

Wilfrid Laurier University

**Scholars Commons @ Laurier**

---

Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)

---

1983

## Juveniles' perceptions of a protective-permissive dichotomy in the juvenile justice system

Robert Paul Saltstone

*Wilfrid Laurier University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd>



Part of the [Personality and Social Contexts Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Saltstone, Robert Paul, "Juveniles' perceptions of a protective-permissive dichotomy in the juvenile justice system" (1983). *Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)*. 507.

<https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd/507>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive) by an authorized administrator of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact [scholarscommons@wlu.ca](mailto:scholarscommons@wlu.ca).

## CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

I.S.B.N.

## THESES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE



National Library of Canada  
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on  
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada  
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada  
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes  
sur microfiche

### NOTICE

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.

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

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

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

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.

**THIS DISSERTATION  
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED  
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED**

### AVIS

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.

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

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 mauvaise qualité.

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

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.

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

JUVENILES' PERCEPTIONS OF A PROTECTIVE-PERMISSIVE DICHOTOMY  
IN THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

by

ROBERT PAUL SALTSTONE

B.A. (Hons.) University of Guelph, 1977

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Master of Arts degree  
Wilfrid Laurier University  
1983

© Robert Paul Saltstone 1983

APPROVAL PAGE

(i)

### Acknowledgements

I wish to thank the following people for their invaluable contributions toward the completion of this paper: Dr. F.R.S. Binding, Dr. D. Morgenson, Dr. J. Naidoo, Mrs. T. Vossos, Heather, and Derrick.

## Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract . . . . .	v
Introduction . . . . .	1
Literature Review . . . . .	4
Method . . . . .	24
Subjects . . . . .	24
JLAM Scale . . . . .	25
Procedure . . . . .	30
Pre-study Procedure . . . . .	30
Full Scale Administration . . . . .	31
Results . . . . .	32
Discussion . . . . .	45
References . . . . .	52
Appendix A (JLAM Scale) . . . . .	58
Appendix B (Inter-Item Correlations from JLAM Scale) . . . . .	63
Appendix C (Raw Input Data for Regression Analysis) . . . . .	68
Appendix D (Raw Input Data for Pearson Correlation Coefficients) . . . . .	70

### List of Tables

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1: Subject breakdown by age, sex and school type . . . . .	26
Table 2a: JLAM scale item correlations (+) . . . . .	33
Table 2b: JLAM scale item correlations (-) . . . . .	34
Table 3: JLAM scale item correlations (b) . . . . .	36
Table 4: Self-report data summary . . . . .	38
Table 5: Multiple regression analysis correlation coefficients correlation matrix . . . . .	41
Table 6: Multiple regression analysis summary table . . . . .	41
Table 7: Multiple range test, LSD procedure . . . . .	43

### Abstract

The juvenile justice system has come under increasing criticism for its traditionally paternalistic and protective posture. The literature surveyed reviews some of the major occurrences, such as the Gault decision, which have led to a new direction in legislation. It is demonstrated that while juveniles are being awarded more due process rights, they are also being held more accountable for their actions.

The paternal versus legalistic, or protective versus permissive, dichotomy clearly emerges during the examination of the literature. It is clearly extracted and analyzed in two papers, one by Dootjes (1972) and one by Leon (1979). Leon's is a review paper and he cites little data. Dootjes' paper concentrates on lawyers' attitudes and is subject to many limitations when viewed as a piece of research.

This study examined the attitudes of juveniles, as subjects of changing legislation, toward the dichotomy. The variables of age and gender were considered and a bi-polar attitude measure, in the form of a Likert scale, was constructed. The self-administered 20-item instrument was composed of statements extracted from the literature which have traditionally reflected the permissive or the protective dimension. It was administered to 109 Northern Ontario school student respondents ranging in age from 12 to 18 years.

It was found that as a respondent's age increased he tended to view himself as being a more appropriate candidate for a more legalistic or permissive system. The strength of the relationship between age and atti-



tude was only moderate however ( $r = .41$ ) and it did not survive the categorization of ages required for one way analysis of variance. The gender of the subject appeared to play no significant role in determining attitude.

Self-report data concerning delinquent behaviour was also collected and revealed a large degree of undetected delinquency on the part of both male and female respondents. The difficulty in drawing conclusions about the nature of the sample due to the manner in which Canadian crime statistics are compiled is discussed.

This paper concludes with a critical analysis of this Likert scale and serious doubts about its validity, and the validity of a number of the assumptions concerning the protective-permissive dichotomy, are raised. Directions for further research are suggested and recommendations for research of this nature to precede legislative decisions, such as those concerning the establishment of an age of criminal responsibility, are made.

Juveniles' Perceptions of a Protective-Permissive Dichotomy  
in the Juvenile Justice System

This Act shall be liberally construed in order that its purpose may be carried out, namely, that the care and custody and discipline of a juvenile delinquent shall approximate as nearly as may be that which should be given by his parents, and that as far as practicable every juvenile delinquent shall be treated, not as a criminal, but as a misdirected and misguided child, and one needing aid, encouragement, help and assistance.

(Juvenile Delinquents Act, Amended 1972, Sec. 38)

This quotation from the Juvenile Delinquents Act (1972) clearly delineates the attitude and orientation of the Canadian system of justice toward the juvenile offender. Literally paternal in its approach, the court has assumed a parental role and the dispositions offered by the Act have been arbitrarily applied, or not, with a far wider range of options than could occur in an adult court. The Act has denied the child responsibility for his actions and its aim has clearly been rehabilitative, therapeutic, and non-punitive.

An examination of the juvenile justice system in Ontario will show that the system's liberal nature has actually denied children rights which are afforded adults. Children have been "guilty of sexual immorality" (Section 2 (1)) and juveniles have routinely received indeterminate sentences. Conceivably, a child found delinquent and committed to a training school for a minor theft offence could be incarcerated for months or even years. By the same token, a child committed to training school for a far more serious offence could be in the community again within days, or even hours.

It would appear, however, that the federal government, through Solicitor General Robert Kaplan, has finally taken the required measures to effect changes in the system which have been urged since the 1960s:

I am committed to replacing the 73-year-old Juvenile Delinquents Act, since it is seriously out of date with contemporary practice and attitudes regarding juvenile justice and inadequate to meet the problems presented today by young people in conflict with the law.

(Young Offenders Bill tabled, 1981, p. 1)

This literature review will examine the slowly-changing philosophy of the juvenile justice system in North America. An overview of the system and its move from the rehabilitative ideal to an orientation which more closely aligns it with the adult justice system will clearly establish a basis for the research to follow.

The literature will also be reviewed with a view toward the developing recognition of a juvenile as an individual with implicit rights. Much of this can be measured through an examination of the degree of legal representation a juvenile has been permitted and the degree to which a juvenile's advocate has represented a juvenile's expressed interests, as opposed to the interests of those who have wanted to act against his wishes but in his "best interest".

In addition some of the literature regarding the moral development of children from the perspectives of Piaget and Kohlberg will be examined. The question of whether or not there are significant hypothesized or demonstrable differences between 12 and 17 year olds in terms of moral development which might significantly influence their attitudes toward the justice system will be discussed. Literature concerning the in-

fluence of gender on attitudes regarding such issues as kindness and obedience to authority is also briefly noted.

