 1961). However, according to MacKay et al. (1963), the peer group provides the setting but not the motivation.

Among those alcohol users who lack peer support, alcohol use is usually seen as an expression of rebellion against the parental authority figure (Alexander, 1967). A few of the many reasons why adolescents drink include curiosity, boredom, stimulus-seeking, status symbolism, expression of disapproval, enjoyable experience, peer pressure, mutual reinforcement, and escape from tension (Schwarz et al., 1978; Blum et al., 1969; Wittenborn et al., 1969).

Studies conducted in the provinces of Ontario and Nova Scotia suggest that alcohol is the number one drug used by adolescents today (Smart et al., 1979, 1977, 1975; Shannon, 1977; Neumann, 1976). Similarly, such findings were also found in British Columbia and Alberta (Bakal et al., 1975; Russell et al., 1974).

#### d) Its Consequences

Results indicate that an increase in alcohol use is directly related to an increase in both age and grade level (Smart et al., 1979, 1977, 1975; Neumann, 1976;

Whitehead, 1971; Maddox and McCall, 1964), and inversely related to grade performance (Smart et al., 1979, 1977, 1975; Clinton, 1976; Dodson et al., 1971; Widseth and Mayer, 1977). Males tend to consume alcohol at a higher rate when compared to females (Smart et al., 1979, 1977, 1975; Shannon, 1977; Neumann, 1976; Whitehead, 1971). Having an older person or friend to purchase alcohol was found to be the most popular method used by students to get alcohol (Ogbourne et al., 1978; Shannon, 1977; Neumann, 1976). Maddox and McCall (1964) found that beer was the beverage most frequently reported and hard liquor the least frequently reported, and that youth drinking was generally secretive in nature. However, those parents who were aware of their child's drinking behavior tended to be tolerant of it (Shannon, 1977; Neumann, 1976). Drinking in licensed establishments was found to increase with age (Shannon, 1977), and youths in later birth positions in large families were found to be associated with a higher degree of alcohol involvement (Barry et al., 1969). It was also found that drinking, especially among older boys, leads to higher rates of police contact (Shannon, 1977).

Ogbourne et al., (1978) suggest that the average underage, youthful offender is a middle class delinquent

male who attends school, is living at home, and is consuming 2.7 drinks per day. This middle class phenomenon was also found in other studies (Smart et al., 1979, 1977, 1975; Clinton, 1976; Dodson et al., 1971; Vaz, 1971).

Ogbourne et al., (1978) and Clinton (1976) examined those youth who were appearing in court for alcohol violations, and found that the majority of offenders had previous court appearances, used alcohol and drugs on a regular basis, and were more apt to associate with peers who indulged in similar conduct.

According to Cavan (1962), F.B.I. reports revealed that driving while intoxicated was rare until ages 18 and 19. It was also found that older male adolescents drove more frequently while under the influence of alcohol when compared to females (Shannon, 1977; Neumann, 1976).

Ward and Nichols (1976: 22), found that in the province of Saskatchewan, out of 8,774 teenagers who were involved in traffic mishaps in 1974, 247 were definitely impaired by alcohol and another 1,067 had been drinking.

As well, studies tend to show that it is the lower class adolescent who manifests implicative or potentially troublesome drinking patterns at an early age and who is more likely to get into trouble with the law (Hughes, 1978; MacKay et al., 1967; Schonfield, 1967).

The reason why some underage drinkers should be arrested while others continue to be unapprehended is unknown. Those who are arrested have the misfortune of getting caught. Those who are arrested may drink more or may have more drinking problems than their peers, thus making them more visible and vulnerable to police detection. Those who are arrested may have had previous involvement with the police as well as involvement in other deviant activities. Those who are arrested may be the scapegoats of our society (Ogbourne et al., 1978).

It is stated that a large percentage of middle and upper class delinquency goes undetected, or is not recorded by law enforcement agencies. This paints a poor picture of reality (Haskell and Yablonsky, 1978; Cicourel, 1968; Gold, 1966).

In conclusion, an examination of the literature suggests that the police exercise wide discretionary powers when encountering youthful offenders. The police officer's attitude toward the following factors are crucial: the youth's sex, age, race, family life, physical appearance, manifest socio-economic status, conduct in school, group affiliations, demeanor when being questioned, previous

record, citizen's complaint, and the seriousness of the offence. These are all elements when taken individually or in diverse combination will prompt the police officer to arrest or let the youth go free. Departmental policy to which a police officer must comply also influences dispositions toward youthful offenders.

In order to better understand the contribution of various legal and extra-legal factors which appear to influence police dispositions toward youthful offenders, the researcher confined herself to an examination of police behavior in relation to one particular offence, alcohol abuse. The literature suggests that alcohol abuse among youth occurs in every socio-economic status level; only for youth is such conduct a criminal offence.

What this study purports is to ascertain what type of youth indulges in the abuse of alcohol and what type of youth is apprehended (arrested) by the police for it.

### References

- ALEXANDER, C.N. (June, 1967) Alcohol and Adolescent Rebellion. Social Forces, 45, 542-550.
- ALEXANDER, C.N. and E.Q. CAMPBELL. (1968) Balance Forces and Environmental Effects: Factors Influencing the Cohesiveness of Adolescent Drinking Groups. Social Forces, 46, 367-374.
- BAKAL, D.A., S.L. MILSTEIN, I. ROOTMAN. (1975) Trends in Drug Use Among Rural Students in Alberta. Canada's Mental Health, 23(4), 8-9.
- BANTON, M. (1964) The Policeman in the Community. London: Tavistock.
- BARRETT, E. (March, 1962) Police Practices and the Law - From Arrest To Release Or Charge. California Law Review, 50, 11-55.
- BARRY, H. JR., H. BARRY III, H.T. BLANE.. (1969) Birth Order of Delinquent Boys with Alcohol Involvement. Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 30, 408-413. 1
- BECKER, H.S. (1963) The Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance. New York: Free Press.
- BITTNER, E. (October, 1967) The Police On Skid Row: A Study of Peacekeeping. American Sociological Review, 32, 699-715.
- BLACK, D.J. (June, 1971) The Social Organization of Arrest. Stanford Law Review, 23(6), 1104-1110.
- BLACK, D.J. and A.J. REISS. (1967) Patterns of Behavior in Police-Citizen Transactions. Studies in Crime and Law Enforcement in Major Metropolitan Areas. Field Survey III Vol. 2, President's Commission on Law Enforcement in Major Metropolitan Areas. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- BLACK, D.J. and A.J. REISS. (1970) Police Control of Juveniles. American Sociological Review, 35, 63-77.
- BLOCH, H.A. and G. GEIS. (1962) Man, Crime and Society. New York: Random House.
- BLUM, R.H. (1969) Students and Drugs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- BODINE, G.E. (1964) Factors Related to Police Disposition of Juvenile Offenders. Syracuse: University Youth Development Centre.
- BORDUA, D.J. (January, 1969) Recent Trends: Deviant Behavior and Social Control. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 369, 149-163.
- BREITAL, C.D. (1960) Controls in Criminal Law Enforcement. University of Chicago Law Review, 27, 427-436.
- BUCKNER, H.T. (August, 1974) Police Culture. Paper presented at the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association Meetings, Toronto.
- CAVAN, R.S. (1962) Juvenile Delinquency. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Co.
- OHVAST, J. (1965) Value Conflicts in Law Enforcement. Crime and Delinquency, 11, 151-161.
- CICOUREL, A.V. (1968) The Social Organization of Juvenile Justice. New York: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- CLARK, J. and R. SYKES. (1974) Some Determinants of Police Organization and Practice in a Modern Industrial Democracy. in D. Glaser, Handbook of Criminology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 455-494.
- CLINTON, J. (1976) Juvenile Offenders and Drug Use. Toronto: Toronto Addiction Research Foundation.
- CLOWARD, R. and L. OHLIN. (1960) Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

- COURTIS, M.C. and I. DUSSUYER. (1970) Attitudes to Crime and the Police in Toronto. Toronto: Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto.
- CUMMING, E., I.M. CUMMING, L. EDELL. (Winter, 1965) Policeman as Philosopher, Guide, and Friend. Social Problems, 12, 276-286.
- DAVIS, K.C. (1969) Discretionary Justice: A Preliminary Inquiry. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press.
- DAVIS, N.J. (1975) Sociological Constructions of Deviance. Iowa: William C. Brown Co.
- DODD, D.J. (1967) Police Mentality and Behavior. Issues in Criminology, 3, 47-67.
- DODSON, W.E., D.F. ALEXANDER, P.F. WRIGHT, R.A. WUNDERLICH. (1971) Pattern of Multiple Drug Abuse Among Adolescents Referred by a Juvenile Court. Pediatrics, 47, 1033-1036.
- EVANS, R. (1973) Developing Policies for Public Security and Criminal Justice. Ottawa: Economic Council of Canada.
- EYSENCK, H. (1964) Crime and Personality. Boston: Houghton and Mifflin.
- FORSLUND, M.A. and T.J. GUSTAFSON. (1970) Influences of Peers and Parents and Sex Differences in Drinking by High School Students. Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 31, 868-875.
- FORTIER, K.N. (1972) The Police Culture: Its Effects on Sound Police-Community Relations. R.C.M.P. Gazette, 34, 6-9.
- FRIEDMAN, C.J., F. MANN, A.S. FRIEDMAN. (1975) A Profile Of Juvenile Street Gang Members. Adolescence, 10(40), 563-607.

- GLUECK, S. and E. GLUECK. (1962) Family Environment and Delinquency. Boston: Houghton and Mifflin.
- GOLD, M. (1966) Undetected Delinquent Behavior. The Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency, 3, 27-46.
- GOLDMAN, N. (1963) The Differential Selection of Offenders for Court Appearances. New York: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- GOLDSTEIN, H. (September, 1963) Police Discretion: The Ideal Versus The Real. Public Administration Review, 23, 140-148.
- GOLDSTEIN, J. (1960) Police Discretion Not To Invoke The Legal Process: Low Visibility Decisions in the Administration of Justice. Yale Law Journal, 69, 543-594.
- GREEN, E. (1970) Race, Social Status and Criminal Arrest. American Sociological Review, 35, 476-490.
- GREENSPAN, E.L. (1978) Martin's Annual Criminal Code. Agincourt, Ontario: Canada Law Book Ltd.
- GRIFFIN, J. (1958) Statistics Essential for Police Efficiency. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.
- GROSMAN, B.A. (1973) The Discretionary Enforcement of Law. Chitty's Law Journal, 21(2), 46-52.
- HAGAN, J. (1977) The Disreputable Pleasures. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd.
- HAMBURG, B.A., H.C. KRAEMER, W. JAHNKE. (1975) A Hierarchy of Drug Use in Adolescence: Behavioral and Attitudinal Correlates of Substantial Drug Use. American Journal of Psychiatry, 132, 1155-1163.
- HAMMOND, R.L. (1973) Almost All You Ever Wanted To Know About Alcoholism. Halifax: Nova Scotia Commission On Drug Dependency.

- HASKELL, M.R. and L. YABLONSKY. (1978) Juvenile Delinquency (2nd ed.) Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co.
- HAYDUK, L. (Winter, 1976) Formulations in Police Work: Some Observations and Related Theoretical Concerns. Canadian Journal of Sociology, 1(4), 463-479.
- HIRSCHI, T. (1980) Labelling Theory and Juvenile Delinquency. in W.R. Gove, The Labelling of Deviance: Evaluating A Perspective. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 271-302.
- HUGHES, F.K. (1978) Youthful Drinking and the Use of Drugs Other Than Alcohol: Some Implications for Adult Problem Drinking. Ottawa: Department of Sociology/Anthropology, Carleton University.
- JAYEWARDENE, C.H.S. (1973) Police and the Changing Society: Problems, Issues, and Solutions. Ottawa: Department of Criminology, University of Ottawa.
- KELLY, W. and N. KELLY. (1976) Policing in Canada. Toronto: MacMillan Co. of Canada Ltd.
- KINNANE, A. (1979) Policing. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publications.
- KIRKHAM, G.L. (April, 1974) What a Professor Learned When He Became A Cop. U.S. News and World Report, 76, 70-72.
- KITSUSE, J.I. and A.V. CICOUREL. (Fall, 1963) A Note on the Use of Official Statistics. Social Problems, 11, 131-139.
- KVARACEUS, W.C. (1966) Dynamics of Delinquency. Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books Inc.
- LA FAVE, W.R. (January and March, 1962) The Police and Non-Enforcement of the Law. Wisconsin Law Review, Parts I and II, 104-137, 179-239.
- LA FAVE, W.R. (1965) Arrest: The Decision to Take a Suspect Into Custody. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- LEVENS, B.R. (1980) Domestic Crisis Intervention. in B.R. Levens and D.G. Dutton, The Social Service Role of Police. Ottawa: Solicitor General Research Division, 205-240.

LOVE, H.D. (1971) Youth and the Drug Problem. Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

MACKAY, J.R. (1961) Clinical Observations on Adolescent Problem Drinkers. Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 22, 124-134.

MACKAY, J.R. (1963) Problem Drinking Among Juvenile Delinquents. Crime and Delinquency, 9(1), 29-38.

MACKAY, J.R., A.E. MURRAY, T.J. HAGERTY, L.J. COLLINS. (1963) Juvenile Delinquency and Drinking Behavior. Journal of Health and Human Behavior, 4, 276-282.

MACKAY, J.R., D.L. PHILLIPS, F.O. BRYCE. (1967) Drinking Behavior Among Teenagers: A Comparison of Institutionalized and Non-Institutionalized Youth. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 8, 46-54.

MADDOX, G.L. and B.C. MCCALL. (1964) Drinking Among Teenagers. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers Centre of Alcohol Studies.

(September 24, 1979) Police Turn To  
Ads To Win Public Support. Marketing, 84(3), 2.

MCEACHERN, A.W. and R. BAUZER. (1967) Factors Related To Disposition in Juvenile Police Contacts. in M.W. Klein, Juvenile Gangs in Context: Research, Theory and Action. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 148-160.

MCNAMARA, J.H. (1967) Uncertainties In Police Work: The Relevance of Police Recruits' Backgrounds and Training. in D.J. Bordua, The Police: Six Sociological Essays. New York: John Wiley & Sons Ltd., 163-252.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM/NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH. (1972) Alcohol and Alcoholism: Problems, Programs and Progress. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

NEILL, W.J. (1970) What Is The Role of the Police? R.C.M.P. Gazette, 32(7), 3-8.

NETTLER, G. (1976) Social Concerns. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

NEUMANN, B. (1976) Student Drug Surveys In Nova Scotia: Summary and Review. Halifax: Nova Scotia Commission On Drug Dependency.

OGBOURNE, A.C., E. VINGILIS, K. KIJEWski, L. SALUTIN. (1978) Drinking Patterns and Problems Among Adolescents Charged With Underage Drinking. Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario.

OLMOS, R.A. (1974) An Introduction To Police-Community Relations. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

ORCUTT, J.D. (1978) Normative Definitions of Intoxicated States: A Test of Several Sociological Theories. Social Problems, 25, 385-396.

OUIMET. (1969) The Role of the Police in a Democratic Society: Report of the Canadian Committee on Corrections. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

PEARCE, J. and H.D. GARRETT. (1970) A Comparison of the Drinking Behavior of Delinquent Youth Versus Non-delinquent Youth in the States of Idaho and Utah. Journal of School Health, 40, 131-135.

PILIAVIN, I. and S. BRIAR. (September, 1964) Police Encounters With Juveniles. American Journal of Sociology, 70, 206-214.

PLATT, A.M. (1969) The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

POPHAM, R.E. (October, 1959) Some Social and Cultural Aspects of Alcoholism. Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal, 4(4), 222-229.

- POUND, R. (1960) Discretion, Dispensation and Mitigation: The Problem of the Individual Special Case. New York University Law Review, 35, 925-937.
- QUINNEY, R. (1969) Crime and Justice In Society. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- REISS, A.J. (July-August, 1968) How Common Is Police Brutality? Transaction, 10-19.
- REISS, A.J. (1971) The Police and the Public. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- REISS, A.J. and D.J. BORDUA (1967) Environment and Organization: A Perspective on the Police. in D.J. Bordua, The Police: Six Sociological Essays. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 25-55.
- ROKEACH, M. (1971) The Value Gap Between Police and Policed. Journal of Social Issues, 27, 155-171.
- RUSSELL, J.S. and M.D. HOLLANDER. (1974) Drug Use Among Vancouver Secondary School Students: 1970 and 1974. Mimeo, Vancouver: Narcotic Addiction Foundation of British Columbia.
- SCHONFIELD, J. (1967) Differences in Smoking, Drinking, and Social Behavior By Race and Delinquency Status in Adolescent Males. Adolescence, 1, 367-380.
- SCHUR, E.M. (1968) Law In Society: A Sociological View. New York: Random House.
- SCHWARZ, R.M., B.R. BURKHART, S.B. GREEN. (1978) Turning On Or Turning Off: Sensation Seeking Or Tension Reduction As Motivational Determinants of Alcohol Use. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 1144-1145.
- SHANNON, W.J. (1977) Drug Use In Secondary Schools, 1976. Halifax: Nova Scotia Commission On Drug Dependency.
- SHEARING, C. and J. LEON. (August, 1974) The Police Image. Paper presented at the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association Meetings, Toronto.