The empirical study which follows will examine how young people, aged 12 to 17, would like the juvenile justice system to exercise its authority over them in terms of a legalistic-protective dichotomy. As a function of age, do young people want to see a more protective, rehabilitative system for juveniles in conflict with the law, or do they want a more legalistic system which, while guaranteeing them rights, also burdens them with responsibility for their actions?

### Literature Review

In a 1979 report, "Lawyers for Children: Where are We Going?", a Toronto-based advocacy organization for the legal rights of children called Justice for Children, explored the question of legal representation available to a child appearing before an Ontario Juvenile court. The report emphasizes that although Ontario's children are now guaranteed legal representation in court (The Child Welfare Act 1978, Bill 114), other factors must be explored:

Equally important is how lawyers are to be provided. Who will represent children? When? How? ... Subject to what constraints? Without great care ... the quality and extent of representation available to children may be restricted, and the legal rights of children undermined.

(Justice for Children, 1979, p.i)

Currently, the Attorney General's office for the Province of Ontario recommends that children be represented by local panels of private, trained attorneys under the administration of the office of the Official Guardian, and that local advisory committees monitor the quality of legal representation provided.

The Justice for Children report sees these recommendations as "fundamentally flawed" (p.ii) and makes twenty-five recommendations for what they feel is a more workable solution to the problem concerning how children can choose capable counsel. As the Summary of Recommendations states: "The fundamental premise must be that a child is entitled to the same nature and extent of representation as is an adult". A child should be full-party to proceedings, any intervening Children's Aid Society should secure an independent lawyer for a child upon apprehension,

the development of specialized expertise should be promoted for juveniles' counsel is essential, and the availability of resources for counsel to undertake independent investigation and consultation is recommended.

As well, the report recommends that lawyers be allowed to advertise a speciality in "Family and Children's Law" ("Family Law" stated in a telephone directory as a "preferred area of practice" is now permitted) and that research into a variety of methods of delivering legal services be implemented, beginning with a pilot project in which full-time lawyers are hired to work in a family court setting. In the interim, the report recommends that Legal Aid supply aid, whenever requested, to a child. Legal Aid does currently provide this service by providing an attorney or by making duty counsel available in most areas.

This report by Justice for Children is representative of the inevitable changes in the juvenile justice system in Ontario and, with the probable passing of the Young Offenders Bill, in Canada. The evolution of this report can be traced by examining a number of articles which have been published in a variety of journals in the past decade. They range from general descriptions of the juvenile justice system and the philosophy which underlies it through issues concerning the role of the psychiatrist and mental health evidence, and whether the juvenile court is placing too much emphasis upon the offender as a person as opposed to the nature and circumstances of his offence.

Through an examination of the literature available from both legal and social science journals the development of the recognition that juveniles are individuals who should be able to instruct counsel to act in

their interest will be explored. With an increase in rights comes an increase in responsibility, however, and at what age paternalistic assistance should be replaced by strict legalistic representation and sentencing will be seen to emerge as an unresolved issue.

In The Child Savers Anthony Platt (1977) carefully develops a thesis which is composed of three major assertions. First of all, Platt contends that delinquency is an invention of the middle class which is rooted in morality and a rehabilitative ideal. Secondly, he suggests that children who mature too quickly are punished for this. Lastly, Platt contends that the system, in its rehabilitative ideal, is actually punitive, intrusive, and aimed at maintaining the dependent status of lower class urban adolescents. (For the purpose of this thesis the adjective phrase "lower class urban" can be dispensed with.)

Platt notes that many early reforms "were aimed at imposing sanctions on conduct unbecoming youth and disqualifying youth from the benefit of adult privileges....[A] central interest was in the normative behavior of youth - their recreation, leisure, education, outlook on life, attitudes to authority, family relationships, and personal morality" (p. 99). Platt feels that the development of special laws for juveniles was based, in large part, upon the reformers' ideal of rescuing children from situations which threatened children's dependency upon adults.

Morality for children was set down in statutes and children who were apprehended were not found "guilty" but were labelled "delinquent" and declared to be in need of help. Help was offered then as it is now in Ontario - through indeterminate sentencing by a paternal system of

justice. The arbitrary nature of the whole system can be established by merely noting that the age limit of a juvenile can range from 15 to 17 depending upon the province or state one finds oneself in.

This philosophical basis forms the foundation for juvenile justice throughout North America. Decisions are consistently made "in the best interest of the child" (Arnold, 1975, p. 21) with an attorney accepting or declining a "guardian ad litem" (p. 21) role as he pleases.

The readiness with which this basic tenet is accepted by the range of professionals dealing with the juvenile offender is alarming. In a representative article concerning the juvenile court system, psychiatrist Donald H. Russell (1975) places little importance upon the reason a child may have originally come before the court:

He has been apprehended and arrested by the police, charged with violation of some municipal ordinance or law of the state... or he may have been brought to the court by his parents on a stubborn-child complaint.

(p.4/9)

Russell urges the court clinic interviewer to attempt to determine defense mechanisms at work and to beware of such problems as "negative transference" and "perspiration odours particular to anxiety and depression" (p.7/12). The offender has become more important than the offence, and the immediate aim is treatment, whether for manslaughter or stubborn behavior.

The problem with the treatment model is, of course, that it is inherently coercive: "There is some evidence to suggest that non-legal factors...such as being idle or being referred to the court by parents,



school or welfare agents, lead to unfavorable consequences in terms of the type of treatment meted out by the court" (Cohen, 1975, p. 54). It is for this reason that academics in countries where the treatment model of juvenile justice is not yet entrenched, fear it.

Donald May (1971) writes that in Britain it is interesting and not a little disquieting that the treatment model has been meeting with uncritical enthusiasm while "in the United States, where it has long been dominant in the handling of juvenile offenders it has been coming under increasing attack" (pp. 360-361). This attack has come not only from lawyers concerned with due process but "also from a growing body of academics disturbed by the unforeseen consequences of its over-zealous application" (p. 361).

May asserts that the treatment model is based upon four fundamental assumptions (pp. 361-362); that "explanations of delinquency are to be found in the behavioural and motivational systems of delinquents, and not in the law and its administration"; that "in some identifiable way delinquents are different from non-delinquents"; that "the delinquent is constrained and cannot ultimately be held responsible for his actions"; and that delinquent behaviour, itself, is not the problem, but an indication of a problem.

This view, May feels, will lead to more frequent, earlier, and longer incarceration of children ("subject only to the limitation imposed by shortage of suitable accommodation" (p. 367)) in treatment programs. He opposes a movement toward this type of a juvenile justice system in Scotland because "when the verbal camouflage that surrounds their operations is stripped away they stand revealed as essentially punitive or-

ganizations" (p. 368).

Goldstein and Drotman (1977) note that while lawyers have recently "...become aware of the significance of childhood...the acceptance of children as a group requiring liberation, no matter how vaguely defined, has not reached nearly the consensus among lawyers...that it has in the helping professions" (pp. 109-110).

While Goldstein and Drotman suggest that it is essential that lawyers and psychiatrists support this notion of "child liberation" they warn that children could become victims of the child's rights professionals. They fear that "many of the actions advocated by the children's movement such as the right to legal counsel and freedom of lifestyle would have the effect of making children like small adults" (p. 117). They suggest that this may in many ways be a regression to a 17th century view of children.

In a "special report" on legal problems of correctional mental health and juvenile detention facilities in Hospital and Community Psychiatry (Huey, 1975) it is interesting to note the difference between the attitude of a lawyer and that of a psychiatrist toward the issue of detaining and treating juveniles. It is likely more representative of the views of lawyers and psychiatrists towards children's rights than that suggested by Goldstein and Drotman (1977).

The report quotes Thomas Choate, an assistant attorney general for Texas, as saying that "juvenile law is a blend of correctional and mental health law" (p. 380). He also states that "it is imperative for each state to have a juvenile code that has a strong procedural code for com-

mitment.... A juvenile commitment statute should safeguard juveniles' rights in a manner comparable to safeguards accorded adult offenders, for the benefit of both the individual juvenile offender and the state" (p. 380).

The "treatment" aspect of the report is represented by Augustus Kinzel, a psychiatrist whose notion of children's rights is that the delinquent "has the right to have his behavior understood and not punished" (p. 381). The distinction between the points of view is a subtle one, but clear. Responsibility and self-determination are implied when one speaks of legal rights. The acceptance of responsibility for one's actions and rights to self-determination evaporate under the treatment model.

Feld (1977) clearly differentiates between the philosophy of the adult court and that of the juvenile court.

The criminal justice system presumes responsible actors who possess free will, make blameworthy choices, and are punished in proportion to the gravity of the offense.... The retributive and deterrent justifications of the adult process attend primarily to the offense committed.... [T]he juvenile court's primary justification is its commitment to the "rehabilitative ideal," the individualized treatment of the offender. At least in theory, the best interests of the individual offender take precedence and the offense is accorded little significance since it provides scant insight into the child's social and psychological needs.

(p. 142)

Feld sees a problem of a loss of rights to juveniles through "individualized justice" (p. 142) on a scale which would be unheard of in adult courts:

While individualized justice may be a desirable ideal, a rule of law can only tolerate individualization on rational bases. The individualization occasioned by judicial inquiry into amenability...creates a frame of relevance so broad that virtually any decision is possible. The extensive and excessive discretion afforded to make these judgements lends itself to a variety of abuses without any demonstrable benefits.

(p. 142)

In Ontario, a report of the Task Force on Family Court Clinics (1978) is one of the first documents which warns of the possible inequity of sentencing on the basis of court clinic reports, many of which discuss issues of amenability to treatment and treatment prognosis. The Task Force's report suggests that "judges should ensure that they do not commit themselves to any findings of fact which have not been made in law...", and conversely, "the clinic should avoid any reference to the facts of the case and deal only with the needs of the child" (p. 8).

As a final comment upon the whole issue of a "court clinic" the report notes that this entire referral procedure "is fraught with risks that may involve serious infringement of the child's civil rights before the Court and, on occasion, an abuse in the criminal process may result" (p. 8).

What the degree of impact will be as a result of such recommendations is unknown. A report of the Department of Justice Committee on Juvenile Delinquency called Juvenile Delinquency in Canada published in 1965 made a number of suggestions including limited and definite institutional commitment and a uniform juvenile age limit of seventeen years nationwide. Sociologists and lawyers praised many aspects of the report,

especially those dealing with community-based prevention (at a level that community psychologists would call "primary prevention" (Rappaport, 1977)) as opposed to "early diagnosis":

The need for community action and co-operation covers the widest possible range; the better, co-ordinated use of present educational, health and welfare services, the establishment of area projects in depressed areas with the employment of detached social workers, intensive studies of multi-problem families and the use of the combined resources of a community in the evaluation of present systems of fostering healthy family life and preventing delinquency.

(Parker, 1967, p. 218)

To date little has been accomplished in meeting the recommendations of the 1965 report, even those which are not as vague as some of those outlined above.

In Canada and in the United States (there is better documentation for the American courts) a juvenile as an individual has many avenues of recourse to have arbitrary sentences reviewed and decisions reversed. However he requires financial resources, awareness, and an attorney with some specialization in juvenile law to accomplish this (see Cohen, 1975 and Silbert and Sussman, 1974, for example).

Most of the progress toward children's rights has been made as a result of test cases; the result of legal action launched against arbitrary dispositions. In an article by Kolker (1970) on the test case in juvenile courts, the author notes that juvenile courts "have jealously guarded their prerogative to mete out justice unimpeded by procedural technicalities and have surrendered this control only with the greatest reluctance" (p. 64). Kolker suggests it may even be necessary to "employ

such extra weapons as press coverage and legislative pressure" (p. 70) if the courts do not respond to legal arguments and precedents.

Of all the test cases in the American courts in the past fifteen years the Gault opinion of the United States Supreme Court has had the widest-reaching effects throughout North America. The Gault decision was based upon an American constitutional argument that the juvenile court system violated constitutional guarantees of due process which must apply to young people as well as to adults. Among the rights the Gault decision upheld were those respecting access to representation by counsel and the right to confront and cross-examine complainants. Institutionalization, for treatment or other purpose, was still a deprivation of liberty, the Supreme Court ruled, and "the condition of being a boy does not justify a Kangaroo court" (In Re Gault p. 28). (A further discussion of constitutional and other issues surrounding In Re Gault can be found in Platt, 1977, and Stapleton, 1970.)

In the Province of Ontario the only legal change of note in the last decade which has indicated a move toward the protection of rights of children was the repeal of Section 8 of the Training Schools Act in 1975. (It was not, however, put in force until 1977 due to "constraints on government funding to individual agencies" (Weiler, 1977, p. 176) which discouraged these agencies from being able to place these children.) Section 8 had provided that parents who were unable to "control" a child could apply to have their child committed to a training school without ever having contravened the law. The only major stipulation was that no other "agency of child welfare" could sufficiently or practicably deal with the child.

The repeal of Section 8 reinforced the growing view that: As a general rule of law, the child should be afforded impartial representation whenever there is

a potential conflict of interest with his family in any proceeding which could result in the minor's confinement. Without such an absolute principle of law, minors will continue to be victimized both by well-meaning and ill-intentioned parents.

(Panneton, 1977, p. 334)

Studies have demonstrated that children view their presence in court, in terms of being able to respond to charges, as important - more important, in fact, than having a lawyer (Lipsitt, 1968). Generally, however, the perceptions of the juvenile toward the juvenile justice system have largely been ignored (Langley, Thomas, and Parkinson, 1976).

The nature of the juvenile justice system has left lawyers confused as to their appropriate "role" or "responsibility". A major reason for this is that it often appears redundant that a child need a defence before a court which is parental in its demeanor:

This extended parens patriae viewpoint was present in another...case. Following a juvenile court trial in which conflicting testimony was presented, counsel for the child asked to present an argument to sum up his child's view of the evidence. The trial judge replied: "I don't believe it would be of benefit to me to have your argument".

(Rubin, 1977, p. 6)

With a legislated "informal" atmosphere and protective mandate, many lawyers feel that there "is still the subconscious assumption that a lawyer should not function like a lawyer in Juvenile Court" (Forer, 1972, p. 333).

A study by Erikson (1974) investigated judges' and social workers' attitudes toward the role of the defence lawyer in juvenile court. One of the most important statements in the article outlines the problem of

role expectations as they affect the defence attorney:

First, their perception of what the lawyer's proper activities are will provide the lawyer with a set of role expectations that will to some extent define his role.... Secondly, if the expectations held by others are contradictory or incompatible, this will be a source of external role conflict for the lawyer.... The identification of external role conflict and its resolution is a necessary preliminary to establishing a consistent role for the lawyer in juvenile court.