- SKOLNICK, J.H. (1966) Justice Without Trial: Law Enforcement In A Democratic Society. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- SKOLNICK, J.H. and J.R. WOODWORTH. (1967) Bureaucracy, Information and Social Control. in D.J. Bordua, The Police: Six Sociological Essays. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 99-136.
- SMART, R., D. FEJER, D. SMITH, W.J. WHITE. (1975) Trends in Drug Use Among Metropolitan Toronto High School Students: 1968-1974. Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario.
- SMART, R., M.S. GOODSTADT, M.A. SHEPPARD, C.B. LIBAN. (1979) Alcohol and Drug Use Among Ontario Students in 1979 and Changes From 1977: Preliminary Findings. Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario.
- SMART, R., M.S. GOODSTADT, I.J. SONE. (1977) Alcohol and Drug Use Among Ontario Students in 1977. Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario.
- SNYDER, C.R. (1958) Alcohol and the Jews. New York: The Free Press.
- STEBBINS, R.A. and C. FLYNN. (August, 1974) Police Definitions of the Situation: Evaluation of a Diploma Program in Law Enforcement and Community Relations. Paper presented at the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association Meetings, Toronto.
- STINCHCOMBE, A. (1963) Institutions of Privacy in the Determination of Police Administrative Practice. American Journal of Sociology, 69(2), 150-160.
- TERRY, R.M. (1967) The Screening of Juvenile Offenders: A Study in the Societal Response to Deviant Behavior. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 58, 173-181.
- TOCH, H.H. (1965) Psychological Consequences of the Police Role. Police, 10, 22-25.
- TRASLER, G. (1962) The Explanation of Criminality. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

- TRIBBLE, S. (1972) Socio-Economic Status and Self- Reported Juvenile Delinquency. Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, 14, 409-415.
- VAZ, E.W. (1971) Delinquency and the Youth Culture: Upper and Middle Class Boys. in W.E. Mann, Social Deviance in Canada. Toronto: The Copp Clark Publishing Co., 74-95.
- VINGILIS, E. (1978) A Literature Review of the Young Drinking Offender: Is He A Problem Drinker? Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario.
- WARD, E. and M. NICHOLS. (May 17, 1976) Raising The Drinking Age: If There is a Problem, Is This the Solution? MacLean's Magazine, 22-23.
- WECHSLER, H. and D. THUM. (1973) Teenage Drinking, Drug Use and Social Correlates. Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 34, 1220-1227.
- WERTHMAN, C. and I. PILIAVIN. (1967) Gang Members and the Police. in D.J. Bordua, The Police: Six Sociological Essays. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 56-98.
- WEST, D.J. (1969) Present Conduct and Future Delinquency. New York: International Universities Press Inc.
- WESTLEY, W.A. (1953) Violence and the Police. American Journal of Sociology, 59, 34-41.
- WESTLEY, W.A. (1970) Violence and the Police: A Sociological Study of Law, Custom and Morality. Boston: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- WEXLER, M.N. (1974) Police Culture: A Response To Ambiguous Employment. in C.L. Boydell, P.C. Whitehead, C.F. Grindstaff, The Administration of Criminal Justice in Canada. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada Ltd., 126-151.
- WHITEHEAD, P.C. (1971) Turned On Students: Patterns of Drug Use in Halifax. Halifax: The Atlantic Association of Sociologists and Anthropologists.

WHITEHOUSE, J.E. (1973) Historical Perspectives on the Police-Community Service Function. Journal of Police Science and Administration, 1(1), 87-92.

WIDSETH, J.C. and J. MAYER. (1971) Drinking Behavior and Attitudes Toward Alcohol in Delinquent Girls. International Journal of Addictions, 6(3), 453-461.

WILSON, J.Q. (1963) The Police and Their Problems: A Theory. Public Policy, 12, 189-216.

WILSON, J.Q. (1968) Varieties of Police Behavior: The Management of Law and Order in Eight Communities. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

WILSON, J.Q. (1968) The Police and the Delinquent in Two Cities. in S. Wheeler, Controlling Delinquents. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 9-30.

WILSON, O.W. (1962) Police Planning. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

WITTENBORN, J.R., H. BRILL, J.P. SMITH, S.A. WITTENBORN. (1969) Drugs and Youth. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

## CHAPTER II

### METHODOLOGY

#### A) Introduction

There are several ways in which police behavior in relation to youth who abuse alcohol can be studied; 1) a participant observation study of police when encountering youthful offenders, 2) an examination of police attitudes toward youth and alcohol abuse, 3) an examination of police reports of youth who have been arrested, 4) an examination of attitudes of youth toward alcohol use and their experience with the police are some of the ways in which this problem can be approached.

In order to determine which type of youth indulges in the abuse of alcohol as well as which type of youth is apprehended (arrested) by the police for it, the researcher devised a method relying on a self-report questionnaire administered to a large number of high school students in the Ottawa area. The objective in the study was to examine the drinking habits of youth and their experience with the police in relation to alcohol abuse, if any, since the use of alcohol by youth cannot be determined other than by asking them directly. Also, time and economic limitations

made this approach to the problem appear to be the most practical.

B) Objective of Study.

What type of youth abuses alcohol or exposes himself to arrest? What type of youth is apprehended by the police for alcohol abuse (that is, which youth gets arrested and which youth goes free and under what conditions is the decision made)? These are the primary questions to be answered in this study.

C) Method Used to Achieve Objective

a) Schools

Since the Ottawa Board of Education would not authorize the testing of high schools under its jurisdiction, another approach was used. Several high school principals were approached. Through the co-operation of the President of the Principal's Association, three high schools of the Ottawa Board of Education agreed to participate in the study. After approaching a high school principal of the Ottawa Roman Catholic Separate School Board, a fourth high school was added to the study. Hence, four high school principals were willing to volunteer, but not without some constraints being imposed. The legitimate comments and

constraints placed on this study are as follows: The principals did not want to give up class time; since they were accountable to parents as well as the general community, they did not seek any publicity from the media once the results were formulated; since they felt responsible for protecting the students' interests due to the personal nature of the posed questions, they demanded strict anonymity; they would designate the potential number of students who would be part of the sample as well as the time and place, so as not to disrupt the normal school routine, but assuring that the chosen classes would represent a good cross-section of the total school population.

TABLE I

## TOTAL HIGH SCHOOL POPULATION IN OTTAWA BY GRADE (1980-1981)

Ottawa High School Population	Grade					N
	9	10	11	12	13	
English High Schools (15)	2888 19.5%	2999 20.2%	3284 22.1%	3290 22.2%	2366 16.0%	14827 100.0%
All High Schools (24)	4358 20.3%	4653 21.7%	4912 22.8%	4718 21.9%	2854 13.3%	21495 100.0%

(Ottawa Board of Education, 1980)

The above table reveals that there was a total of 21,495 students attending all high schools in Ottawa during the period of 1980 and 1981 when the questionnaire was administered. Since this study was confined to English high schools only, it was found that 14,827 students attended these English high schools during the same period.

TABLE II

GRADE BY AVERAGE AGE IN TWO ONTARIO SCHOOLS AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL

Grade	Milton				Belleville					
	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18	18-19+	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18	18-19+
9	90.0%	-	-	-	-	100.0%	-	-	-	-
10	-	87.5%	-	-	-	-	89.2%	-	-	-
11	-	-	68.2%	-	-	-	-	100.0%	-	-
12	-	-	-	75.0%	-	-	-	-	85.7%	-
13	-	-	-	-	73.3%	-	-	-	-	-
n	40	24	22	24	15	18	37	20	28	0

N=103

N=125

(Ministry of Education, 1979)

Since the Ottawa Board of Education does not collect statistics on the average age of students per grade, it was necessary to examine Education Statistics in Ontario, 1979. Using two sample schools in the province of Ontario, the above table was formulated. These two schools were chosen by the Ministry because the schools encompass all grades, elementary through secondary. They were the only schools where such statistics were gathered. (See Table II)

According to the most recent census, the four high schools in this sample are located in different socio-economic areas of Ottawa; two middle to upper class areas and two middle to lower class areas.

b) Subjects

The subjects tested in this study are English-speaking male and female high school students in grades nine to thirteen which corresponds approximately with the age range fourteen to nineteen years; 572 students participated. Out of this total, 307 are males and 265 are females.

In the sample, 72 students are 13 years of age, 67 are 14 years of age, 123 are 15 years of age, 158 are 16 years of age, 98 are 17 years of age, 94 are 18 years of age, and 20 students are 19 years and over.

TABLE III

## SAMPLE HIGH SCHOOL POPULATION IN OTTAWA BY GRADE (1980-1981)

Sample High School Population	Grade					N
	9	10	11	12	13	
Sample High Schools (4)	113 19.8%	127 22.2%	138 24.1%	105 18.4%	89 15.6%	572 100.0%

The majority of students (317) are Catholic; 157 are Protestant, 3 are Jewish, 6 are Moslem and 78 students belong to other religions.

As well, the majority of students (472) are Caucasian; 15 are Negroid, 11 are Mongoloid, and 31 are Native.

When comparing the above table to the table on the total high school population in Ottawa (see Table I), it was found that the sample population represents three per cent (3%) of the total high school population in Ottawa and it represents four per cent (4%) of the total English high school population.

TABLE IVGRADE BY AVERAGE AGE IN SAMPLE HIGH SCHOOL POPULATION IN  
OTTAWA

Grade	Average Age					n
	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18	18-19+	
9	81.4%	-	-	-	-	113
10	-	85.1%	-	-	-	127
11	-	-	82.6%	-	-	138
12	-	-	-	80.0%	-	105
13	-	-	-	-	86.6%	89
						N=572

The findings in this table are similar to those found in the table of the two sample schools in the province of Ontario. (See Table II)

Hence, the sample population in this study is representative of the total high school population in Ottawa. With some reservations and caution, the results can be generalized to the student population in the Ottawa area.

Owing to circumstances beyond the researcher's control, not all grades are equally represented in each school. One middle to upper class school requested 100 questionnaires for grades 11 to 13; the researcher received 100 completed

questionnaires. Another middle to upper class school requested 220 questionnaires for grades 9 to 13; the researcher received 217 completed questionnaires, 3 of which were unaccountable. One middle to lower class school requested 220 questionnaires for grades 9 to 12 (no grade 13); the researcher received 108 completed questionnaires, 94 were unused and 18 were not accounted. Another middle to lower class school requested 220 questionnaires for grades 9 to 13; 147 were completed questionnaires, 15 were ruined, 42 were unused, and 16 were lost.

Due to constraints imposed upon the research, this study approximates a selected stratified sample. It is a selected non-probability sample because not everyone had the chance to participate or the equal opportunity to respond; all subjects volunteered. It is also a stratified sample because the researcher took precautions to ensure that the sample would include subjects belonging to several socio-economic status levels; a lower socio-economic status level, a middle socio-economic status level, and an upper socio-economic status level. Hence, with some reservations and caution, the results of this type of sampling can be generalized to the student population in the Ottawa area.

c) Questionnaire

The measuring tool used in this study is a structured questionnaire consisting of closed-ended questions; all questions posed have exhaustive and mutually exclusive categories. The researcher is interested in classifying attitudes of youth who get into trouble with the police because of alcohol abuse.

The dependent variable in this study is police arrest. The two major independent variables are socio-economic status and offence type which is restricted to the criminal act, alcohol abuse.

The dependent variable, police arrest, is measured by the question "How did the police react?" (#52), where one of the categories included arrest. For this sample population, how often police make an arrest is determined by comparing how many youth come to the attention of the police, and how many of these same youth get arrested.

The independent variable, socio-economic status, is measured in three different ways. It is evaluated by family occupational status (#5), by family occupational income (#6), and by the socio-economic status of the area in which the school is located. According to Statistics Canada, the four high schools in this sample are located in different

socio-economic areas of Ottawa; two middle to upper class areas and two middle to lower class areas. Since it was not possible to compare the information given in this study with some objective or factual criterion because of the constraints required in assuring the anonymity of the subjects, it is assumed that students attending the selected high schools come from the surrounding area.

Offence type, alcohol abuse, is measured by whether or not a youth gets arrested for drinking only, for drinking and drugs, or for other delinquent or criminal acts; the researcher is interested only where an arrest is made for drinking. The offence, alcohol abuse, in this study refers to alcohol possession by youth, intoxication by youth in a public place, or any other situation where a complaint is made to the police (i.e. party).

A number of questions related to alcohol habits of youth are included in the questionnaire to measure general information on alcohol use among students in Ottawa. Fourteen questions addressed this dimension (#18-31): the amount of alcohol consumed by youth, when did they take their first drink, when they are most likely to drink, if they still drink, do their parents know about their drinking, which method they use most often to get alcohol, how often

alcohol interferes with preparation for classes and exams, how often alcohol is involved in motor vehicle mishaps, how often they drink in a public place, and which type of alcoholic beverage they prefer. By knowing how often youth used alcohol in a month (#18), and how many bottles, glasses, or shots of alcohol they had at any one sitting (#30), it is possible to determine which youth abused alcohol and from this subset, how many came to the attention of the police. In addition, it is also possible to determine the social class of these youths.

The literature suggests that there are a number of other variables which determine police dispositions toward youthful offenders (socio-economic status and offence type are only two factors). These latter variables were also included in order to determine their influence on the sample in this study. These independent variables consist of the following: sex, age, religion, race, grade level and performance, family life (including siblings), physical appearance, demeanor (attitudes toward the law and the police), hidden criminality, citizen's complaint, peer affiliation, and previous record. Although religion is not considered an influencing factor on police dispositions

toward youthful offenders, it tends to be associated with different attitudes toward drinking.

Each of the demographic variables, sex, age, religion, and race, is measured only once by asking the students to indicate the appropriate category into which they belong; all categories are mutually exclusive. The variable, sex, is dichotomized into two categories, male and female (#1). The variable, age, is divided into eight categories which range from 12 years and under to 19 years and over inclusive (#2). The variable, religion, is divided into five categories - Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Moslem, and Other (#3). The variable, race, is divided into four categories - Caucasian, Negroid, Mongoloid, and Native (#4).

The variables, grade level and performance, are measured similar to the demographic variables. The variable, grade level, is divided into seven categories which range from grade 7 to grade 13 inclusive (#11). Grade performance is measured by a question on over-all grade average which consists of five categories ranging from 40% and under to 75% and over inclusive (#12). It is assumed that a clear mind, exempt from alcohol, should be able to achieve better school marks than a confused mind.

The variable, family life, is measured in order to determine if there is family cohesion or breakdown; the absence of family controls suggests that there is a greater tendency for criminal and delinquent activity. The likelihood of arrest is greater for these youth. Family life is measured by whether one lives at home with both parents, with one parent, or lives in other arrangements (#16). For this study, family breakdown exists when a student lives with one parent only, or lives in other arrangements. If a student is not living at home with both parents, a further question requests why (ie. divorce/separation, death). (#17).

There are three questions relating to siblings; how many brothers and sisters a student has (#13), how many brothers and sisters are older (#14), and whether or not these brothers or sisters have been in trouble with the police (#15). The objective is to determine whether or not police have a tendency to arrest youths whose siblings have also been in trouble with the police.

Obtaining information about one's physical appearance is difficult when the researcher does not interview each student. Both style of clothing and hair are important in arriving at a first impression. To measure this, three

different pictures of youth were included in the self-administered questionnaire (#32). One picture displayed youth in fancy dress, a second picture displayed youth in casual dress, and a third displayed youth in hippy style dress. It was felt that a student could provide an appropriate response if he or she was asked to describe his or her appearance from the three pictures provided. The literature suggests that police have a tendency to stereotype youth according to their physical appearance. The pictures provided in this study are typical of how different youth dress and wear their hair.