(pp. 128-129)

In the Erikson study the majority of the lawyers, judges and social workers interviewed saw the role of the defence counsel as "important" or "very important". Only four of thirty-three individuals interviewed (one judge and three social workers), saw the juvenile courtroom as an inappropriate place for a traditional defence lawyer. All of these subjects stressed the rehabilitative concerns of the court (pp. 133-134). Most of the agreement among subjects as to the need for legal representation of a juvenile occurred when the charges were serious and incarceration was a likely disposition. There was less agreement when charges were minor.

As a piece of research the Erikson study is not without its problems. Only seven judges formed the judicial portion of the sample and all of the subjects were drawn from the Metropolitan Toronto area. This was apparently done largely for convenience as the researcher interviewed the subjects rather than relying on mailed questionnaires. The advantages of this are debatable as little was apparently gained from the use of interviews and open questions that could not have been gained by use of closed



questions on a questionnaire. It also has the disadvantage of offering a very biased sample from which to draw conclusions about a role which may very well be influenced by community size and attitudes. Lastly, the attitudes of the lawyers were obtained from information gathered in a 1972 study by Dootjes and others.

The Dootjes study also used a series of open and closed questions in a carefully constructed interview schedule. All 30 subjects were drawn from a list of 60 duty counsel lawyers from Metropolitan Toronto. This sample is clearly biased: Seventy-five percent were under thirty-five years of age and half had practiced law for three years or less.

Dootjes focused on the role conflicts of the lawyer. She divided the possible roles of the lawyer into three categories: legalistic, amicus curiae, and a social work role. This approach varies little from that of Leon (1979). Leon, however, used the almost analogous terms "protective", "permissive", and "middle-of-the-road" (p. 17). Dootjes found little consistency in the ways in which the lawyers viewed their roles, but "the amicus curiae approach was the most frequent compromise..." (p. 143).

Much of the Dootjes' research involved examining the social work/legalistic conflict and she concluded that while lawyers can not meet all expectations, most are able to work out a "fairly comfortable role" in the juvenile court (p. 148). The Young Offenders Bill, which seemed to be near implementation at the time of Dootjes' writing (over a decade later it is still pending legislation) would, she suggests, aid in the clarification of the role of the lawyer in juvenile court:

The new Young Offenders Bill may contribute towards the suggested clarification of lawyer's functions; firstly, by its incorporation of due process protections for juveniles, secondly, by the abandonment of the general offence of delinquency and its replacement by specific Criminal Code and Federal statutory offences and, thirdly, by separating more clearly the adjudicatory and dispositional stages of the hearing. If fully implemented, these proposed changes will probably increase the legalistic orientation at the adjudicatory stage, but will allow the lawyer to respond more in a [sic] amicus curiae or social work capacity at the subsequent dispositional stage.

This suggested clear separation of the stages of the juvenile court process would do more than permit a child to have a lawyer to represent him at the trial stage with the full rights afforded an adult. It would mark the culmination of what began in Canada in 1965 with the Department of Justice report on Juvenile Delinquency and what, in 1970 and in 1975, were attempted with the introduction of the Act Respecting Young Offenders and to Repeal the Juvenile Delinquents Act, and the legislative proposal, Young Persons in Conflict with the Law, respectively.

Leon's terms, "protective", "permissive", and "middle-of-the-road" (terms which, for the purposes of this paper, will be adopted to refer to the orientation of the entire justice system toward the juvenile) are similar to, but more value-laden than Dootjes'. Leon sees the protective approach as being similar to Dootjes' social work approach. Actions taken from this perspective are characteristically "for" children and "on behalf" of children.

What Leon refers to as the "permissive" approach, Dootjes refers to as a legalistic one. Leon states that "this group would use legislation

to maximize freedoms and liberties for children, according to the child's own wants and desires" (p. 17). Almost all participants in the juvenile justice system have always balked at adopting this approach with children. As Platt (1977) says: "A lawyer typically has conscientious reservations about helping a juvenile to "beat a case" and, if a case is won on a technicality, he feels obliged to personally [sic] warn his client against the dangers of future misconduct" (p. 167).

Leon's "middle-of-the-road" approach encompasses and balances the protective and permissive approaches. It is different from Dootjes' amicus curiae or "friend of the court" which is an intermediary position, acting between the judge, child, and social workers. The Young Offenders Bill also tries to strike a balance, according to Robert Kaplan (Young Offenders Bill tabled, 1981, p. 2), "between the needs of young offenders and the interests of society"; perhaps a more subtle way of stating the protective-permissive dichotomy.

It is the purpose of this paper to explore this balance through the dichotomies hypothesized by Dootjes and Leon. As the determining factor in making decisions regarding protectiveness and permissiveness has traditionally been age, the question is raised: At what age do young people regard themselves as requiring protective (paternal) versus permissive (legalistic) representation and justice? Although the federal government has determined that 12 years is the minimum age of criminal responsibility, the maximum age at which one may be regarded as a "young person" (the phrase destined to replace "juvenile") may still be 15, 16, or 17, depending upon the province in which an individual happens to reside.

This problem will likely resolve itself in 1983 when it is expected that 18 years will be nationally established as the minimum age of criminal responsibility. This in turn will probably create a myriad of other problems as provinces attempt to meet the needs of a new and larger population of juveniles. Physical facilities, staff, and programming will have to be expanded.

What is particularly disturbing is the apparently arbitrary nature with which the age of 18 was chosen. As a proportion of the population involved in crime, the 16 to 24 year age bracket is generally accepted to be the largest, or most at risk (see Shuster, 1982, for example). In 1980 juveniles accounted for over a third of the offences against property, 18 percent of offences of violence, and 21 percent of all other criminal offences (Statistics Canada, 1980, p. 23). If the degree to which an age group is involved in crime was not taken into consideration in determining an age for criminal responsibility one might assume that the decision was based upon a presumption that there is a substantial difference in the ability to appreciate the nature of a criminal act between 16, 17, and 18 year olds.

If one looks to the two developmental psychologists who have traditionally been regarded as the most influential in terms of their work in determining how levels of moral and intellectual development relate to age, however, it is found that, generally speaking, there are no appreciable differences between 16, 17, and 18 year olds. Crain (1980) compares the work of Piaget and Kohlberg and notes that while there are substantial differences between the attitudes of pre-teens and early teens

concerning moral issues, there appear to be few, if any, differences between individuals over 16 years of age. In fact, in terms of appreciating what is referred to as conventional morality, the 16 year old differs little from the 14 year old.

Piaget (1932) states that while notions of justice develop as a function of age (p. 312) the "organization and codification of rules" (p. 318) is complete by age 12. Social learning theorists such as Bandura (1969) disagree in that they hypothesize that moral judgements are more variable within and between individuals and more modifiable than Piaget's theory would suggest. However they do not dispute the early age at which moral judgements are assimilated.

Kohlberg (1964) has suggested that perhaps teenage delinquents suffer from "simple developmental arrest". However more recently it has become apparent that "the hypothesized immaturity of moral judgement in juvenile delinquents has not received consistent empirical support" (Jurkovic, 1980, p. 724). This clearly supports Kohlberg's earlier assertions that conventional morality is well developed by age 14.

A study exploring children's judgements of kindness (Baldwin and Baldwin, 1970) found that there were few differences between the responses of eighth graders (approximately 13 years old) and those of college students. In addition the authors noted that the social class of the subject was of little consequence in determining his responses and that no differences could be attributed to the gender of the subject.

The issue of subject gender is a broad and complex one. It is raised with regard to this paper because of the discrepancy found in statistics

between the number of males and the number of females in conflict with the law. Both juvenile and adult women are significantly less often delinquent or criminal. While Canadian statistics do not separate male and female juveniles, female adults commit only a quarter the number of property offences than their male counterparts and only about ten percent of the number of offences of violence (Statistics Canada, 1980, p. 23).

A study by Bronfenbrenner (1970), in which 12 year old boys and girls were compared in terms of their responses to adult censure and their attitudes toward such issues as minor theft revealed that girls were significantly more dutiful than boys. This observation held true for both American and Soviet children. Coupled with the data pertaining to rates of crime and delinquency this study could lead one to expect that in any measure of attitudes toward justice issues there would be a significant difference between the responses of young male and female respondents.

Lastly, this study uses a Likert format scale (the Juvenile Legal Attitude Measurement scale, or JLAM scale) to explore the attitudes of juveniles. This scale was constructed specifically for use in this study. The Likert scale is, because of its ease of administration and for other reasons, a technique of attitude measurement often used with young people. For example Nitzberg (1980) successfully used a Likert scale to elicit a measure regarding the need for interpersonal relationships among 11 to 19 year old adolescents. A considerable amount of literature justifying the use of a Likert-type scale as an appropriate instrument

for this study is included in the Method section of this paper.

The purpose of this empirical study, then, is to examine the basic question of how a juvenile age relates to the hypothesized protective-permissive dichotomy.

More specifically, the following questions will be explored:

1. Can statements which have traditionally been associated with either a protective or a permissive orientation be used in a Likert scale format to exact an overall score on one of these dimensions?
2. Will these scale items, when analyzed, correlate as predicted? In other words will each item associated with a particular orientation correlate significantly, and in the proper direction, with the other items hypothesized to be of the same orientation?
3. Does a young person's age generally determine whether he or she tends more toward a protective or a permissive orientation? In other words, does the Likert scale score regress to the age variable?
4. Do the attitudes of these young people change significantly at a particular age, such as at age 16, perhaps as a result of convention or of community expectation?
5. Does the gender of the individual young person play a role in determining the degree to which he or she adheres more to a protective or a permissive orientation?
6. What implications do all of these questions have for both legislation and policy planning in the criminal justice field and for further research?

In addition, self-report data obtained from juvenile and young

adult respondents pertaining to previous contact with criminal justice system and delinquent behaviour will be gathered. It primarily will be examined to compare rates of delinquent behaviour between male and female respondents but will also provide information about nature of the sample.



### Method

Subjects: The 109 respondents were selected by means of quota sampling on the basis of school and grade (Babbie, 1973, p. 75). A centrally located high school with a population of approximately 1400 was selected. Students were drawn from the entire District to attend this school which is representative of other high schools in the District. As a result, this researcher regarded the student body as a homogeneous subset of the population composed of all secondary school students in the District.

A senior public school located approximately two blocks away, and demonstrating similar sample characteristics, was also selected so that subjects from 12 to 17 years inclusive could be obtained. One hundred and twenty questionnaires were prepared and divided into six groups of 20 for each of grades seven through 12 inclusive.

The community from which these schools were selected is a Northern Ontario city with a population of approximately 50,000. This community possesses a diversified economic base and depends to a large degree upon the tourist industry. Approximately 40 percent of the population is French Canadian. A small percentage of the student population is Native Indian. Many of these Native students attend high school in this city but originally come from more remote northern communities. These factors should be taken into account when considering the generalizability of the data obtained from this sample.

One hundred twenty scales were produced in order to attempt to ensure at least 100 respondents. In addition to general considerations related to the power of statistical tests (Cohen, 1969, p. 8), 100 subjects is

normally considered to be a minimally adequate number for multiple regression analysis (Kerlinger & Pedhazur, 1973, pp. 442, 446-447).

Permission was obtained from the Director of Education for the District School Board to approach school principals directly for permission to administer the JLAM scale. It was agreed that participation by students would be voluntary and that administration of the scale would be done by the researcher and would occur outside of the regular classroom. Subjects would only be identified as male or female and by age, determined by month and year (but not day) of birth. (More details concerning the instrument follow. For more information pertaining to administration of the scale, refer to the Procedure section.)

The resulting breakdown of subjects by age and sex is illustrated in Table 1. It will be noted that the number of respondents across age categories is somewhat discrepant. This is actually exaggerated as the result of categorizing the age variable, something which was not done when regressive analysis was employed. A similar exaggeration will be noted when examining the number of 16 and 17 year old male and female secondary school students.

Of 120 JLAM scales distributed, 111 were returned. Two were unuseable, having no age or gender data on them, which left 109 to be submitted to analysis.

JLAM scale: The instrument used was a five response category 20-item Likert scale (Appendix A). Item response ranged from "agree strongly" to "disagree strongly" with "undecided" as a mid-point.

The Likert scale format was chosen for several reasons. First of

Table 1

Subject Breakdown by Age, Sex, and School Type

Sex	Age (Years)						
	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Public School							
Male	3	10	6	3			
Female	6	10	9	2			
Secondary School							
Male	1		1	1	9	14	2
Female			5	8	16	3	

Total number of males: 50

Total number of females: 59

Total number of subjects: 109

all, as the literature review revealed, the notion of the protective-permissive dichotomy is based upon some fundamental attitudes toward a handful of basic issues concerning the intervention of the law into the lives of young people. Each of the 20 randomly placed items presents one of these issues in a positive or negative way.

It is suggested by Platt (1977) and others that an individual who is of a protective or child saving orientation will respond favourably toward notions such as more personalized justice and legislated morality for children. Scale item (2) is an example of an item which promotes personalized justice: "When a person my age goes to Court, the Court should look at what the person is like, not just at what he or she did wrong". Scale item (14) promotes legislated morality for young people: "It should be against the law for a girl my age to leave home to live with her boyfriend".

It is hypothesized that a person who would agree with the above two statements would disagree with statements promoting a more permissive stance such as item (5) which supports more strictly legislated rights and responsibilities for children: "A person my age should be held fully responsible for any criminal act he or she commits".

The ease with which agree/disagree statements can be constructed for a hypothetical construct with only one dimension such as this is immediately apparent.

Secondly, previous studies purporting to explore attitudes toward juvenile legal representation which have used interview techniques (Erikson, 1979, for example) did not successfully elicit more information

than, or information of a quality superior to, that which could be obtained by employing a questionnaire. This study was able to obtain a larger, less biased sample than could be readily obtained through the use of interviews and anonymity, important when attempting to elicit self-report information pertaining to criminal activity, was maintained.

In addition, a Likert scale produces data which easily lends itself to statistical analysis. While the data was ordinal in nature, it has become conventional to treat ordinal data obtained from Likert scales as interval data for statistical purposes. The assumption is that the "ordinally measured variable is based on an underlying variable with an unknown interval metric" (O'Brien, 1979, p. 854. Also see Labovitz, 1967, and Kerlinger, 1973, pp. 438-441).

Lastly, while the advantages of using a bi-polar scale are evident, there are several reasons why the Likert was deemed to be the superior instrument. When compared to a method of pair comparisons, for example, the Likert format requires only one quarter the number of items to obtain similar information and, consequently, requires only one third the time to complete and is not repetitious (Fisher, Weiss, & Dawis, 1968). Each Likert item also offers a "middle position". It has been found that offering "an explicit middle alternative in a forced choice attitude item increases the proportion of respondents in that category...10 to 20 percent [or more]" (Presser & Schuman, 1980, p. 83). The Likert is also the only widely used and tested bi-polar measure in which both the "extremeness" of a statement and its "direction" can be measured (Gordon, 1967).