To measure the variable, demeanor, a number of questions related to school discipline were included (#33-38); whether or not a student skips or gets suspended from school and how his or her parents feel about it, whether or not a student cheats often on any class test or gets frequently sent out of a classroom by a teacher. Other questions included how youth feel toward themselves and the law; whether or not they perceive themselves as delinquent, whether or not others consider them as being delinquent (#41-42). Questions relating to the law and the police consist of the following: Is mistreatment by the police the worst thing about getting caught for stealing? (#39)

Would one tell the police if one saw certain individuals commit criminal or delinquent acts? (#40) Has one ever been roughed up by the police? (#43) Hirschi's eight item scale (a Likert type) on discipline was also included. Examples from this scale are the following: "Policemen try to give all kids an even break", "It is alright to get around the law if you can get away with it", "I have a lot of respect for the police". How a youth interacts with the police officer tends to influence how the latter will react. Will he make an arrest or will he let the youth go free? The literature suggests that youths who are disrespectful toward the police will likely get arrested more often than youths who are respectful.

The literature suggests that a higher proportion of youths who engage frequently in criminal and delinquent activity come to the attention of the police. The likelihood of arrest is greater for these youth. To measure the amount and types of crime of the sample population in this study, the Nye and Short Hidden Criminality scale was included in the questionnaire (#45). This scale is a Guttman type scale containing the following eleven items: 1) Driving without a license or permit, 2) Stealing things worth less than \$2.00, 3) Buying or

drinking alcohol, 4) Skipping school, 5) Destroying property, 6) Engaging in illicit sex, 7) Stealing things of medium value (\$2.00 to \$50.00), 8) Stealing things worth more than \$50.00, 9) Running away from home, 10) Defying parents' authority, 11) Using narcotics.

Based on the results of a pre-test, the scale was modified since some students did not apprehend all of the items. Thus, the items were put into question format in the past tense to create a better understanding; the actual items in the scale were not changed. For example, the statement "Driving a car without a driver's license or permit" was changed to "Have you ever driven a car without a driver's license or permit?" The wording of one item was changed from "Narcotics violations" to "Have you ever smoked up (used narcotics)?"

The literature also suggests that a complainant can influence how a police officer will react. In some situations, he will leave a police officer no other alternative but to arrest the youth. Thus, knowing whether or not someone complains and insists that the police make an arrest is crucial in studying police behavior. The questionnaire measures this facet (#49-51).

One's reputation often depends upon whom one has for peers. For youth this is extremely important since the literature suggests that they seek approval from their peers. Peer affiliation was measured by asking whether or not youth were alone or with friends when they committed a criminal or delinquent act (#53), and whether or not youth preferred to drink with their peers (#20).

Police have a tendency to arrest those youth who persist in breaking the law and who show little respect for the police. To determine whether or not persistent arrest and criminality influence police dispositions toward youthful offenders in this study, previous record was measured by asking youth how many times they had been in trouble with the police (#54).

The self-administered questionnaire used in this study is contained in Appendix A.

According to the literature, there are a number of factors that determine who gets arrested by the police. In summary, these variables include the youth's socio-economic status, sex, age, race, grade performance, family life, physical appearance, demeanor, hidden criminality, citizen's complaint, offence type, peer affiliation, and previous record. In order to determine under what conditions

youth get arrested for alcohol abuse, it is necessary to examine these variables as measured in the questionnaire. For example, is it the offence, or is it the youth's socio-economic status level, demeanor, and/or physical appearance that determines whether or not a police officer will make an arrest?

d) Hypothesis

In reference to the major dependent and independent variables in this study, the primary hypothesis states that police arrest a higher proportion of lower class youth for alcohol abuse.

For the purpose of analysis, the null hypothesis states that there is no significant difference in the number of arrests made by the police of youth who abuse alcohol in the different socio-economic status levels.

e) Reliability and Validity

Reliability is the degree to which the measure can be depended upon to secure consistent results upon repeated application; that is, will the same methods used by different researchers or at different time periods produce the same results. It is the stability of the measurement process itself when applied under standard conditions

(Smith, 1975; Loether and McTavish, 1974; Suchman, 1967).

Zetterberg (1963: 50-51) discusses four types of reliability.

- 1) Congruence of several indicators or the extent to which several indicators measure the same thing.
- 2) Precision of an instrument or the extent to which the same indicator is consistent for a single observer.
- 3) The objectivity of an instrument or the extent to which the same indicator is consistent for two or more observers.
- 4) Constancy of the object measured or the extent to which the object being measured does not fluctuate.

Validity is the degree to which any measure or procedure succeeds in doing what it purports to do. It is the extent to which a measurement process is able to make distinctions based (only) on the variable one intends to measure. Questions are to be clear as possible so if it was administered to a similar sample, the researcher would get virtually the same results (Loether and McTavish, 1974; Suchman, 1967).

Suchman (1967: 124-125) discusses two types of validity, internal validity and external validity.

Internal validity suggests that the various indices selected to measure the concept are all highly interrelated or related according to a preconceived model. It is the type of validity one seeks in scaling procedures.

External validity consists of the relationship between the test measure and some outside criterion; the comparison of the measure with some objective or factual criterion.

Reliability and validity are interrelated. Reliability is a necessary condition for validity. There can be no validity without reliability, but there can be reliability without validity (Suchman, 1967).

In this study, the questionnaire was pre-tested to indicate problematic areas as well as to generate further response categories. These have been adjusted accordingly. The pre-test was given to 20 students, 8 were the researcher's colleagues and the remaining 12 were high school students.

The pre-test modifications include the following: The question "Is the principle breadwinner disabled for work?" was changed to "who earns the most money in your family?" (#9) and "If your mother is the one who earns more money, is it because your father is disabled, ill?" (#10).

The question "Are you (a) living with your father - your mother has died, (b) living with your father - your mother lives somewhere else, (c) living with your mother - your father has died, (d) living with your mother - your father lives somewhere else, (e) none of these" was changed to "Are you (a) living with your parents, (b) living with only one parent, (c) living in other arrangements" (#16) and "If you are not living with both your parents, check the statement that best applies to you (a) your parents are separated/divorced, (b) your father has died, (c) your mother has died, (d) both your parents have died, (e) you have left home" (#17).

The question "When would you most likely drink?" was changed to "When are you likely to drink? (Check more than one if it applies to you)" (#20).

The question "If you have used alcohol but have stopped, which of the following comes closest to your reason for stopping?" was changed to "Are you still drinking alcohol?" (#21) and "If no, which of the following comes closest to your reason for stopping" (#22).

The question "Which of these methods have you used most to get alcohol?" was changed to "Which of these methods have you used to get alcohol? (Check more than one if it applies to you)" (#24).

The question "What would be the worst thing about getting caught for stealing?" (#39) had the item "Public shame/embarassment" added to its categorial list.

The question "Have you ever had trouble with the police as a result of drinking? (a) because of drinking only (b) because of drinking and other drugs (c) because of drinking and some other reason (d) had trouble with the police for reasons other than alcohol use (e) never had trouble with the police" was changed to "Have you ever had trouble with the police?" (#46) and "If you have had trouble with the police, check the reasons below which apply to you (a) for drinking only (b) for drinking and drugs (c) for other delinquent acts" (#47).

Before administering the questionnaire to the sample population and after the appropriate modifications, the questionnaire was further tested by 10 more high school students. All responded to the questionnaire without any difficulty.

However, circumstances beyond the researcher's control omitted the application of the test-retest to the same subjects. Due to the nature of the posed questions, all students encountered in the pre-test were hesitant in allowing the researcher to test them in the future.

As well, the researcher was only given permission to interview the sample population in this study once and therefore could not test its reliability nor validity.

Subject validity entails misinformation given by the subject. This area of validity could not be determined since the posed questions could not be compared with some objective or factual criterion because of the constraints required in assuring the anonymity of the juvenile and the young adult.

The Nye and Short Hidden Criminality scale and the Hirschi discipline scale have been tested and re-tested for reliability as well as validity by their originators and consequently, have been used in other studies as a measuring device. Other questions posed in this questionnaire have previously been utilized by Dr. W.J. Shannon and P.C. Whitehead in their studies on Drug and Alcohol Use By High School Students in the province of Nova Scotia (ie. refer to question #18 in the questionnaire; see Appendix A).

Hence, the major concerns for reliability and validity in this study are the subject's mood, motivation, and fatigue at the time of testing, the subject's ability to respond honestly, the failure to reach those students who

were absent on the day the questionnaire was administered, and the subject's ability to provide the same response on repeated testing.

D) Administration of Questionnaire

Although the researcher is aware of the advantages and disadvantages of using the questionnaire format, the reasons why it was administered in this study are the following: The questionnaire appeared to be the best method for studying attitudes and behavior of subjects that took place in the past as well as the present. Such was the case in this study. The questionnaire appeared to be the best method relative to time limitations and assuring the anonymity of respondents. Anonymity was crucial because of the personal nature of the questions posed. High school students were the subjects tested in this study. It is assumed that all high school students can read and since the questionnaire was modified after being pre-tested and then re-tested, the researcher made certain that all high school students were capable of understanding the posed questions. By distributing the questionnaire in the classroom setting, a good cross-section of high school students was acquired with the least amount of bias infiltration. All students present had little choice but to respond.

Other means of collecting the data were considered, but found to be inappropriate for the information required. Since there are no recent available studies on the subject, the best method to determine the amount of alcohol use by youth in particular areas or schools of Ottawa was to ask them directly. The last available study occurred in the year, 1970. It can be obtained upon request at the Ottawa Addiction Research Foundation.

After a personal interview with each principal, a time period was set for each high school as to when the normal school routine would be interrupted. Hence, the questionnaires were administered in the four high schools (572 students) during the period of December 1st, 1980 and January 31st, 1981. All questionnaires were delivered to each school personally and left with the principal. The researcher was not able to administer the questionnaires herself in the high schools but was told that the questionnaires would be administered among those students attending compulsory courses since these classes would represent a good cross-section of the total school population.

Each high school took approximately one to two weeks to administer the questionnaires. When each school completed the task, the principal contacted the researcher by telephone

to come and pick up the questionnaires. Each principal was thanked in person for his/her co-operation in the study. As well, each received a personal hand-written letter by mail.

#### E) Compilation and Analysis of Data

When all the questionnaires were collected, the data was coded onto computer sheets and later placed onto a computer disk. Because of the quality level of the data and the response rate, it was necessary to use a descriptive analysis, the contingency table, using the SPSS program (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). A contingency table is a percentaged table which reveals associations between two variables within categories of other variables; that is controlling for a number of variables and testing for sources of spuriousness (Loether and McTavish, 1974):

Using the BMDP program (Bio-Medical Data Processing) a loglinear analysis was also conducted with the intent of creating a loglinear model from the data. The purpose of the loglinear analysis is to obtain a description of the relationships between the factors of the multiway table, either by forming a model for the data or by testing and ordering the importance of the interactions between the

factors; the analysis is based on fitting a (hierarchical) loglinear model to the cell frequencies (Dixon and Brown, 1979).

In analyzing the data, it was found that certain variables were of some significance, but not statistically significant to be assimilated into a model. Consequently, a model was not established for the data; the number of cases involved were insufficient due to the limitations encountered in the methodology. It was not possible to obtain a random sample of the population due to restrictions imposed by the school principals as to the time, place, as well as number of students to be interviewed.

If having been granted the opportunity to gather the data with the full co-operation of the Ottawa Board of Education, which this study did not have, then a random sample of the population would have been selected; the number of youth composing the arrest group would have exceeded seventeen cases so that further analysis could have been conducted.

The results to follow will indicate what the researcher found.

References

- BLISHEN, B.R. and W.K. CARROLL. (August, 1978) Sex Differences in a Socio-Economic Index for Occupations in Canada. The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 15(3), 352-371.
- BLISHEN, B.R. and H.A. MCROBERTS (February, 1976) A Revised Socio-Economic Index for Occupations in Canada. The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 13(1), 71-79.
- BURKE, P.J. and A.T. TURK. (1975) Factors Affecting Post-Arrest Dispositions: A Model for Analysis. Social Problems, 22, 313-332.
- DIXON, W.J. and M.B. BROWN. (1979) B.M.D.P. Biomedical Computer Programs: P-Series, 1979. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- FORCESE, D.P. and S. RICHER. (1973) Social Research Methods. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- HIRSCHI, T. (1969) Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- LOETHER, H.J. and D.G. MCTAVISH. (1974) Descriptive and Inferential Statistics: An Introduction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc.
- NIE, N.H. (1975) S.P.S.S.: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (2nd ed.). Toronto: McGraw-Hill.
- NYE, F.I. and J.F. SHORT JR. (June, 1957) Scaling Delinquent Behavior. American Sociological Review, 22, 330.
- ONTARIO MINISTRY OF EDUCATION. (1979) Education Statistics in Ontario. Ontario: Ministry of Education Research Department.

- OTTAWA ADDICTION RESEARCH FOUNDATION. (1970) The Ontario Drug Survey: Univariate Results. Ottawa: Ottawa Board of Education Research Department.
- OTTAWA BOARD OF EDUCATION. (1980) Education Statistics in Ottawa. Ottawa: Ottawa Board of Education Research Department.
- SHANNON, W.J. (1977) Drug Use In Secondary Schools, 1976. Halifax: Nova Scotia Commission on Drug Dependency.
- SIMON, J.L. (1978) Basic Research Methods in Social Science: The Art of Empirical Investigation (2nd ed.). New York: Random House.
- SMITH, H.W. (1975) Strategies of Social Research: The Methodological Imagination. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- STATISTICS CANADA. (1971) Canadian Classification and Dictionary of Occupations. Ottawa-Hull: Supply and Services Canada.
- STATISTICS CANADA. (1971) Population and Housing Characteristics by Census Tracts. Ottawa-Hull: Supply and Services Canada.
- SUCHMAN, E.A. (1967) Evaluative Research: Principles and Practice in Public Service and Social Action Programs. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- WHITEHEAD, P.C. (1971) Turned On Students: Patterns of Drug Use in Halifax. Halifax: The Atlantic Association of Sociologists and Anthropologists.
- ZETTERBERG, H.L. (1963) On Theory and Verification in Sociology. Totowa, New Jersey: The Bedminster Press.

CHAPTER IIITHE RESULTSA). Introduction

The objective of this study is to determine which type of youth indulges in the abuse of alcohol as well as which type of youth is apprehended (arrested) by the police for it. For the purpose of analysis, the null hypothesis states that there is no significant difference in the number of arrests made by the police of youth who abuse alcohol in the different socio-economic status levels.

Before proceeding to test the hypothesis in this study, it is necessary to examine how the variables, alcohol abuse and socio-economic status are measured in the analysis.

Table V examines the number of youths in the total sample population who consume alcohol and how many of these youths abuse it.

For the purpose of this study, "n" represents the base population for each calculation of percentages.

TABLE V.

## FREQUENCY BY VOLUME OF ALCOHOL USE AMONG HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Frequency of Alcohol use	TOT PCT		Volume of alcohol use					TOTAL
	0	Less 1	1-2	3-5	6-8	9+		
Not at all	21.3	-	-	-	-	-	n=120 21.3	
Less 1 per month	Abstainers & Light Users		Casual Drinkers		Occasional Abusers		n=149 26.4	
	-	5.3	10.6	7.1	2.9	0.5		
About 2 per month	-	2.0	Casual Drinkers		Occasional Abusers		n=100 17.7	
	-	2.0	6.7	6.0	2.7	0.3		
About 3 times per month	-	0.3	Normal Drinkers		Heavy Abusers		n= 60 10.6	
	-	0.3	2.3	4.4	2.9	0.7		
About 4 times or more per month	-	0.3	Normal Drinkers		Heavy Abusers		n=135 23.9	
	-	0.3	3.9	9.4	5.9	4.4		
TOTAL	n=120 21.3	n=45 8.0	n=133 23.6	n=152 26.9	n=80 14.2	n=34 6.0	n=564 100.0	

Alcohol users are dichotomized into the following three basic categories: (See Table V)

1) Abstainers and light users = 26.6% (ie. 150)

Abstainers are individuals who have not consumed alcohol in the past six months. Light users are those who drink less than once per month within the past six months and

consume less than one glass or shot of liquor at any one sitting.

2) Non-abusers = a) Casual drinkers = 33.0% (ie. 187)

b) Normal drinkers = 20.0% (ie. 113)

Casual drinkers are individuals who consume two or more times per month, less than one glass or shot of liquor at any one sitting. They also consume not more than twice per month a maximum of one to five glasses or shots of liquor at any one sitting.

Normal drinkers are those who drink more than twice per month a maximum of one to five glasses or shots of liquor at any one sitting.

3) Abusers = a) Occasional abusers = 6.4% (ie. 36)

b) Heavy abusers = 13.9% (ie. 78)

Occasional abusers are individuals who consume more than five glasses or shots of liquor at any one sitting not more than twice per month.

Heavy abusers are those who consume more than five glasses or shots of liquor at any one sitting more than twice per month.

The variable, socio-economic status, is measured by comparing one's fathers' or mothers' occupation to a socio-economic index formulated by Census Canada. Using this socio-economic index, six social classes have been isolated ranging from -29 to 70+ (See Table VI).

According to Census Canada, the three categories ranging below 50 are middle to lower class and the three categories ranging above 50 are middle to upper class. In this table, 50 is used as the median since the socio-economic index ranks between 10 and 90.

Average family income is not used in the analysis since results reveal that the majority of occupations in Ottawa have good salaries despite their status; 11.1% (n=572) families make less than \$20,000 per year, 32.2% (n=572) make \$20,000 to \$37,500 per year, and 56.7% (n=572) make \$38,000 and over. According to Revenue Canada, Ottawa has the eighth highest average income level in Canada at \$13,887.00 per year.

\*

TABLE VI

TOTAL SAMPLE POPULATION BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

Total sample population	ROW PCT TOT PCT	Range of Socio-Economic Index					Socio-Economic Status	TOTAL
		Middle - Upper						
		Lower - Middle	29-39	40-49	50-59	60-69		
1) High School Middle - Upper	9.0 1.6	7.0 1.2	16.0 2.8	6.0 1.0	39.0 6.8	23.0 4.0	n=100 17.5	
2) High School Middle - Lower	14.8 2.8	16.7 3.1	16.7 3.1	7.4 1.4	20.4 3.8	24.1 4.5	n=108 18.9	
3) High School Middle - Upper	11.1 4.2	9.7 3.7	13.8 5.2	12.4 4.7	38.7 14.7	14.3 5.4	n=217 37.9	
4) High School Middle - Lower	17.7 4.5	20.4 5.2	20.4 5.2	6.1 1.6	15.0 3.8	20.4 5.2	n=147 25.7	
TOTAL	n=75 13.1	n=76 13.3	n=94 16.4	n=50 8.7	n=167 29.2	n=110 19.2	n=572 100.0	

The above table reveals that 43% (n=572) of the sample population are middle to lower class and 57% (n=572) are middle to upper class. Although but one high school corresponds with its socio-economic area. Although, according to Statistics Canada, the high school is located in a middle to lower socio-economic area, results reveal that students from different social classes attend this high school. (See Table VI)

#### B) Testing of Hypothesis

In order to test the hypothesis in this study, a loglinear analysis, consisting of the following tables, was conducted to determine which social class of youths gets arrested for alcohol/alcohol and drug abuse.

When analyzing the tables in this study, it is important to keep in mind that there are students who may have falsified their responses either by understating or exaggerating.

TABLE VII

## SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS BY ALCOHOL ABUSE

Alcohol Abuse	ROW PCT		Socio-Economic Status					TOTAL
	TOT	PCT	Lower - Middle			Middle - Upper		
	-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+		
Occasional Abuse	13.9	16.7	19.4	2.8	22.2	25.0	n= 36	
	4.4	5.3	6.1	0.9	7.0	7.9		
Heavy Abuse	7.7	14.1	15.4	11.5	21.8	29.5	n= 78	
	5.3	9.6	10.5	7.9	14.9	20.2		
TOTAL	n=11	n=17	n=19	n=10	n=25	n=32	n=114	
	9.6	14.9	16.7	8.8	21.9	28.1	100.0	
		N=47			N=67			
		41.2			58.8			

Alcohol consumption among youths is found to exist in all social classes. Each class has its alcohol abusers; 41.2% (n=114) are middle to lower class abusers and 58.8% (n=114) are middle to upper class abusers. (See Table VII)

Tables VIII, IX and X examine how many and what type of youths in the total sample population come to the attention of the police for alcohol/alcohol and drug abuse, and which of these youths get arrested. For wording purposes only, tables VIII and IX have been combined in the text. (See Table X)

TABLE VIII

## SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS BY ARREST FOR ALCOHOL ABUSE

Arrest	COL PCT		Alcohol Use				Total	
	Socio-Econ. Status	TOT PCT	Abst. & L.U.	Nonabusers Cas.	Normal	Abusers Occ. Heavy		
Middle to Lower	( Less 29		0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	25.0	n= 3 23.1
	( 30-39		0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	n= 1 7.7
	( 40-49		0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	n= 2 15.4
<u>NO</u>								
Middle to Upper	( 50-59		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	n= 1 7.7
	( 60-69		0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	n= 2 15.4
	( 70+		0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	50.0	n= 3 23.1
Total			n=0 0.0	n=0 0.0	n=5 41.7	n=3 25.0	n=4 33.3	N=12 92.3
Middle to Lower	( less 29		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n= 0 0.0
	( 30-39		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n= 0 0.0
	( 40-49		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n= 0 0.0
<u>YES</u>								
Middle to Upper	( 50-59		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n= 0 0.0
	( 60-69		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n= 0 0.0
	( 70+		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	n= 1 7.7
Total			n=0 0.0	n=0 0.0	n=0 0.0	n=0 0.0	n=1 100.0	N= 1 7.7
TOTAL			N=0 0.0	N=0 0.0	N=5 38.5	N=3 23.1	N=5 38.5	N=13 100.0

TABLE IX

## SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS BY ARREST FOR ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE

Arrest	COL PCT TOT PCT		Alcohol Use				Total	
	Socio-Econ. Status		Abst. & L.U.	Nonabusers Cas. Normal	Abusers Occ. Heavy			
Middle to Lower	( Less 29		0.0	0.0	12.5	66.7	0.0	n= 3 10.7
	( 30-39		0.0	0.0	25.0	33.3	0.0	n= 3 10.7
	( 40-49		50.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	22.2	n= 5 17.9
<u>NO</u>								
Middle to Upper	( 50-59		50.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	11.1	n= 3 10.7
	( 60-69		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	n= 3 10.7
	( 70+		0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	33.3	n= 5 17.9
Total			n=2 9.1	n=0 0.0	n=8 36.4	n=3 13.6	n=9 40.9	N=22 78.6
Middle to Lower	( Less 29		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n= 0 0.0
	( 30-39		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n= 0 0.0
	( 40-49		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n= 0 0.0
<u>YES</u>								
Middle to Upper	( 50-59		0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	n= 1 3.6
	( 60-69		0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	n= 3 10.7
	( 70+		0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	33.3	n= 2 7.1
Total			n=0 0.0	n=1 16.7	n=1 16.7	n=1 16.7	n=3 50.0	N= 6 21.4
TOTAL			N=2 7.1	N=1 3.6	N=9 32.1	N=4 14.3	N=12 42.9	N=28 100.0

TABLE X

(Summary of Tables VIII and IX)  
 SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS BY ARREST FOR ALCOHOL/ALCOHOL AND DRUG  
 ABUSE

Arrest	Socio-Econ. Status	COL PCT TOT PCT		Alcohol Use			Total
		Abst. & L.U.	Nonabusers Cas.	Normal	Abusers Occ.	Heavy	
Middle to Lower	( Less 29	0.0	0.0	7.7	66.7	7.7	n= 6 14.6
	( 30-39	0.0	0.0	23.1	16.7	0.0	n= 4 9.8
	( 40-49	50.0	0.0	30.7	0.0	15.4	n= 7 17.1
<u>NO</u>							
Middle to Upper	( 50-59	50.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	15.4	n= 4 9.8
	( 60-69	0.0	0.0	15.4	0.0	23.1	n= 5 12.2
	( 70+	0.0	0.0	15.4	16.7	38.5	n= 8 19.5
Total		n=2 5.9	n=0 0.0	n=13 38.2	n=6 17.7	n=13 38.2	N=34 82.9
Middle to Lower	( Less 29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n= 0 0.0
	( 30-39	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n= 0 0.0
	( 40-49	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n= 0 0.0
<u>YES</u>							
Middle to Upper	( 50-59	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	n= 1 2.4
	( 60-69	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	n= 3 7.3
	( 70+	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	50.0	n= 3 7.3
Total		n=0 0.0	n=1 14.3	n=1 14.3	n=1 14.3	n=4 57.1	N= 7 17.1
TOTAL		N=2 4.9	N=1 2.4	N=14 34.1	N=7 17.1	N=17 41.5	N=41 100.0

TABLE XI

(Summary of Table X)  
 SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS BY ARREST FOR ALCOHOL/ALCOHOL AND DRUG  
 ABUSE

Arrest	Socio-Econ. Status	COL PCT TOT PCT.	Abst. & L.U.	Alcohol Use			Total
				Nonabusers Cas.	Normal	Abusers Occ. Heavy	
<u>NO</u>	M - L (-29 - 49)	50.0	0.0	61.5	83.4	23.1	n=17 41.5
	M - U (50 - 70+)	50.0	0.0	38.5	16.7	77.0	n=17 41.5
	Total	n=2 5.9	n=0 0.0	n=13 38.2	n=6 17.7	n=13 38.2	N=34 82.9
<u>YES</u>	M - L (-29 - 49)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n= 0 0.0
	M - U (50 - 70+)	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	n= 7 17.1
	Total	n=0 0.0	n=1 14.3	n=1 14.3	n=1 14.3	n=4 57.1	n=7 17.1
	TOTAL	N=2 4.9	N=1 2.4	N=14 34.1	N=7 17.1	N=17 41.5	N=41 100.0

Although all classes of youths come to the attention of the police for drinking/drinking and drugs, (41.5% (n=41) are middle to lower class and 58.5% (n=41) are middle to upper class), the results of this study reveal that 100.0% (n=7) of youths arrested for these offences are from the middle to upper class. (See Tables X and XI) Hence, the null hypothesis in this study cannot be rejected.

The majority, 71.4% (n=7), of youths arrested for drinking/drinking and drugs are alcohol abusers. Out of those youths who come to the attention of the police but do not get arrested, 55.9% (n=34) are abusers of alcohol, 38.2% (n=34), are non-abusers and 5.9% (n=34) are abstainers. As well, the results reveal that police are manifestly lax when arresting youths who come to their attention; only 7 out of 41 youths were arrested for alcohol/alcohol and drug abuse. (See Tables X and XI) In the total sample population, only 17 out of 145 youths who came to their attention for various offences were arrested.

In summary, out of a total sample of 564 youths, 20.2% (ie. 114) youths abuse alcohol (see Table V). Out of this 20.2% (ie. 114), 41.2% (ie. 47) are from the middle to lower class and 58.8% (ie. 67) are from the middle to upper class. (See Table VII) Only 21.0% (ie. 24) of these 114 youths who

abuse alcohol come to the attention of the police for alcohol/alcohol and drug abuse. (See Table X)

Out of the total sample population, only 7.3% (ie. 41) youths come to the attention of the police for alcohol/alcohol and drug abuse; 58.5% (ie. 24) of these youths are abusers of alcohol, 36.6% (ie. 15) are non-abusers, and 4.9% (ie. 2) are abstainers (see Table X). It was found that 66.7% (ie. 16) of these 24 abusers are from the middle to upper class and 33.3% (ie. 8) are from the middle to lower class.

Of the 15 non-abusers, 46.7% (ie. 7) are from the middle to upper class and 53.3% (ie. 8) are from the middle to lower class. One abstainer is from the middle to upper class and the other is from the middle to lower. (See Table X)

Only 17.1% (ie. 7) of the 41 youths who come to the attention of the police for alcohol/alcohol and drug abuse are arrested. All 7 youths arrested are from the middle to upper class; 71.4% (ie. 5) are abusers of alcohol. The remaining 28.6% (ie. 2) are non-abusers. (See Table X)

One youth from the middle to upper class reports getting arrested for alcohol abuse only (See Table VIII). Six youths from the middle to upper class report getting arrested for alcohol and drug abuse. (See Table IX)

### C) Testing of Objective

In reference to the objective of this study, that is, which type of youth indulges in the abuse of alcohol as well as which type of youth gets apprehended (arrested) by the police for it, the following results were found.

#### a) What Type of Youth Abuses Alcohol

More males, 34.0% (n=235) who report using alcohol abuse it when compared to females, 16.3% (n=209). A higher percentage 32.4% (n=213) of youths ages 15 and 16 years who report using alcohol abuse it when compared to those ages 13 and 14 years, 20.4% (n=54) and those 17 years and older, 19.2% (n=177).

Religion tends not to be a significant factor where alcohol abuse is concerned. Out of 230 Roman Catholics who report using alcohol, 27% abuse it. Out of 129 Protestants, 26.3% abuse it and out of those belonging to other religions 23.7% (n=59) abuse it. All youths of the Jewish and Moslem faiths are abstainers. More Caucasians 27.7% (n=376) who report using alcohol abuse it compared to Negroids 10% (n=10), Mongoloid 16.7% (n=6) and Native 20% (n=25).

Out of 185 youths with a grade average below 65%, a higher percentage 36.7% who report using alcohol abuse it when compared to those with a grade average above 65%, 18% (n=255).

Socio-economic status tends not to be a significant factor where alcohol abuse is concerned. Out of 179 youths

TABLE XII

## ALCOHOL ABUSE BY FAMILY LIFE

Alcohol Abuse	COL	PCT	Family Life		Total		
	TOT	PCT	Both Parents	One Parent		Other Arrangements	
Occasional	33.8	21.9	33.3	9.7	0.0	0.0	n=36
Heavy	66.2	43.0	66.7	19.3	100.0	6.1	n=78
Total	n=74	64.9	n=33	29.0	n=7	6.1	n=114
							100.0

in the middle to lower class who report using alcohol, 26.3% abuse it when compared to youths in the middle to upper class, 25.3% (n=265).

The majority of abusers 56.2% (n=112), have siblings who never come to the attention of the police; 30.4% (n=112) have siblings who did come to their attention, 8.9% (n=112) report that they do not know, and 4.5% (n=112) do not have any siblings.

As well, the majority of abusers 64.9% (n=114), live at home with both of their parents; 29.0% (n=114) live with one parent only, and 6.1% (n=114) live in other arrangements. (See Table XII)

A higher proportion of youths 75.2% (n=113), who abuse alcohol never drive a motor vehicle after drinking; 9.7% (n=113) do once or twice, 7.1% (n=113) do three or four times, and 8.0% (n=113) drive a car after drinking five times or more. The majority of alcohol abusers 89.3% (n=112), are neither passengers in a motor vehicle accident after drinking nor intoxicated drivers 96.4% (n=110), of a motor vehicle in an accident; 10.7% (n=112) are passengers and 3.6% (n=110) are drivers in motor vehicle mishaps after drinking alcohol. However, 66.7% (n=6) of youths who are drivers involved in a motor vehicle mishap after drinking, are heavy alcohol abusers.

A higher proportion of youths 52.6% (n=114), who abuse alcohol cheat at least once or twice on a class test or exam; 47.4% (n=114) report never cheating on any class test or exam. Most alcohol abusers 78.9% (n=114), do not get suspended from school. However, 62.5% (n=16) of youths who do report being suspended more than once or twice from school are alcohol abusers.

TABLE XIII

## ALCOHOL ABUSE BY PHYSICAL APPEARANCE

Alcohol Abuse	Physical Appearance			Total
	Fancy Dress	Casual Dress	Hippyish Dress	
Occasional	0.0 0.0	33.3 14.7	28.8 15.6	n= 33
Heavy	100.0 1.8	66.7 29.4	71.2 38.5	n= 76
Total	n=2 1.8	n=48 44.0	n=59 54.1	n=109 100.0

More hippy style dressers 54.1% (n=109), report being abusers of alcohol; 44.0% (n=109) are casual dressers, and 1.8% (n=109) are fancy dressers. (See Table XIII)

For further information as to how the variables demeanor and hidden criminality are measured in this chapter, refer to Appendix B.