In addition to the 20 JLAM scale items, four "yes/no" questions were

asked concerning whether or not (1) the respondent had ever committed a criminal act, and (2) not been apprehended, (3) been arrested, or (4) appeared in juvenile or adult court. This information was required to compare the degree of criminal activity between the sexes and to establish the rates of delinquent and criminal behaviour for this sample in the event that comparisons between this, and other samples are desired. Respondents were also required to indicate their gender and the month and year of their birth on the scale.

The scale was scored to obtain an overall "protective score" by reversing the score on each of items 3, 5, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, and 19 and assigning -2, -1, 0, +1, or +2 to the response category indicated. For example, item (5) ("A person my age should be held fully responsible for any criminal act he or she commits") is a "permissive item". To check "agree strongly" would give a +2 score to a permissive statement. This would have to be reversed (and scored as -2 to ensure that higher overall scores would reflect the protective end of the hypothesized continuum. An "agree strongly" for item (14) ("It should be against the law for a girl my age to leave home to live with her boyfriend") would not have to be reversed as a higher score in this instance would support the protective end of the continuum. A maximum "protective score" of +40 was possible.

### Procedure

Pre-study procedure: A small and somewhat informal pre-study utilizing ten 12 year old public school students (five male and five female) was carried out. Each subject was given a questionnaire and a pencil. The verbal instructions were minimal and did not vary significantly from those outlined for the full scale administration (below). The purpose of this pre-study was to determine the suitability of the questionnaire for self-administration by the younger respondent.

None of the respondents expressed difficulty in comprehending any of the 20 JLAM scale items. After the respondents had completed the full questionnaire the researcher asked individual students to explain to the group his or her interpretation of each of the four self-report questions regarding criminal behaviour. The purpose was to ensure consistency of understanding among the students particularly regarding the phrases "criminal act", "arrested", and "have you ever been to...court?".

Criminal acts were generally correctly interpreted as being more serious legal trespasses. Theft was commonly mentioned. None of the pre-study subjects regarded simple trespassing, littering, or speeding as criminal. "Arrested" was understood to mean being physically apprehended by the police. All interpreted the phrase "been to court" as having had to attend court as an accused person, not merely as a spectator or as a witness. (Nevertheless, two subjects, one high school female and one public school female requested clarification of this during the actual administration of the scales.)

Full scale administration: In each school the scales were distributed for self-administration in a lunch room, study hall area between 11:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. In the senior public school two stacks of questionnaires, with 20 in each, were placed on a table with a box of pencils and small signs indicating "grade 7" and "grade 8". In the secondary school there were four stacks of questionnaires with the grades labelled from nine to 12 inclusive. The researcher announced that questionnaires were being made available as part of a university study designed to discover students' opinions about the law. Subjects were informed that they were not required to participate and that any questions they might have about the nature of the study would be answered after they had completed the questionnaires. If they did not understand a question or statement they were permitted to ask to have it clarified. They were instructed not to put their names on the questionnaires so that their responses would remain confidential in that no one student could be identified. They were also requested to work independently at one of the large tables in the study hall area where they were, generally speaking, in a position to be observed by the researcher.

The researcher remained at each school until one half hour after the last questionnaire from each grade's stack was taken by a potential respondent, and after all of the student's questions were answered.



### Results

The data and its analyses are presented in five separate sections. The first deals with an examination of the JLAM scale and individual scale items. The second examines the self report data. In the third and fourth sections participants' scores are examined and subjected to analysis utilizing different statistical techniques in order to determine how juveniles' sex and age effect their perception of the hypothesized protective-permissive dichotomy. In the fifth section the results are simply and specifically applied to all but the last of the six questions raised in the Literature Review. The final question pertaining to suggestions for further research and to implications for policy planning and for legislation is dealt with in the Discussion section. All statistics were calculated through the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences programme, SPSS (Nie et al., 1975).

JLAM Scale: As previously indicated, after administration the scale items determined to be of a permissive or legalistic nature were reversed and each scale item was scored from +2 for "agree strongly" through -2 for "disagree strongly". Each "undecided" was assigned a zero. All 20 items were then correlated and a Pearson product moment correlation matrix was obtained (Tables 2(a) and 2(b)). Pearson's  $r$  was used in spite of the fact that another technique such as Kendall's tau may have at first appeared more suitable. This would have made little sense, however, considering that multiple regression techniques were to be employed later. In addition, SPSS calculates significance

Table 2(a)

## JLAM Scale Item Correlations\*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1. Never adult court	0																			
2. What juvenile's like	X	0																		
3. Pay own restitution			0																	
4. Refuse attend school				0																
5. Hold juvenile responsible	X	X		X	0															
6. Never to jail	X	X		X		0														
7. Lawyer knows best		X		X		X	0													
8. Pinball illegal				X				0												
9. Do community service		X	X		X				0											
10. Boy lives girlfriend				X		X	X			0										
11. Judge like parent	X	X				X	X			X	0									
12. Help not punishment	X	X			X	X	X			X	X	0								
13. Choose own lawyer					X	X				X	X		0							
14. Girl lives boyfriend					X	X				X	X			0						
15. Lawyer for free				X				X	X						0					
16. Adult court fairer				X												0				
17. Off on technicality		X					X		X	X			X		X		0			
18. Too grown up				X		X	X		X	X			X	X	X			0		
19. Go to jail	X	X	X		X	X		X		X	X	X						X	0	
20. Too young to be criminal	X	X	X		X	X		X	X		X							X	X	0

\*"X" denotes item correlations significant to the .10 level or better which are also in the predicted direction.

Table 2(b)

## JLAM Scale Item Correlations\*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1. Never adult court	0																			
2. What juvenile's like		0																		
3. Pay own restitution			0																	
4. Refuse attend school				0																
5. Hold juvenile responsible					0															
6. Never to jail						0														
7. Lawyer knows best							0													
8. Pinball illegal								0												
9. Do community service									0											
10. Boy lives girlfriend										0										
11. Judge like parent											0									
12. Help not punishment												0								
13. Choose own lawyer													0							
14. Girl lives boyfriend														0						
15. Lawyer for free															0					
16. Adult court fairer																0				
17. Off on technicality																	0			
18. Too grown up																		0		
19. Go to jail																			0	
20. Too young to be criminal																				0

\*"Y" denotes item correlations significant to the .10 level or better which are in the direction opposite to that predicted.

levels for Pearson's  $r$  and Kendall's tau in the same manner.

The correlation of the scale items raises some interesting problems. As Table 2(b) indicates, many of the items which correlate to a generous statistically significant level ( $Z.10$ ) and account for a significant proportion of variance do so in a direction opposite to that predicted. Table 3 demonstrates this more clearly by indicating, for each item, the number of other scale items which correlate to a significant level in the predicted direction, and those which do not. Note, however, that the ratio of items correlating as predicted to those not correlating as predicted is almost 2:1 (134:74).

It is not difficult to see why item 3 (pertaining to restitution) and item 9 (pertaining to community service) appear to correlate in no consistent direction, for example. These notions are rather neutral ones despite the fact that they were included in the permissive/legalistic dimension because they were seen to emphasize offender responsibility. It is less easy to understand why item 20 (a person my age is really too young to be a criminal) correlated so inconsistently. This statement is the basis of the protective philosophy and would have been hypothesized to be the best "protective orientation" predictor item before the results were tabulated.