TABLE XIV

## ALCOHOL ABUSE BY Demeanor

Alcohol Abuse	COL	Demeanor			Total
	TOT	Less 3	Undecided to	Positive	
	PCT		4-7	8-11	
	PCT		12-15		
Occasional	28.8	12.5	42.1	53.8	n= 36
	16.7	1.7	7.0	6.1	
Heavy	71.2	87.5	57.9	46.2	n= 78
	41.2	12.3	9.7	5.3	
Total	n=66	n=16	n=19	n=13	n=114
	57.9	14.0	16.7	11.4	100.0

When analyzing the following three items on the Hirschi discipline scale, "Policemen try to give all kids an even break" "It is alright to get around the law if you can get away with it" and "I have a lot of respect for the police", results reveal that 57.9% (n=114) of alcohol abusers are undecided to negative in their attitude toward the police; 42.1% (n=114) are favorable toward the police. As well, when analyzing only one of these items on the Hirschi discipline scale, "I have a lot of respect for the police", it was found that 46.5% (n=114) of abusers have favorable attitudes toward the police, 27.2% (n=114) are undecided and 26.3% (n=114) are unfavorable. (See Table XIV)

TABLE XV

## ALCOHOL ABUSE BY FREQUENCY OF CRIMINAL ACTIVITY

Alcohol Abuse	Frequency of Criminal Activity			Total
	Very Often 12-22	Occasional 23-33	Very Little 34-44	
Occasional	0.0 0.0	24.2 13.2	48.8 18.4	n= 36
Heavy	100.0 7.9	75.8 41.2	51.2 19.3	n= 78
Total	n=9 7.9	n=62 54.4	n=43 37.7	n=114 100.0

When analyzing all eleven items on the Nye and Short Hidden Criminality scale, results reveal that 54.4% (n=114) of abusers engage at least once or twice to several times in criminal activity; 7.9% (n=114) engage very frequently or often, and 37.7% (n=114) are the least frequent to engage in the criminal and delinquent activities composing the scale. Out of those youths who engage very frequently in criminal and delinquent activity, 75.0% (n=12) are heavy abusers of alcohol. When analyzing only one item on the Nye and Short Hidden Criminality scale, use of narcotics, it was found that 43.9% (n=114) of abusers report using narcotics very often; only 17.5% (n=114) report never using narcotics.

(See Table XV)

TABLE XVI

## ALCOHOL ABUSE BY ARREST

COL PCT TOT PCT	Arrest		Total
	Yes	No	
Alcohol Abuse			
Occasional	33.3 2.6	31.4 28.9	n= 36
Heavy	66.7 5.3	68.6 63.2	n= 78
Total	n=9 7.9	n=105 92.1	n=114 100.0

As well, the majority of youths, 70.0% (n=738) drink in the company of their peers.

Few youths who abuse alcohol come to the attention of the police and get arrested. This study reveals that 92.1% (n=114) of abusers do not get arrested for alcohol abuse. (See Table XVI)

TABLE XVII

## ALCOHOL ABUSE BY POLICE ATTENTION

Alcohol Abuse	POLICE ATTENTION					
	COL PCT		Total	COL PCT		Total
	Drinking Yes	No		Drinking & Drugs Yes	No	
Occasional	25.0 3.0	27.1 23.9	n= 18	12.5 3.0	32.0 24.2	n= 18
Heavy	75.0 8.9	72.9 64.2	n= 49	87.5 21.2	68.0 51.5	n= 48
Total	n=8 11.9	n=59 88.1	n= 67 100.0	n=16 24.2	n=50 75.8	n= 66 100.0

Only 11.9% (n=67) of abusers come to the attention of the police for drinking, and 24.2% (n=66) for drinking and drugs. (See Table XVII)

b) What Type of Youth Gets Arrested for Alcohol/Alcohol and Drug Abuse?

To determine which type of youth gets arrested for alcohol/alcohol and drug abuse, a number of tables were analyzed.

Due to a limited sample, only a basic description of the population arrested for alcohol/alcohol and drug abuse is provided.

TABLE XVIII

## ARREST BY POLICE ATTENTION FOR ALCOHOL/ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE

Police Attention	COL PCT TOT PCT		Total
	Arrest Yes	Arrest No	
Alcohol Abuse	14.3 2.4	35.3 29.3	n= 13
Alcohol & Drug Abuse	85.7 14.6	64.7 53.7	n= 28
Tbtal	n=7 17.1	n=34 82.9	n= 41 100.0

Results reveal that 17.1% (n=41) of youths who come to the attention of the police for alcohol/alcohol and drug abuse are arrested. (See Table XVIII)

From this percentage, 71.4% (n=7) are male and 28.6% (n=7) are female. It was found that 28.6% (n=7) are 14 years of age, 42.8% (n=7) are 15 years of age, and 28.6% (n=7) are 17 years of age. Roman Catholic youths make up 28.6% (n=7) of the arrest group, Protestant youths, 28.6% (n=7), and those youths belonging to other religions make up 42.8% (n=7). No youths of the Jewish or Moslem faiths get arrested for alcohol/alcohol and drug abuse. The majority of youths arrested 85.7% (n=7), are Caucasian; 14.3% (n=7) are Mongoloid.

A higher percentage of youths arrested for alcohol/ alcohol and drug abuse 42.8% (n=7) have an overall grade average of between 50% and 64%; 28.6% (n=7) have an average between 65% and 74%, and 28.6% (n=7) have an average of 75% and over.

Whether one had siblings in trouble with the police is not significant as 28.6% (n=7) report that they have siblings who do not come to the attention of the police, and 28.6% (n=7) report that they do have siblings who come to their attention. As well, 28.6% (n=7) report that they do not know and to 14.2% (n=7) this question does not apply.

A higher proportion of this arrest group 57.1% (n=7), never drive a motor vehicle after drinking; 14.3% (n=7) do once or twice, and 28.6% (n=7) do it more than twice. A higher percentage of this arrest group are neither passengers 57.1% (n=7), nor drivers 85.7% (n=7) of a motor vehicle in an accident after drinking alcohol; 14.3% (n=7) are passengers once, 28.6% (n=7) are passengers more than once, and 14.3% (n=7) are drivers only once in a motor vehicle mishap after drinking alcohol.

TABLE XIX

## FAMILY LIFE BY ARREST FOR ALCOHOL/ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE

Arrest	COL PCT		Family Life Other Arrangements	Total
	Both Parents	One Parent		
Alcohol Abuse	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	50.0 14.3	n= 1
Alcohol & Drug Abuse	100.0 42.8	100.0 28.6	50.0 14.3	n= 6
Total	n=3 42.8	n=2 28.6	n=2 28.6	n= 6 100.0

A higher percentage of youths arrested for alcohol/ alcohol and drug abuse 42.8% (n=7), live at home with both parents; 28.6% (n=7) live with one parent only, and 28.6% (n=7) live in other arrangements. (See Table XIX)

The majority of youths arrested in this group 85.7% (n=7), cheat at least once on a class test or exam. Only 14.3% (n=7) report never cheating on a class test or exam. Few youths in this arrest group get suspended from school; 28.6% (n=7) get suspended once or twice. The other 71.4% (n=7) report never getting suspended from school.

TABLE XX

## PHYSICAL APPEARANCE BY ARREST FOR ALCOHOL/ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE

Arrest	Physical Appearance			Total
	Fancy Dress	Casual Dress	Hippyish Dress	
Alcohol Abuse	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	16.7 14.3	n= 1
Alcohol & Drug Abuse	0.0 0.0	100.0 14.3	83.3 71.4	n= 6
Total	n=0 0.0	n=1 14.3	n=6 85.7	n= 7 100.0

More hippy style dressers 85.7% (n=7), are arrested for alcohol/alcohol and drug abuse. Only 14.3% (n=7) are casual dressers. Youths who display a very elite appearance do not come to the attention of the police for alcohol/alcohol and drug abuse. (See Table XX)

TABLE XXI

## DEMEANOR BY ARREST FOR ALCOHOL/ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE

Arrest	COL PCT TOT PCT				Total
	Less 3	Demeanor			
		Undecided to 4-7	8-11	Positive 12-15	
Alcohol Abuse	20.0 14.3	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	n= 1
Alcohol & Drug Abuse	80.0 57.1	100.0 14.3	0.0 0.0	100.0 14.3	n= 6
Total	n=5 71.4	n=1 14.3	n=0 0.0	n=1 14.3	n= 7 100.0

When analyzing the following three items on the Hirschi discipline scale "Policemen try to give all kids an even break", "It is alright to get around the law if you can get away with it" and "I have a lot of respect for the police", results reveal that a higher proportion of the arrest group 71.4% (n=7), are undecided to negative in their attitude toward the police; 28.6% (n=7) are favorable. Also, when analyzing only one of these items on the Hirschi discipline scale, "I have a lot of respect for the police", it was found that the majority 71.4% (n=7) have an unfavorable attitude toward the police, and only 28.6% (n=7) are favorable. (See Table XXI)

TABLE XXIIFREQUENCY OF CRIMINAL ACTIVITY BY ARREST FOR ALCOHOL/ALCOHOL  
AND DRUG ABUSE

Arrest	Frequency of Criminal Activity			Total
	Very Often 12-22	Occasional 23-33	Very Little 34-44	
Alcohol Abuse	0.0	20.0	0.0	n= 1
Alcohol & Drug Abuse	100.0 28.6	80.0 57.1	0.0 0.0	n= 6
Total	n=2 28.6	n=5 71.4	n=0 0.0	n= 7 100.0

When analyzing all eleven items on the Nye and Short Hidden Criminality scale, results reveal that all youths 100.0% (n=7) who are arrested for alcohol/alcohol and drug abuse engage at least once or twice to several times in the criminal and delinquent activities composing the scale. Also, when analyzing only one item on the Nye and Short Hidden Criminality scale, use of narcotics, it was found that the majority 71.4% (n=7), smoke up very often; 28.6% (n=7) report smoking up several times. (See Table XXII)

Peer affiliation is reported by all youths arrested for alcohol/alcohol and drug abuse, 100.0% (n=7).

TABLE XXIII

## PREVIOUS RECORD BY ARREST FOR ALCOHOL/ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE

Arrest	COL PCT				Total
	One Time	Two Times	Three Times	Four or More Times	
Alcohol Abuse	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	n= 1
Alcohol & Drug Abuse	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	
Alcohol & Drug Abuse	100.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	n= 6
	42.9	0.0	0.0	42.9	
Total	n=3	n=0	n=0	n=4	n= 7
	42.9	0.0	0.0	57.1	100.0

Whether or not a complainant requests that an arrest be made is insignificant. For the majority who did get arrested 60.0% (n=5), the complainant did not make such a request. However, 40.0% (n=5) did have a complainant who wanted them to be arrested.

The majority of the arrest group, 57.1% (n=7), have four or more encounters with the police; 42.9% (n=7) report having no previous record. (See Table XXIII)

In summary, the type of youth in this study that tends to abuse alcohol is a Caucasian male belonging to either the middle to lower or middle to upper class, 15 to 16 years of age, with an overall grade average of below 65

living at home with both parents, dishonest in school, hippy style in appearance, undecided to negative in his attitude toward the police, deviant, frequent user of narcotics, peer affiliated, and rarely caught by the police. The variable, religion tends not to be significant.

The type of youth that tends to be arrested for alcohol/alcohol and drug abuse is a Caucasian male, middle to upper class, 15 years of age, with an overall grade average of between 50% and 64%, living at home with both parents, dishonest in school, hippy style in appearance, undecided to negative in his attitude toward the police, deviant, frequent user of narcotics, peer affiliated, and has a previous record.

Consequently, the major hypothesis in this study was not confirmed.

#### D) General Youth Attitudes and Behavior

Further statements can be made from the analysis about youths in general; their drinking habits, their family life, their style of dress, their attitude toward the police, their hidden criminality, and their experience with the police.

Males tend to consume more alcohol when compared to females. Out of 306 males who report using alcohol 24.5% drink four or more times a month. Out of 264 females who report using alcohol 23.1% drink four or more times a month.

Also, at any one sitting a higher percentage of males 11.0% (n=236) drink nine or more glasses or shots of liquor compared to 4.3% (n=210) females, and 8.5% (n=236) males drink less than one glass or shot of liquor at any one sitting compared to 12.4% (n=210) females.

Results reveal that alcohol consumption varies directly with age, that is, as one's age increases, one's alcohol consumption increases. It was found that 12.7% (n=79) of youths 13 and 14 years of age who report using alcohol, drink four or more times a month compared to 39.5% (n=114) of youths 18 and 19 years of age and 30.4% (n=79) of 13 and 14 year olds are abstainers (did not drink at all in the past 6 (six) months) compared to 9.6% (n=114) of 18 and 19 year olds. Similar results were found with the amount consumed at any one sitting. It was also found that alcohol consumption varies directly with grade level, that is, as one's grade level increases, one's alcohol consumption increases. In grade nine, 32.1% (n=112) youths report not using alcohol in the past 6 (six) months compared to 10.1% (n=89) in grade thirteen and 15.2% (n=112) in grade nine drink four or more times a month compared to 42.7% (n=89) in grade thirteen.

Alcohol consumption is inversely related to academic performance; 16.5% (n=224) of youths with an overall grade average of below 65% did not drink at all in the past six months compared to 23.6% (n=339) with an average above 65%.

When given multiple response questions, it was found that a higher percentage of students, 40.0% (n=738) are more likely to drink before, during, or after a party. As well, a higher proportion of youths in trouble with the police 84.2% (n=152), report peer affiliation. The most popular method used by students to attain alcohol was when a friend gave it to them, 22.0% (n=1028) and beer was found to be the popular alcoholic beverage, 40.0% (n=524).

Results indicate that age and alcohol consumption varies directly with motor vehicle accidents. Out of those youths who drink four or more times a month, and have been in a motor vehicle mishap, 80.0% (n=5) are 17 years of age and older.

TABLE XXIV

## SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS BY ARREST.

Socio-economic Status	COL PCT TOT PCT Arrest		Total
	Yes	No	
Less 29	11.8 0.3	13.2 12.8	n= 75
30 - 39	11.8 0.3	13.3 12.9	n= 76
40 - 49	11.8 0.3	16.6 16.1	n= 94
50 - 59	5.9 0.2	8.8 8.6	n= 50
60 - 69	35.3 1.0	29.0 28.1	n=167
Over 70	23.5 0.7	19.1 18.5	n=110
Total	n=17 3.0	n=555 97.0	n=572 100.0

When analyzing tables on the total sample population, it was found that there is no association between socio-economic status and youth arrest. Youths get arrested for delinquent and criminal activity on all levels of social strata with more youths reporting in the middle to upper class; 11.8% (n=17) in the lower class get arrested for

delinquent and criminal activity in comparison with 23.5% (n=17) in the upper class. (See Table XXIV) Out of 245 youths from the middle to lower class, 2.4% get arrested. Out of 327 youths from the middle to upper class, 3.4% get arrested.

The results reveal that there are more one parent families and more youths living in other arrangements in the middle to upper class in comparison with the lower class; 25.5% (n=114) in the lower class are one parent families compared to 55.2% (n=114) in the upper class, and 7.6% (n=26) in the lower class live in other arrangements compared to 57.7% (n=26) in the upper class. However, the majority of lower class, one parent families 92.9% (n=14), are a result of divorce and separation. Upper class families tend to experience greater death rates 56.0% (n=50), compared to separation and divorce 36.0% (n=50).

TABLE XXV

## ARREST BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS BY FAMILY LIFE

Arrest	Socio-Econ. Status	Family Life			Total	
		Both Parents	One Parent	Other Arrangements		
Yes	Less 29	14.3 5.9	11.1 5.9	0.0 0.0	n= 2	
	Low SES	30 - 39	0.0 0.0	22.2 11.8	0.0 0.0	n= 2
		40 - 49	14.3 5.9	11.1 5.9	0.0 0.0	n= 2
		50 - 59	0.0 0.0	11.1 5.9	0.0 0.0	n= 1
	High SES	60 - 69	57.1 23.5	22.2 11.8	0.0 0.0	n= 6
Over 70		14.3 5.9	22.2 11.8	100.0 5.9	n= 4	
	Total	n=7 41.2	n=9 52.9	n=1 5.9	n= 17 100.0	

The majority of youths arrested 52.9% (n=17), have one parent families when compared to families where both parents are present 41.2% (n=17). However, socio-economic status is not a contributing factor. (See Table XXV)

Middle to upper class youths tend to dress more casual 19.0% (n=310), compared to 11.6% (n=310) in the lower class.

TABLE XXVI

## ARREST BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS BY PHYSICAL APPEARANCE

Arrest	Socio-econ. Status	Physical Appearance			Total
		Fancy Dress	Casual Dress	Hippyish Dress	
Yes	Less 29	0.0	0.0	16.7	n= 2
	30 - 39	0.0	25.0	8.3	n= 2
	40 - 49	0.0	0.0	16.7	n= 2
Low SES	50 - 59	0.0	0.0	8.3	n= 1
	60 - 69	0.0	75.0	25.0	n= 6
	Over 70	0.0	0.0	25.0	n= 3
High SES	Total	n=0 0.0	n=4 25.0	n=12 75.0	n=16 100.0

A higher proportion of youths who get arrested by the police 75.0% (n=16), display a poor physical appearance; 1.3% (n=310) of casual dressers get arrested compared to 5.6% (n=215) hippy style dressers. Youths who display a very elite appearance avoid arrest. Socio-economic status is not a contributing factor where physical appearance or arrest are concerned. (See Table XXVI)

TABLE XXVII

## ARREST BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS BY RESPECT FOR THE POLICE

Arrest	Socio-Econ. Status	COL PCT TOT PCT			Total
		Respect for Police			
Yes		Agree	Undecided	Disagree	
Low SES	Less 29	20.0 5.9	25.0 5.9	0.0 0.0	n= 2
	30 - 39	0.0 0.0	25.0 5.9	12.5 5.9	n= 2
	40 - 49	20.0 5.9	0.0 0.0	12.5 5.9	n= 2
	50 - 59	20.0 5.9	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	n= 1
High SES	60 - 69	40.0 11.8	25.0 5.9	37.5 17.6	n= 6
	Over 70	0.0 0.0	25.0 5.9	37.5 17.6	n= 4
	Total	n=5 29.4	n=4 23.5	n=8 47.1	n= 17 100.0

As well, slightly more youths in the upper class dress hippyish and display a poor physical appearance 18.1% (n=215), compared to 14.4% (n=215) in the lower class. In interpreting these results, there does not seem to be much of a difference in the way youths in the different classes dress.

When examining Hirschi's attitude scale on discipline, results reveal that all social classes have similar attitudes toward the police. When analyzing only one item on the scale, "I have a lot of respect for the police", the majority 63.3% (n=572) in all classes agree that they have respect for the police. However, the upper class has a slightly more hostile attitude toward them.

Out of three possible categories, it was found that more youths arrested 47.1% (n=17) disagree with the statement, "I have a lot of respect for the police". From this percentage, 75.0% (n=8) are from the middle to upper class. (See Table XXVII)

When examining the items on the Nye and Short Hidden Criminality scale, it was found that there is no association between socio-economic status and the severity of the offences committed. All social classes tend to engage in similar levels of delinquent and criminal activity with more delinquent and criminal activity being reported in the middle to upper classes; 12.3% (n=81) smoke up often in the lower class compared to 21.0% (n=81) in the upper class. As well, youths who do get arrested engage consistently and at a higher rate in all delinquent and criminal activity; 52.9% (n=17) of the arrest group smoke up very often.

TABLE XXVIII

## ARREST BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS BY NARCOTIC USE

Arrest Yes	Socio-econ. Status	Narcotic Use			Total
		Very Often	Occasional	Very Little	
Low SES	Less 29	22.2 11.8	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	n= 2
	30 - 39	11.1 5.9	20.0 5.9	0.0 0.0	n= 2
	40 - 49	11.1 5.9	20.0 5.9	0.0 0.0	n= 2
High SES	50 - 59	0.0 0.0	20.0 5.9	0.0 0.0	n= 1
	60 - 69	22.2 11.8	20.0 5.9	100.0 17.6	n= 6
	Over 70	33.3 17.6	20.0 5.9	0.0 0.0	n= 4
	Total	n=9 52.9	n=5 29.4	n=3 17.6	n= 17 100.0

Results do not indicate that a higher proportion of lower class youths committing more severe offences get arrested by the police; 22.2% (n=9) of the arrest group in the lower class smoke up often compared to 33.3% (n=9) in the upper class. (See Table XXVIII)

TABLE XXIX

## ARREST BY POLICE CONTACT

Arrest	Police Contact				Total
	One Time	Two Times	Three Times	Four or More Times	
Yes	7.9	11.6	11.1	23.8	n= 17
	3.4	3.4	1.4	3.4	11.7
No	92.1	88.4	88.9	76.2	n=128
	40.0	26.2	11.0	11.0	88.3
Total	n=63	n=43	n=18	n=21	n=145

There is no association between youths who have been arrested and who have had siblings in trouble with the police. Among those youths arrested, 41.2% (n=17) had siblings in trouble with the police. Similar results were found for those who did not have siblings in trouble with the police.

A higher proportion of youths 42.9% (n=17) who encounter a complainant requesting an arrest get arrested by the police compared to 28.6% (n=17) who did not get such a request but did get arrested.

One's chances of avoiding arrest decreases with an increase in police contacts. Out of 63 youths with a first offense, 92.1% do not get arrested. Out of 21 youths with four or more contacts with the police, 76.2% do not get arrested.

As well, out of 63 youths with a first offense, 7.9% get arrested compared to 23.8% (n=21) of youths with four or more contacts with the police. (See Table XXIX)

In conclusion, the results reveal, as perceived by youth, that police are manifestly lax when arresting youths who come to their attention and are even more lax when it comes to arresting youths for alcohol/alcohol and drug abuse. Although, the majority of youths who get arrested tend to be undecided to negative in their attitude toward the police, on the whole, the majority of youths in this study tend to respect the police.

References

- BLISHEN, B.R. and W.K. CARROLL. (August, 1978) Sex Differences in a Socio-Economic Index for Occupations in Canada. The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 15(3), 352-371.
- BLISHEN, B.R. and H.A. MCROBERTS. (February, 1976) A Revised Socio-Economic Index for Occupations in Canada. The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 13(1), 71-79.
- REVENUE CANADA. (1981) Taxation Statistics, 1979. Ottawa-Hull: Supply and Services Canada.
- STATISTICS CANADA. (1971) Canadian Classification and Dictionary of Occupations. Ottawa-Hull: Supply and Services Canada.

CHAPTER IVDISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

The major hypothesis "Police arrest a higher proportion of lower class youth for alcohol abuse" was not confirmed in this study. The results reveal that socio-economic status tends not to be a factor affecting the police officer's decision to arrest youthful offenders. The factors, perceived by youth, to have significance where police discretion is concerned are physical appearance, the severity of the delinquent and criminal activity in which youth engage, one's demeanor (respect toward the law and the police), one's family life, one's previous record, one's peer affiliation, and whether a complainant requests that an arrest be made. The variables, race, siblings in trouble with the police, and socio-economic status do not tend to have significance in this study.

One of the major reasons why race does not appear to be significant may be due to the fact that the city of Ottawa has a low number of racial and ethnic groups that are politically and criminally active; police arrest individuals who commit criminal acts and tend not to be selective.

Although the majority of subjects in this study are Caucasian, as they constitute the majority race in the city of Ottawa and, therefore, have a greater probability of representation in the sample, the results reveal that the majority of all individuals avoid arrest when they come to the attention of the police. Law reference policies tend to be applied equally regardless of the offender's social class or race.

The lack of association between youths who are arrested by the police, and their siblings who had trouble with the police, could possibly be explained by both the size of the police department and the city regions patrolled. The police officer patrolling the city, especially in Ottawa where team-policing has not been established, cannot get to know everyone on an individual basis. Therefore, the behavior of one's sister or brother does not tend to matter to the police officer who has a suspect in hand. Possibly in smaller communities, this relationship might be significant.

Although the literature review implies that delinquency is a lower class phenomenon (Haskell and Yablonsky, 1978; Tribble, 1972; West, 1969; Eysenck, 1964; MacKay, 1963; Bloch and Geis, 1962; Gluecks, 1962; Trasler, 1962), and

lower class delinquents are more likely to get into trouble with the law (Hughes, 1978; MacKay et al., 1967; Schonfield, 1967; Gold, 1966), the results in this study tend not to support these findings. This study tends to lend support to the findings of Vaz (1971) which suggest that the average underage youthful offender is a middle to upper class delinquent. The arrest of offenders for criminal and delinquent activity is found to exist in all levels of the social strata with more youths reporting in the middle to upper class. For example, all youth arrested for alcohol/alcohol and drug abuse in this study are middle to upper class.

One of the major reasons why delinquent and criminal activity is not concentrated in the lower class may be due to the fact that the city of Ottawa does not have any ghetto regions and students from all social class backgrounds can be found in particular schools. As well, Ottawa is a government city where the majority of citizens are middle class. According to Revenue Canada, Ottawa has a high standard of living with an average yearly income of \$13,887, and ranks eighth out of a hundred selected cities in Canada. Consequently, where there exist middle to upper class adolescents engaging in delinquent and criminal

activity, police arrest accordingly and tend not to discriminate on the basis of social class; more middle to upper class students are arrested in this study for their delinquent and criminal activity. Also, more youth in the middle to upper class abusing alcohol and drugs report getting arrested for it. Police, as perceived by youth, tend not to discriminate when making an arrest where social class is concerned.

The findings in this study tend to support both extra legal and legal considerations found to be influential in police dispositions toward youthful offenders. One's manner of dress, demeanor, and family life are found to be influential social factors that bias police dispositions as perceived by youth and other studies (Cicourel, 1968; Werthman and Piliavin, 1967; Skolnick, 1966; Piliavin and Briar, 1964; Goldman, 1963). As well, the findings suggest that there is a tendency to let the offender who respects the police off easily but to give the offender who is disrespectful the works; this phenomenon is supported in other studies (Kinnane, 1979; Black, 1971; Black and Reiss, 1970; Cicourel, 1968; Werthman and Piliavin, 1967; Skolnick, 1966; Piliavin and Briar, 1964; Goldman, 1963; La Fave, 1962; Westley, 1953). The majority of youthful offenders are found to be

with their peers at the time of the offence thus indicating that peer affiliation is an influential factor for those youth engaging in delinquent and criminal activity. Police, as perceived by youth, tend to arrest those who display a hippy style appearance. Those youth who dress well or modish do not come to the attention of the police even though they break the law. As well, the majority of these youth tend to come from one parent families.

Legal factors tend to be also influential in relation to police dispositions toward youthful offenders. These include the severity of delinquent and criminal activity in which youth engage, one's number of contacts with the police (previous record), and whether or not a complainant requests that an arrest be made. Hirschi (1980) and Green (1970) suggest that where legal factors are taken into account, the relationship between socio-economic status and police disposition usually is either weak or removed. This could be a further reason as to why socio-economic status as hypothesized has not been a significant factor in this study. The results of Terry's (1967) and Goldman's (1963) studies suggest that the severity of the offence and the previous record are the most important factors affecting police disposition. This study tends to support these findings as well.

However, the majority of adolescents who do come to the attention of the police are diverted from the Criminal Justice System. Arrest, as perceived by youth, is not a common action taken by the police. Rather the emphasis is on diverting the young person from the system.

Where alcohol consumption is concerned, the results tend to support the findings in the literature. Alcohol is consumed by youth in all levels of social strata. Males consume more alcohol than females, alcohol consumption varies directly with age and grade level and is inversely related to academic performance. These findings are supported by Smart et al., 1979, 1977, 1975; Shannon, 1977; Neumann, 1976; Whitehead, 1971. The results equally confirm that a higher proportion of youth prefer to drink with their peers and will use their peers as a means of getting alcohol. Confirming the Maddox and McCall (1964) study, beer is the most popular alcoholic beverage. As expected, it was found that age and alcohol consumption varies directly with motor vehicle accidents (Shannon, 1977; Neumann, 1976; Cavan, 1962).

The results of this study, with some reservations, may be generalized to the student population in the Ottawa

area. However, it is important to keep in mind the type of instrument used in this study as well as the method of sampling.

In conclusion, the police, as perceived by youth, are manifestly lax when arresting youths who come to their attention, and are even more lax when arresting youths for alcohol/alcohol and drugs. Although the majority of youths who are arrested in this study tend to have unfavorable attitudes toward the police, on the whole, the majority of youth in Ottawa tend to respect the police.

Furthermore, the police, as perceived by youth, exercise wide discretion when encountering youthful offenders, and diversion appears to be only one of the common methods they use. Although this may be policy followed by the police department, the decision to arrest or not to arrest is also influenced by the individual police officer every time he encounters a youthful offender. Indeed, the youth's first contact with the police will have a lasting impression on him or her. By and large, as the police tend to be respected by the youth in Ottawa, the way they use discretion could appear not only necessary but also beneficial to the community and its citizens.

It is hoped that this study will initiate other studies on police discretion. Which variables (extra legal versus legal) have a greater impact on police disposition toward youthful offenders could be further researched. Because of the quality level of the data in this study, such analysis was not possible.

3

### References

- BLACK, D.J. (June 1971) The Social Organization of Arrest. Stanford Law Review, 23(6), 1104-1110.
- BLACK, D.J. and A.J. REISS. (1970) Police Control of Juveniles. American Sociological Review, 35, 63-77.
- BLOCH, H.A. and G. GEIS. (1962) Man, Crime and Society. New York: Random House.
- CAVAN, R.S. (1962) Juvenile Delinquency. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Co.
- CICOUREL, A.V. (1968) The Social Organization of Juvenile Justice. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- EYSENCK, H. (1964) Crime and Personality. Boston: Houghton and Mifflin.
- GLUECK, S. and E. GLUECK. (1962) Family Environment and Delinquency. Boston: Houghton and Mifflin.
- GOLD, M. (1966) Undetected Delinquent Behavior. The Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency, 3, 27-46.
- GOLDMAN, N. (1963) The Differential Selection of Offenders for Court Appearances. New York: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- GREEN, E. (1970) Race, Social Status and Criminal Arrest. American Sociological Review, 35, 476-490.
- HASKELL, M.R. and L. Yablonsky. (1978) Juvenile Delinquency (2nd ed.) Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co.
- HIRSCHI, T. (1980) Labelling Theory and Juvenile Delinquency. in W.R. Gove, The Labelling of Deviance: Evaluating a Perspective. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 271-302.
- HUGHES, F.K. (1978) Youthful Drinking and the Use of Drugs Other Than Alcohol: Some Implications for Adult Problem Drinking. Ottawa: Department of Sociology/Anthropology, Carleton University.

- KINNANE, A. (1979) Policing. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publications.
- LA FAVE, W.R. (January and March, 1962) The Police and Non-Enforcement of the Law. Wisconsin Law Review, Parts I and II, 104-137, 179-239.
- MACKAY, J.R. (1963) Problem Drinking Among Juvenile Delinquents. Crime and Delinquency, 9(1), 29-38.
- MACKAY, J.R., D.L. PHILLIPS, F.O. BRYCE. (1967) Drinking Behavior Among Teenagers: A Comparison of Institutionalized and Non-Institutionalized Youth. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 8, 46-54.
- MADDOX, G.L. and B.C. MCCALL. (1964) Drinking Among Teenagers. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers Centre of Alcohol Studies.
- NEUMANN, B. (1976) Student Drug Surveys In Nova Scotia: Summary and Review. Halifax: Nova Scotia Commission On Drug Dependency.
- PILIAVIN, I. and S. BRIAR. (September, 1964) Police Encounters With Juveniles. American Journal of Sociology, 70, 206-214.
- REVENUE CANADA. (1981) Taxation Statistics, 1979. Ottawa-Hull: Supply and Services Canada.
- SCHONFIELD, J. (1967) Differences in Smoking, Drinking, and Social Behavior By Race and Delinquency Status in Adolescent Males. Adolescence, 1, 367-380.
- SHANNON, W.J. (1977) Drug Use In Secondary Schools, 1976. Halifax: Nova Scotia Commission on Drug Dependency.
- SKOLNICK, J.H. (1966) Justice Without Trial: Law Enforcement In A Democratic Society. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- SMART, R., D. FEJER, D. SMITH, W.J. WHITE. (1975) Trends in Drug Use Among Metropolitan Toronto High School Students: 1968-1974. Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario.