Only items 8 and 13 correlated in the predicted direction in all instances, making attitudes regarding playing pinball during school hours and those associated with the right to choose any lawyer as the most consistent predictor items.

Table 3

JLAM Scale Item Correlations (b)

	<u>+ r</u>	<u>- r</u>
1. Never adult court	7	2
2. What Juvenile's like	8	5
3. Pay own restitution	4	4
4. Refuse attend school	5	6
5. Hold juvenile responsible	6	4
6. Never to jail	11	3
7. Lawyer knows best	8	2
8. Pinball illegal	5	0
9. Do community service	5	5
10. Boy lives girlfriend	9	4
11. Judge like parent	10	4
12. Help not punishment	8	2
13. Choose own lawyer	5	0
14. Girl lives boyfriend	6	3
15. Lawyer for free	4	6
16. Adult court fairer	2	8
17. Off on technicality	6	1
18. Too grown up	7	5
19. Go to jail	10	2
20. Too young to be criminal	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
Totals:	134	74

+ r: Number of items correlating with other items in the predicted direction.

- r: Number of items correlating with other items in a direction opposite to that predicted.

There are many (literally hundreds) correlations which could be examined. All are presented in Appendix B with corresponding levels of significance. Suffice it to note that while the scale appears to have promising elements, more analysis and refinement are required. In addition there are questions regarding the scale's reliability and validity which remain unanswered. These aspects will be discussed further in the Discussion section.

Self-Report Data: The self-report section of the questionnaire was composed of only four questions:

1. Have you ever committed a criminal act for which you were not caught?
2. Have you ever been arrested?
3. Have you ever been to juvenile court?
4. Have you ever been to adult court?

A great deal of work has been done to examine the validity of self-report measures as they apply to criminal activity. It can be stated that they have been accepted as accurate measures of delinquency rates and consistently compare favourably with available official data. (See Hindelang *et al.*, 1979, for example). More recently self-report methods have been appraised more positively because they can measure delinquency in non-delinquent populations and because they are often said to measure delinquent behaviour rather than official response to delinquent behaviour (Hindelang *et al.*, 1979).

Table 4 summarizes the responses to the four self-report questions concerning delinquent and criminal behaviour. This data was originally

Table 4

Self-Report Data Summary

(Percent Responding "YES")

	<u>PUBLIC SCHOOL</u>		<u>SECONDARY SCHOOL</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>
	<u>MALES</u>	<u>FEMALES</u>	<u>*MALES</u>	<u>FEMALES</u>	
1. Criminal act for which not caught?	11 (50%)	8 (30%)	23 (82%)	16 (50%)	58 (53%)
2. Ever arrested?	3 (14%)	1 (4%)	7 (25%)	4 (15%)	15 (14%)
3. Juvenile Court?	1 (5%)	1 (4%)	4 (14%)	2 (6%)	8 (7%)
4. Adult Court?	0	0	1 (4%)	1 (3%)	2 (2%)

\* One respondent did not complete this section.

collected in order to compare this sample with other samples from other research articles in the literature and with official statistics. However, the manner in which national and local police statistics are calculated make this difficult.

Statistics Canada (1980) does not categorize juvenile offenders on the basis of gender. In addition this study does not divide the offence types in the manner that Statistics Canada does. It was thought that this would have been too difficult for the respondents to do accurately. For these reasons it would be inappropriate to attempt any direct comparisons. Suffice it to say that, when comparing subjects by groups based upon gender, in all instances male respondents indicated higher positive response rates for all four questions. This difference was most marked in response to the question concerning the commission of criminal acts for which the subject was not caught.

It is interesting, and somewhat alarming, to note that 53 percent of all respondents and 82 percent of secondary school males indicated having committed criminal acts for which they were not caught. It is also interesting that of the secondary school males and females arrested only about half of these arrests ever resulted in court appearances.

#### Analysis of Subject Score, Age, and Sex through Multiple Regression

Analysis: Multiple regression analysis using a stepwise procedure was employed to identify the degree to which the JLAM scale protective scores depend upon subjects' ages and gender. The dependent variable was the Likert scale score which was scored in a "protective" direction. Age and sex were entered, in that order, as independent variables. Age was



calculated to two decimal places in order to minimize information loss (for example, 17 years, one month, was entered as 17.08). The sex variable was dummy coded.

Table 5 illustrates the correlation coefficients in the form of a correlation matrix. Note that the independent variables are not highly correlated, indicating a low probability of multicollinearity.

Table 6, a summary table, illustrates the degree to which the overall protective score regresses to, or depends upon, a subject's age ( $r = .41$ ,  $r^2 = .1707$ ). With  $f_{crit}$  4.82 at .01 and df 2/100 this correlation is also highly significant at  $F$  19.9128. The gender variable accounts for an  $r$ -square change value of only .0033 and is not, in any case, statistically significant.

It is quite clearly demonstrated that, as a subject's age increased, his score on the protective dimension of the Likert scale decreased. It is also apparent that the sex of the subject played no role in determining his or her JLAM scale score. That the sex variable plays no role is interesting when one examines the pronounced differences in self-reported rates of delinquency and arrest between sexes (Table 4). The implications of these results will be examined further in the Discussion section.

One Way Analysis of Variance: The use of both multiple regression analysis and one way analysis of variance with the same data is, admittedly, unusual. It is not without purpose, however. Multiple regression analysis was used because it does not "lose" data in the way that analysis of variance can when continuous variables are categorized. In this study,

Table 5

Multiple Regression AnalysisCorrelation CoefficientsCorrelation Matrix

	PROTECTIVE SCORE	AGE	SEX
PROTECTIVE SCORE	1.00000	-.41314	-.14219
AGE	-.41314	1.00000	.20906
SEX	-.14219	.20906	1.00000

Table 6

Multiple Regression AnalysisSummary Table

VARIABLE	MULTIPLE R	R SQUARE	R-SQUARE CHANGE	SIMPLE
AGE	.4131	.1707	.1707	-.4131
SEX	.4171	.1739	.0033	-.1422

the relationship between age and the dependent protective score variable was identified. One hypothesis which was not addressed, however, was that concerning how a subject of a particular age might respond to the JLAM scale. Would a 16 year old, for example, respond differently from a 15 year old because in Ontario a 16 year old is regarded as an adult and a 15 year old, a child? In order to examine this question the continuous age variable was categorized, 12 through 17 inclusive.

A one way analysis of variance (SPSS subprogramme Oneway with a Scheffe test ( $f_{crit} .10$ )), however, revealed no statistically significant difference between any particular pair of the six age groups. When one engages in "data snooping" some differences are found using an LSD (least significant difference) post hoc comparison ( $f_{crit} .05$ ). However even this procedure, with its high across-data error rate, does not support the hypothesis that, because age 16 has been established as the age of adulthood in Ontario with regard to criminal responsibility, there are significant differences between the responses of 15 and 16 year old subjects (Table 7). The lack of significant results from the analysis of variance are not surprising, however, when one notes how poorly this data lends itself to categorization.

Results Summary: The results can be conveniently summarized by briefly applying them to the five major questions raised in the Literature Review.