- SMART, R., M.S. GOODSTADT, M.A. SHEPPARD, C.B. LIBAN. (1979) Alcohol and Drug Use Among Ontario Students in 1979 and Changes from 1977: Preliminary Findings. Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario.
- SMART, R., M.S. GOODSTADT, I.J. SONE. (1977) Alcohol and Drug Use Among Ontario Students in 1977. Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario.
- TERRY, R.M. (1967). The Screening of Juvenile Offenders: A Study in the Societal Response to Deviant Behavior. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 58, 173-181.
- TRASLER, G. (1962) The Explanation of Criminality. London: Routledge and Kegan, Paul.
- TRIBBLE, S. (1972) Socio-Economic Status and Self-Reported Juvenile Delinquency. Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, 14, 409-415.
- VAZ, E.W. (1971) Delinquency and the Youth Culture: Upper and Middle Class Boys. in W.E. Mann, Social Deviance in Canada. Toronto: The Copp Clark Publishing Co., 74-95.
- WERTHMAN, C. and I. PILIAVIN. (1967) Gang Members and the Police. in D.J. Bordua, The Police: Six Sociological Essays. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 56-98.
- WEST, D.J. (1969) Present Conduct and Future Delinquency. New York: International Universities Press Inc.
- WESTLEY, W.A. (1953) Violence and the Police. American Journal of Sociology, 59, 34-41.
- WHITEHEAD, P.C. (1971) Turned On Students: Patterns of Drug Use in Halifax. Halifax: The Atlantic Association of Sociologists and Anthropologists.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALEXANDER, C.N. (June 1967) Alcohol and Adolescent Rebellion. Social Forces, 45, 542-550.
- ALEXANDER, C.N. and E.Q. CAMPBELL. (1968) Balance Forces and Environmental Effects: Factors Influencing the Cohesiveness of Adolescent Drinking Groups. Social Forces, 46, 367-374.
- BAKAL, D.A.; S.L. MILSTEIN, I. ROOTMAN. (1975) Trends in Drug Use Among Rural Students in Alberta. Canada's Mental Health, 23(4), 8-9.
- BANTON, M. (1964) The Policeman in the Community. London: Tavistock.
- BARRETT, E. (March 1962) Police Practices and the Law - From Arrest To Release Or Charge. California Law Review, 50, 11-55.
- BARRY, H. JR., H. BARRY III, H.T. BLANE. (1969) Birth Order of Delinquent Boys with Alcohol Involvement. Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 30, 408-413.
- BECKER, H.S. (1963) The Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance. New York: Free Press.
- BITTNER, E. (October 1967) The Police On Skid Row: A Study of Peacekeeping. American Sociological Review, 32, 699-715.
- BLACK, D.J. (June 1971) The Social Organization of Arrest. Stanford Law Review, 23(6), 1104-1110.
- BLACK, D.J. and A.J. REISS. (1967) Patterns of Behavior in Police-Citizen Transactions. Studies in Crime and Law Enforcement in Major Metropolitan Areas. Field Survey III Vol. 2, President's Commission on Law Enforcement in Major Metropolitan Areas. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- BLACK, D.J. and A.J. REISS. (1970) Police Control of Juveniles. American Sociological Review, 35, 63-77.
- BLISHEN, B.R. and W.K. CARROLL. (August 1978) Sex Differences in a Socio-Economic Index for Occupations in Canada. The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 15(3), 352-371.
- BLISHEN, B.R. and H.A. MCROBERTS (February 1976) A Revised Socio-Economic Index for Occupations in Canada. The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 13(1), 71-79.
- BLOCH, H.A. and G. GEIS. (1962) Man, Crime and Society. New York: Random House.
- BLUM, R.H. (1969) Students and Drugs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- BODINE, G.E. (1964) Factors Related To Police Disposition of Juvenile Offenders. Syracuse: University Youth Development Centre.
- BORDUA, D.J. (January 1969) Recent Trends: Deviant Behavior and Social Control. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 369, 149-163.
- BREITAL, C.D. (1960) Controls in Criminal Law Enforcement. University of Chicago Law Review, 27, 427-436.
- BUCKNER, H.T. (August 1974) Police Culture. Paper presented at the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association Meetings, Toronto.
- BURKE, P.J. and A.T. TURK. (1975) Factors Affecting Post-Arrest Dispositions: A Model for Analysis. Social Problems, 22, 313-332.
- CAVAN, R.S. (1962) Juvenile Delinquency. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Co.

- CHWAST, J. (1965) Value Conflicts in Law Enforcement. Crime and Delinquency, 11, 151-161.
- CICOUREL, A.V. (1968) The Social Organization of Juvenile Justice. New York: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- CLARK, J. and R. SYKES. (1974) Some Determinants of Police Organization and Practice in a Modern Industrial Democracy. in D. Glaser, Handbook of Criminology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 455-494.
- CLINTON, J. (1976) Juvenile Offenders and Drug Use. Toronto: Toronto Addiction Research Foundation.
- CLOWARD, R. and L. OHLIN. (1960) Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- COURTIS, M.C. and I. DUSSUYER. (1970) Attitudes to Crime and the Police in Toronto. Toronto: Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto.
- CUMMING, E., I.M. CUMMING, L. EDELL. (Winter 1965) Policeman as Philosopher, Guide, and Friend. Social Problems, 12, 276-286.
- DAVIS, K.C. (1969) Discretionary Justice: A Preliminary Inquiry. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press.
- DAVIS, N.J. (1975) Sociological Constructions of Deviance. Iowa: William C. Brown Co.
- DIXON, W.J. and M.B. BROWN. (1979) B.M.D.P. Biomedical Computer Programs: P-Series, 1979. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- DODD, D.J. (1967) Police Mentality and Behavior. Issues in Criminology, 3, 47-67.
- DODSON, W.E., D.F. ALEXANDER, P.F. WRIGHT, R.A. WUNDERLICH. (1971) Pattern of Multiple Drug Abuse Among Adolescents Referred by a Juvenile Court. Pediatrics, 47, 1033-1036.

EVANS, R. (1973) Developing Policies For Public Security and Criminal Justice. Ottawa: Economic Council of Canada.

EYSENCK, H. (1964) Crime and Personality. Boston: Houghton and Mifflin.

FERDINAND, T. and E. LUCHTERHAND. (1970) Inner-City Youth, the Police, the Juvenile Court and Justice. Social Problems, 17, 510-527.

FORCESE, D.P. and S. RICHER. (1973) Social Research Methods. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

FORSLUND, M.A. and T.J. GUSTAFSON. (1970) Influences of Peers and Parents and Sex Differences in Drinking by High School Students. Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 31, 868-875.

FORTIER, K.N. (1972) The Police Culture: Its Effects On Sound Police-Community Relations. R.C.M.P. Gazette, 34, 6-9.

FRIEDMAN, C.J., F. MANN, A.S. FRIEDMAN. (1975) A Profile of Juvenile Street Gang Members. Adolescence, 10(40), 563-607.

GLUECK, S. and E. GLUECK. (1962) Family Environment and Delinquency. Boston: Houghton and Mifflin.

GOLD, M. (1966) Undetected Delinquent Behavior. The Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency, 3, 27-46.

GOLDMAN, N. (1963) The Differential Selection of Offenders for Court Appearances. New York: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

GOLDSTEIN, H. (September 1963) Police Discretion: The Ideal Versus The Real. Public Administration Review, 23, 140-148.

- GOLDSTEIN, J. (1960) Police Discretion Not To Invoke The Legal Process: Low Visibility Decisions in the Administration of Justice. Yale Law Journal, 69, 543-594.
- GREEN, E. (1970) Race, Social Status and Criminal Arrest. American Sociological Review, 35, 476-490.
- GREENSPAN, E.L. (1978) Martin's Annual Criminal Code. Agincourt, Ontario: Canada Law Book Ltd.
- GRIFFIN, J. (1958) Statistics Essential for Police Efficiency. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.
- GROSMAN, B.A. (1973) The Discretionary Enforcement of Law. Chitty's Law Journal, 21(2), 46-52.
- HAGAN, J. (1977) The Disreputable Pleasures. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd.
- HAMBURG, B.A., H.C. KRAEMER, W. JAHNKE. (1975) A Hierarchy of Drug Use in Adolescence: Behavioral and Attitudinal Correlates of Substantial Drug Use. American Journal of Psychiatry, 132, 1155-1163.
- HAMMOND, R.L. (1973) Almost All You Ever Wanted To Know About Alcoholism. Halifax: Nova Scotia Commission On Drug Dependency.
- HASKELL, M.R. and L. YABLONSKY. (1978) Juvenile Delinquency (2nd ed.) Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co.
- HAYDUK, L. (Winter 1976) Formulations in Police Work: Some Observations and Related Theoretical Concerns. Canadian Journal of Sociology, 1(4), 463-479.
- HIRSCHI, T. (1969) Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- HIRSCHI, T. (1980) Labelling Theory and Juvenile Delinquency. in W.R. Gove, The Labelling of Deviance: Evaluating A Perspective. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 271-302.

- HUGHES, F.K. (1978) Youthful Drinking and the Use of Drugs Other Than Alcohol: Some Implications for Adult Problem Drinking. Ottawa: Department of Sociology/Anthropology, Carleton University.
- JAYEWARDENE, C.H.S. (1973) Police and the Changing Society: Problems, Issues, and Solutions. Ottawa: Department of Criminology, University of Ottawa.
- KELLY, W. and N. KELLY. (1976) Policing in Canada. Toronto: MacMillan Co. of Canada Ltd.
- KINNANE, A. (1979) Policing. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publications.
- KIRKHAM, G.L. (April 1974) What A Professor Learned When He Became A Cop. U.S. News and World Report, 76, 70-72.
- KITSUSE, J.I. and A.V. CICOUREL. (Fall 1963) A Note On the Use of Official Statistics. Social Problems, 11, 131-139.
- KVARACEUS, W.C. (1966) Dynamics of Delinquency. Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books Inc.
- LA FAVE, W.R. (January and March, 1962) The Police and Non-Enforcement of the Law. Wisconsin Law Review, Parts I and II, 104-137, 179-239.
- LA FAVE, W.R. (1965) Arrest: The Decision To Take A Suspect Into Custody. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- LEVENS, B.R. (1980) Domestic Crisis Intervention. in B.R. Levens and D.G. Dutton, The Social Service Role of Police. Ottawa: Solicitor General Research Division, 205-240.
- LOETHER, H.J. and D.G. MCTAVISH. (1974) Descriptive and Inferential Statistics: An Introduction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc.
- LOVE, H.D. (1971) Youth and the Drug Problem. Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

MACKAY, J.R. (1961) Clinical Observations on Adolescent Problem Drinkers. Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 22, 124-134.

MACKAY, J.R. (1963) Problem Drinking Among Juvenile Delinquents. Crime and Delinquency, 9(1), 29-38.

MACKAY, J.R., A.E. MURRAY, T.J. HAGERTY, L.J. COLLINS. (1963) Juvenile Delinquency and Drinking Behavior. Journal of Health and Human Behavior, 4, 276-282.

MACKAY, J.R., D.L. PHILLIPS, F.O. BRYCE. (1967) Drinking Behavior Among Teenagers: A Comparison of Institutionalized and Non-Institutionalized Youth. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 8, 46-54.

MADDOX, G.L. and B.C. MCCALL. (1964) Drinking Among Teenagers. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers Centre of Alcohol Studies.

(September 24, 1979). Police Turn To Ads To Win Public Support. Marketing, 84(3), 2.

MATZA, D. (1964) Delinquency and Drift. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

MCEACHERN, A.W. and R. BAUZER. (1967) Factors Related To Disposition in Juvenile Police Contacts. in M.W. Klein, Juvenile Gangs in Context: Research, Theory and Action. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 148-160.

MCNAMARA, J.H. (1967) Uncertainties In Police Work: The Relevance of Police Recruits' Backgrounds and Training. in D.J. Bordua, The Police: Six Sociological Essays. New York: John Wiley & Sons Ltd., 163-252.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM/NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH. (1972) Alcohol and Alcoholism: Problems, Programs and Progress. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

NEILL, W.J. (1970) What Is the Role Of The Police? R.C.M.P. Gazette, 32(7), 3-8.

- NETTLER, G. (1976) Social Concerns New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- NEUMANN, B. (1976) Student Drug Surveys In Nova Scotia: Summary and Review. Halifax: Nova Scotia Commission On Drug Dependency.
- NIE, N.H. (1975) S.P.S.S.: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (2nd ed.). Toronto: McGraw-Hill.
- NYE, F.I. and J.F. SHORT JR. (June 1957) Scaling Delinquent Behavior. American Sociological Review, 22, 330.
- OGBOURNE, A.C., E. VINGILIS, K. KIJEWski, L. SALUTIN. (1978) Drinking Patterns and Problems Among Adolescents Charged With Underage Drinking. Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario.
- OLMOS, R.A. (1974) An Introduction To Police-Community Relations. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.
- ONTARIO MINISTRY OF EDUCATION. (1979) Education Statistics in Ontario. Ontario: Ministry of Education Research Department.
- ORCUTT, J.D. (1978) Normative Definitions of Intoxicated States: A Test of Several Sociological Theories. Social Problems, 25, 385-396.
- OTTAWA ADDICTION RESEARCH FOUNDATION. (1970) The Ontario Drug Survey: Univariate Results. Ottawa: Ottawa Board of Education Research Department.
- OTTAWA BOARD OF EDUCATION. (1980) Education Statistics in Ottawa. Ottawa: Ottawa Board of Education Research Department.
- QUIMET. (1969) The Role of the Police in a Democratic Society: Report of the Canadian Committee on Corrections. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

- PEARCE, J. and H.D. GARRETT. (1970) A Comparison of the Drinking Behavior of Delinquent Youth Versus Non-delinquent Youth in the States of Idaho and Utah. Journal of School Health, 40, 131-135.
- PILIAVIN, I. and S. BRIAR. (September 1964) Police Encounters With Juveniles. American Journal of Sociology, 70, 206-214.
- PLATT, A.M. (1969) The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- POPHAM, R.E. (October 1959) Some Social and Cultural Aspects of Alcoholism. Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal, 4(4), 222-229.
- POUND, R. (1960) Discretion, Dispensation and Mitigation: The Problem of the Individual Special Case. New York University Law Review, 35, 925-937.
- QUINNEY, R. (1969) Crime and Justice In Society. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- REISS, A.J. (July-August, 1968) How Common Is Police Brutality? Transaction, 10-19.
- REISS, A.J. (1971) The Police and the Public. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- REISS, A.J. and D.J. BORDUA (1967) Environment and Organization: A Perspective on the Police. in D.J. Bordua, The Police: Six Sociological Essays. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 25-55.
- REVENUE CANADA. (1981) Taxation Statistics, 1979. Ottawa-Hull: Supply and Services Canada.
- ROKEACH, M. (1971) The Value Gap Between Police and Policed. Journal of Social Issues, 27, 155-171.
- RUSSELL, J.S. and M.D. HOLLANDER. (1974) Drug Use Among Vancouver Secondary School Students: 1970 and 1974. Mimeo, Vancouver: Narcotic Addiction Foundation of British Columbia.

- SCHONFIELD, J. (1967) Differences in Smoking, Drinking, and Social Behavior By Race and Delinquency Status in Adolescent Males. Adolescence, 1, 367-380.
- SCHUR, E.M. (1968) Law in Society: A Sociological View. New York: Random House.
- SCHWARZ, R.M., B.R. BURKHART, S.B. GREEN. (1978) Turning On Or Turning Off: Sensation Seeking Or Tension Reduction As Motivational Determinants of Alcohol Use. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 1144-1145.
- SHANNON, W.J. (1977) Drug Use In Secondary Schools, 1976. Halifax: Nova Scotia Commission On Drug Dependency.
- SHEARING, C. and J. LEON. (August 1974) The Police Image. Paper presented at the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association Meetings, Toronto.
- SIMON, J.L. (1978) Basic Research Methods in Social Science: The Art of Empirical Investigation (2nd ed.). New York: Random House.
- SKOLNICK, J.H. (1966) Justice Without Trial: Law Enforcement In A Democratic Society. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- SKOLNICK, J.H. and J.R. WOODWORTH. (1967) Bureaucracy, Information and Social Control. in D.J. Bordua, The Police: Six Sociological Essays. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 99-136.
- SMART, R., D. FEJER, D. SMITH, W.J. WHITE. (1975) Trends in Drug Use Among Metropolitan Toronto High School Students: 1968-1974. Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario.
- SMART, R., M.S. GOODSTADT, M.A. SHEPPARD, C.B. LIBAN. (1979) Alcohol and Drug Use Among Ontario Students in 1979 and Changes From 1977: Preliminary Findings. Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario.

- SMART, R., M.S. GOODSTADT, I.J. SONE. (1977) Alcohol and Drug Use Among Ontario Students in 1977. Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario.
- SMITH, H.W. (1975) Strategies of Social Research: The Methodological Imagination. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- SNYDER, C.R. (1958) Alcohol and the Jews. New York: The Free Press.
- STATISTICS CANADA. (1971) Canadian Classification and Dictionary of Occupations. Ottawa-Hull: Supply and Services Canada.
- STATISTICS CANADA. (1971) Population and Housing Characteristics by Census Tracts. Ottawa-Hull: Supply and Services Canada.
- STEBBINS, R.A. and C. FLYNN. (August 1974) Police Definitions of the Situation: Evaluation of a Diploma Program in Law Enforcement and Community Relations. Paper presented at the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association Meetings, Toronto.
- STINCHCOMBE, A. (1963) Institutions of Privacy in the Determination of Police Administrative Practice. American Journal of Sociology, 69(2), 150-160.
- SUCHMAN, E.A. (1967) Evaluative Research: Principles and Practice in Public Service and Social Action Programs. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- TERRY, R.M. (1967) The Screening of Juvenile Offenders: A Study in the Societal Response to Deviant Behavior. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 58, 173-181.
- TOCH, H.H. (1965) Psychological Consequences of the Police Role. Police, 10, 22-25.
- TRASLER, G. (1962) The Explanation of Criminality. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

- TRIBBLE, S. (1972) Socio-Economic Status and Self-Reported Juvenile Delinquency. Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, 14, 409-415.
- VAZ, E.W. (1971) Delinquency and the Youth Culture: Upper and Middle Class Boys. in W.E. Mann, Social Deviance in Canada. Toronto: The Copp Clark Publishing Co., 74-95.
- VINGILIS, E. (1978) A Literature Review of the Young Drinking Offender: Is He A Problem Drinker? Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario.
- WARD, E. and M. NICHOLS. (May 17, 1976) Raising The Drinking Age: If There is a Problem, Is This the Solution? MacLean's Magazine, 22-23.
- WECHSLER, H. and D. THUM. (1973) Teenage Drinking, Drug. Use and Social Correlates. Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 34, 1220-1227.
- WERTHMAN, C. and I. PILIAVIN. (1967) Gang Members and the Police. in D.J. Bordua, The Police: Six Sociological Essays. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 56-98.
- WEST, D:J. (1969) Present Conduct and Future Delinquency. New York: International Universities Press Inc.
- WESTLEY, W.A. (1953) Violence and the Police. American Journal of Sociology, 59, 34-41.
- WESTLEY, W.A. (1970) Violence and the Police: A Sociological Study of Law, Custom and Morality. Boston: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- WEXLER, M.N. (1974) Police Culture: A Response To Ambiguous Employment. in C.L. Boydell, P.C. Whitehead, C.F. Grindstaff, The Administration of Criminal Justice in Canada. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada Ltd., 126-151.
- WHITEHEAD, P.C. (1971) Turned On Students: Patterns of Drug Use in Halifax. Halifax: The Atlantic Association of Sociologists and Anthropologists.

- WHITEHOUSE, J.E. (1973) Historical Perspectives on the Police-Community Service Function. Journal of Police Science and Administration, 1(1), 87-92.
- WIDSETH, J.C. and J. MAYER. (1971) Drinking Behavior and Attitudes Toward Alcohol in Delinquent Girls. International Journal of Addictions, 6(3), 453-461.
- WILSON, J.Q. (1963) The Police and Their Problems: A Theory. Public Policy, 12, 189-216.
- WILSON, J.Q. (1968) Varieties of Police Behavior: The Management of Law and Order in Eight Communities. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- WILSON, J.Q. (1968) The Police and the Delinquent in Two Cities. in S. Wheeler, Controlling Delinquents. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 9-30.
- WILSON, O.W. (1962) Police Planning. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.
- WITTENBORN, J.R., H. BRILL, J.P. SMITH, S.A. WITTENBORN. (1969) Drugs and Youth. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.
- ZETTERBERG, H.L. (1963) On Theory and Verification in Sociology. Totowa, New Jersey: The Bedminster Press.

## APPENDIX "A"

### STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT ALCOHOL

Many experts in the field of alcoholism are of the opinion that teenage drinking is a serious problem today. The Department of Criminology of the University of Ottawa is investigating this social problem, in particular to find out the attitudes and leisure time activities of young people.

This questionnaire is designed to discover the drinking habits of young people. It also includes some questions related to whether or not young people get into trouble with the law as a result of their drinking habits.

YOU have been selected to be part of this group of young people. Therefore, your answers are very important. However, your answers will remain entirely anonymous. It means that no one will ever be able to identify you nor identify the questions you have answered.

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ON ANY PART OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. READ EACH QUESTION CAREFULLY AND REPLY AS TRUTHFULLY AS POSSIBLE TO EACH ONE. THERE IS NO TIME LIMIT BUT IT SHOULD NOT TAKE YOU LONGER THAN "20" MINUTES. ANSWER AS QUICKLY OR AS SLOWLY AS YOU WISH.



6. (a) What is your FATHER'S yearly income?

Under 2,000 -----	1( )
2,000 - 3,999 -----	2( )
4,000 - 6,999 -----	3( )
7,000 - 9,999 -----	4( )
10,000 - 14,999 -----	5( )
15,000 - 24,999 -----	6( )
25,000 and over -----	7( )

(b) What is your MOTHER'S yearly income?

Under 2,000 -----	1( )
2,000 - 3,999 -----	2( )
4,000 - 6,999 -----	3( )
7,000 - 9,999 -----	4( )
10,000 - 14,999 -----	5( )
15,000 - 24,999 -----	6( )
25,000 and over -----	7( )

7. Does your family own or rent your HOME?

Own -----	1( )
Rent -----	2( )
Don't know -----	3( )
Does not apply to me ---	4( )

8. Is your family on WELFARE?

Yes -----	1( )
No -----	2( )
Don't know -----	3( )

9. WHO earns the most money in your family?

Father -----	1( )
Mother -----	2( )
Other -----	3( )

10. If your MOTHER is the one who earns more money, is it because your father is disabled, ill?

Yes -----	1( )
No -----	2( )
Does not apply to me ---	3( )

11. What GRADE are you presently in?

- 7 ----- 1( )
- 8 ----- 2( )
- 9 ----- 3( )
- 10 ----- 4( )
- 11 ----- 5( )
- 12 ----- 6( )
- 13 ----- 7( )

12. What is your overall AVERAGE for all subjects this year?

- Under 40 ----- 1( )
- 40 - 49 ----- 2( )
- 50 - 64 ----- 3( )
- 65 - 74 ----- 4( )
- 75 and over ----- 5( )

13. How many brothers and sisters do you have?  
(Place number on line)

Brothers ( \_\_\_\_\_ )

Sisters ( \_\_\_\_\_ )

14. How many OLDER brothers and sisters do you have?  
(Place number on line)

Brothers ( \_\_\_\_\_ )

Sisters ( \_\_\_\_\_ )

15. Have any of your brothers or sisters been in trouble  
with the police?

Yes ----- 1( )

No ----- 2( )

Don't know ----- 3( )

Does not apply to me --- 4( )

16. Are YOU

Living with your parents ----- 1( )

Living with only one parent ----- 2( )

Living in other arrangements ----- 3( )

17. If YOU are not living with both your parents, check the statement that best applies to you.

- Your parents are separated/divorced 1( )
- Your father has died ----- 2( )
- Your mother has died ----- 3( )
- Both your parents have died ----- 4( )
- You have left home ----- 5( )

18. In the past six months, I have used ALCOHOL

- Not at all ----- 1( )
- Less than once per month ----- 2( )
- About twice per month ----- 3( )
- About three times per month ----- 4( )
- About four times or more per month 5( )

\* If you have not used alcohol in the past six months, skip to question #32.

19. When did you have your FIRST DRINK of alcohol?  
(Beer, wine or liquor)

- This year, 1980 ----- 1( )
- Last year, 1979 ----- 2( )
- Two or three years ago, 1977-1978 - 3( )
- Four or five years ago, 1975-1976 - 4( )
- Over five years ago, 1974 or before 5( )

20. WHEN are you likely to drink?  
(Check more than one if it applies to you)

- Usually when I am alone ----- 1( )
- When I'm with my close friends ---- 2( )
- Before, during or after a party --- 3( )
- Anywhere away from home ----- 4( )
- Anytime outside school -----
- (Does not matter) ----- 5( )
- When I am home ----- 6( )

21. Are you STILL DRINKING alcohol?

- Yes ----- 1( )
- No ----- 2( )

22. If NO, which of the following comes closest to your REASON for stopping?

- Thought it might be harmful/addictive ----- 1( )
- My parents/others forced me to stop ----- 2( )
- My friends wanted me to stop ----- 3( )
- I'm no longer interested in drinking ----- 4( )
- Other ----- 5( )

23. How much do your PARENTS know about your drinking habits?

- They do not know that I drink ----- 1( )
- They do not know I drink as much as I do ---- 2( )
- They know I drink and want me to stop ----- 3( )
- They know I drink and it is O.K. ----- 4( )
- I do not live with my parents ----- 5( )

24. Which of these METHODS have you used to get alcohol? (Check more than one if it applies to you)

- Said that you were older ----- 1( )
- Used an older person's I.D. card ----- 2( )
- Had an older person buy it for you ----- 3( )
- Friends gave it to you ----- 4( )
- Friends sold it to you ----- 5( )
- Parents gave it to you ----- 6( )
- You stole it ----- 7( )
- Bought it yourself ----- 8( )
- None of the above ----- 9( )

25. How OFTEN has drinking alcohol interfered with your preparation for classes/exams?

- Never ----- 1( )
- Once or twice ----- 2( )
- Two or three times ----- 3( )
- More than three times --- 4( )

26. How OFTEN have you driven a motor vehicle after drinking alcohol?

- Never or do not drive --- 1( )
- Once or twice ----- 2( )
- Three or four times ----- 3( )
- Five times or more ----- 4( )

27. Have you ever been a PASSENGER in a motor vehicle involved in a traffic accident after you drank alcohol?
- Yes, once only ----- 1( )  
 Yes, more than once ----- 2( )  
 No ----- 3( )
28. Have you ever been the DRIVER of a motor vehicle involved in a traffic accident after you drank alcohol?
- Yes, once only ----- 1( )  
 Yes, more than once ----- 2( )  
 No ----- 3( )
29. In the last six months, how OFTEN have you been drinking in a bar, tavern, beverage room or lounge?
- Never ----- 1( )  
 Once or Twice ----- 2( )  
 Three or four times ----- 3( )  
 Five to ten times ----- 4( )  
 More than ten times ----- 5( )
30. When you drink alcohol, about how MANY bottles of beer, glasses of wine or shots of liquor would you have at any one sitting?
- Less than one ----- 1( )  
 One or two ----- 2( )  
 Three to five ----- 3( )  
 Six to eight ----- 4( )  
 Nine or more ----- 5( )
31. WHICH of the following do you prefer most often?
- Beer ----- 1( )  
 Wine ----- 2( )  
 Hard Liquor ----- 3( )  
 None of the above ----- 4( )

32. Which PICTURE best describes the way you dress most of the time? (Place an "X" in that bracket)



( )

( )

( )

33. During the last year, did you ever stay away from SCHOOL just because you had other things you wanted to do?

Often	1( )
A few times	2( )
Once or twice	3( )
Never	4( )

34. How did your PARENTS feel about your staying away from school?

I have never stayed away	1( )
They didn't know about it	2( )
They didn't care	3( )
They disapproved	4( )
They approved	5( )
I don't know	6( )
I am not living with or in contact with my parents	7( )

35. During the last year, did you ever CHEAT on any class test?

Often ----- 1( )  
A few times ----- 2( )  
Once or twice ----- 3( )  
Never ----- 4( )

36. During the last year, were you ever SENT OUT of a classroom by a teacher?

Often ----- 1( )  
A few times ----- 2( )  
Once or twice ----- 3( )  
Never ----- 4( )

37. Have you ever been SUSPENDED from school?

Often ----- 1( )  
A few times ----- 2( )  
Once or twice ----- 3( )  
Never ----- 4( )

38. How did your PARENTS feel about your being suspended?

I have never been suspended ----- 1( )  
They didn't care ----- 2( )  
They were angry with me ----- 3( )  
They didn't know about it ----- 4( )  
They were angry with the school --- 5( )  
I don't know ----- 6( )  
I am not living with or in  
contact with my parents ----- 7( )

39. What would be the worst thing about getting caught for STEALING?

The police might not treat you  
right ----- 1( )  
Your parents would be angry ----- 2( )  
Your friends would look down on  
you ----- 3( )  
Public shame/embarrassment ----- 4( )  
Don't know ----- 5( )

40. Would you tell the POLICE if you saw these things?

(a) A 14 year old drinking in a bar. Yes ----- 1( )  
Maybe ----- 2( )  
No ----- 3( )



(b) People who break the law are almost always caught and punished.

X	X	X	X	X
Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

(c) Being sent to juvenile court would bother me a lot.

X	X	X	X	X
Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

(d) Policemen try to give all kids an even break.

X	X	X	X	X
Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

(e) Most things that people call delinquency don't really hurt anyone.

X	X	X	X	X
Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

(f) It is alright to get around the law if you can get away with it.

X	X	X	X	X
Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

(g) Most criminals really should not be blamed for the things they have done.

X	X	X	X	X
Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

(h) I have a lot of respect for the police.

X	X	X	X	X
Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

45. Respond to the following questions as they apply to you (Circle an "X") Have you ever...

(a) Driven a car without a driver's license or permit?

X	X	X	X
Very	Several	Once or	No
Often	Times	Twice	

(b) Taken little things (worth less than \$2.00) that did not belong to you?

X	X	X	X
Very	Several	Once or	No
Often	Times	Twice	

(c) Bought or drank beer, wine or liquor? (include drinking at home)

X	X	X	X
Very	Several	Once or	No
Often	Times	Twice	

(d) Skipped school without a legitimate excuse?

X	X	X	X
Very	Several	Once or	No
Often	Times	Twice	

(e) Purposely damaged or destroyed public or private property?

X	X	X	X
Very	Several	Once or	No
Often	Times	Twice	

(f) Had sex relations with a person of the same or opposite sex?

X	X	X	X
Very	Several	Once or	No
Often	Times	Twice	

(g) Taken things of medium value (\$2.00 to \$50.00)?

X	X	X	X
Very	Several	Once or	No
Often	Times	Twice	





53. Were you alone or with friends?

Alone ----- 1( )  
Friends ----- 2( )  
Other ----- 3( )

54. How MANY times have you been in trouble with the police?

One time ----- 1( )  
Two times ----- 2( )  
Three times ----- 3( )  
Four or more times ----- 4( )

55. If more than one time, did you ever appear in court?

Yes ----- 1( )  
No ----- 2( )

56. If YES, what was the verdict or outcome?

Fine ----- 1( )  
Community Service Order - 2( )  
Probation ----- 3( )  
Foster Home ----- 4( )  
Children's Aid Society -- 5( )  
Training School ----- 6( )  
No action taken ----- 7( )  
None of the above ----- 8( )

APPENDIX "B"

The variables demeanor and hidden criminality (frequency of criminal and delinquent activity) are each measured in this study by a scale composing a number of questions derived from the Hirschi discipline scale and the Nye and Short Hidden Criminality Scale.

The variable demeanor is measured by the following three items from the Hirschi discipline scale (a Likert type) that specifically pertain to measuring one's attitude toward the law (including the police); "Policemen try to give all kids an even break", "It is alright to get around the law if you can get away with it", "I have a lot of respect for the police".

Each item provides five alternative responses which the researcher coded between one and five inclusive.

ie: "I have a lot of respect for the police"

5 X	4 X	3 X	2 X	1 X
Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

"It is alright to get around the law if you can get away with it"

1 X	2 X	3 X	4 X	5 X
Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

When combining all three items, the lowest possible score is three or lower and the highest possible score is fifteen.

For coding purposes, these scores were dichotomized into four categories: 1 = 3 or lower

2 = 4 - 7

3 = 8 - 11

4 = 12 - 15

A higher score indicates an undecided to a more favorable attitude toward the law (including the police). A lower score indicates an undecided to a less favorable attitude toward the law (including the police).

The variable hidden criminality (frequency of criminal and delinquent activity) is measured by the following eleven items (questions) from the Nye and Short Hidden Criminality Scale (a Guttman type):

1. Driving without a license or permit;
2. Stealing things worth less than \$2.00;
3. Buying or drinking alcohol;
4. Skipping school;
5. Destroying property;
6. Engaging in illicit sex;
7. Stealing things of medium value (\$2.00 to \$50.00);
8. Stealing things worth more than \$50.00;
9. Running away from home;
10. Defying parents' authority;

11. Using narcotics.

Each item provides four alternative responses which the researcher coded between one and four inclusive.

ie. "Have you ever driven a car without a driver's license or permit"

1	2	3	4
X	X	X	X
Very Often	Several Times	Once or Twice	No

When combining all eleven items, the lowest possible score is eleven or lower and the highest possible score is forty-four.

For coding purposes, these scores were dichotomized into four categories:

1 = 11 or lower

2 = 12 - 22

3 = 23 - 33

4 = 34 - 44

A higher score indicates a lower frequency of criminal and delinquent activity. A lower score indicates a higher frequency of criminal and delinquent activity.