Questions (1) and (2) inquire whether or not statements which have traditionally been associated with either a protective or a permissive orientation can be used in a Likert scale format to exact an overall

Table 7

Multiple Range TestLSD Procedure

Ranges for the .05 level

Homogeneous Subsets\*

SUBSET 1	Age 17	Age 16		
<hr/>				
SUBSET 2	Age 16	Age 15		
<hr/>				
SUBSET 3	Age 15	Age 14	Age 13	Age 12
<hr/>				

\*Subsets of groups, no pair of which has means which differ by more than the shortest significant range for a subset of that size.

(For a further discussion of the L.S.D. procedure see Nie et al., 1975, p. 427. For two examples of posteriori contrasts presented as subsets of groups see p. 432.)

score on one of these dimensions and, if so, will the items correlate with one another as predicted. It would appear that, while the JLMA scale was readily constructed and administered, the lack of correlation in the predicted direction for several items raises serious questions concerning the scale's validity.

Question (3) asks whether or not the JLAM scale regresses to the age variable and it would appear that it does to a moderate degree. Question (4) asks if this change occurs at age 16 or at any other specific age. It would appear that it does not but problems of data categorization make this difficult to ascertain.

The gender factor and its effect upon an individual's scale score is raised in question (5). The results strongly suggest that the sex of the respondent makes no difference in determining how he or she responds to the scale portion of the questionnaire.

### Discussion

In a very general way this research study has demonstrated that young people's views with regard to how they should be dealt with by the legal system are linked to their age but are not dependent upon their gender. It appears that the older an adolescent is, the more he views himself as being a suitable subject for a non-paternal, legalistic judicial process. Before expanding upon the results of their implications, however, it is important to assess some of this study's limitations.

Perhaps the most serious limitation of this study is that there is concern with regard to the validity of the JLAM scale. Was the final score obtained for each respondent really a measure of the protective dimension of his attitudes on a protective-permissive continuum? Because a substantial number of items (composed of assumptions taken from the literature) did not correlate (or worse, correlated with other items in a direction opposite to that predicted) either the instrument or the assumptions must be suspect. Among the possibilities that must be taken into consideration is that the scale may have been measuring, in an oblique way, another construct or part of another dichotomy such as liberalism-conservatism.

A larger and more controlled pre-test which rendered sufficient data to analyze and discard some of the scale's items would possibly have increased the age/score correlation but still would not have explained why many items, and, consequently, assumptions did not correlate as expected. Common methods of determining whether or not a scale measures what it purports to measure can not be used in this instance because of the

dichotomy. For example, Crawford (1968) tested the validity of a scale which purported to measure driver attitudes which in turn were used to predict driver risk. To do this he merely administered the scale to predetermined groups of low accident record and high accident record drivers to ascertain the scale's validity. Predetermined groups of individuals of a protective or permissive orientation are, of course, not so readily obtained and as a result some questions regarding this scale's validity must remain unanswered.

A Likert scale's validity often varies negatively with its reliability (Bartlett, et al., 1960). In addition the reliability of an attitude scale is sometimes thought to determine little about the scale's value since the apparent reliability may be due more to bias than to true scale score: "If attitude scales can be conceived to be a form of self-rating, one might expect that reliability of attitude scales where bias is uncontrolled might be a function of a consistency in bias rather than a consistency in the measurement of the attitude" (DuBois & Manning, 1960, p. 703). This argument is not important in this study because no re-testing of subjects was undertaken.

In this study reliability of a test-retest nature could not be done because of the small number of respondents in the pre-study. Replication of this study would be required. Split-half reliability was not tested for two reasons. First of all, the total number of subjects was insufficient to split for analysis. Secondly, (and a major reason that no attempt was made to obtain a larger sample) there can often be significant differences between test-retest reliability and split-half reliability

estimates (Crawford, 1968). High test-retest reliability implies stability of attitude over time which is regarded as being more important in determining the value of an attitude scale.

A last limitation concerns the sampling procedure. Subjects were all volunteer school students and asking them to complete this questionnaire may have been regarded by some as an imposition on their time. This may explain why nine questionnaires were not returned. Also, after handing out a questionnaire it was difficult for the researcher to exert control over a subject and, as a result, not all subjects may have worked alone and made independent judgements. As well, a larger sample would have allowed a split-half reliability estimate to be done and may have helped to reduce the discrepancies in group size when the data was categorized for analysis of variance. A more specific method of quota sampling might also have accomplished this.

As a last comment concerning the sample, the reader should be aware that, because the respondents were drawn from a Northern Ontario high school, the sample may have contained a larger number of French Canadian and Native students than would have been contained in a Southern Ontario sample. It is not suggested that this is necessarily of any consequence, but if significant differences were found between the results of this study and results found through replication with, for example, a Southern Ontario sample, the ethnicity issue raised here might warrant exploration.

Despite some of the admitted limitations of this study, there is no reason to believe that the significant correlation between age and scale score was merely spurious. Nor should the lack of a discovery of effect



of gender upon scale score be suspect. One should not be concerned about the validity of the specific information obtained or the validity of the Likert scale as a tool for attitude measurement. The validity question raised earlier concerned only the validity of this scale as it measures a hypothesized dichotomy. We can be unsure of the strength of the dichotomy without doubting the validity of the specific information or of the overall scale score. This being the case, a number of other questions can be explored.

With regard to subject age, it is interesting to note that there was a moderate relationship between age and scale score ( $r = .41$ ). This means, of course, that of the possible factors influencing a decrease in the choice of protective items by a respondent, an increase in the respondent's age accounted for at least 17 percent of this variance. In other words, the older the respondent was the more likely he was to choose as appropriate for people his age items indicating more legalistic representation, less legislating of moral issues, and dispositions more punitive than rehabilitative. This is not, generally speaking, a surprising finding. What is surprising, however, is the apparent lack of difference between certain age groups.

It is, again, unfortunate that the data were largely unsuitable to examine using one way analysis of variance as more between-group differences might have been revealed. However there are the barest indications that there are differences between the attitudes of those 14 years of age and under and those 16 and over (Table 7). This difference should be examined further because it clearly has implications for legislating

an age of criminal responsibility. While it is recognized that the age that young people indicate that they wish to be subject to an adult justice system can not be the only concern for those legislating such an age, it should also not be ignored. Further research might concentrate on exploring the differences between 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 year olds with a sample more suitable for analysis of variance.

The lack of a significant difference between male and female respondents on the Likert portion of the questionnaire is interesting because the literature reviewed suggested that there might be reasons to expect differences. It can only be suggested that although male and female adolescents may differ in rates of delinquent behaviour, they appear to feel that they should be treated the same way in law, and no differently by the Courts when they transgress the law.

It might be worthwhile to administer the scale to younger children to find if the differences found by Bronfenbrenner (1970) are reflected in their scale scores. These differences are certainly evident in the self-report section concerning delinquency rates in which male subjects reported much higher levels of detected and undetected delinquency.

Any additional research must begin with further refinement of the JLAM scale. Examination for internal consistency and item analysis could be done. If valid, the scale could be administered to delinquent and criminal populations and even to lawyers and Family Court judges. If the scale is found to possess test-retest reliability it could be used to measure attitude changes over time with these groups. This would prove particularly interesting if the Young Offenders Bill becomes law.

Expansion of the self-report delinquency section to include details of religious background and ethnicity in addition to age and gender would provide a wealth of data for a variety of analyses.

Lastly, while this particular study has its shortcomings, it is the first study to use an attitude scale and a large sample to explore attitudes toward an aspect of the juvenile justice system. Empirical literature in this area is so sparse as to be nearly non-existent. Anthony Platt's book, The Child Savers (1977) is often cited as the definitive work in this area but it lacks an empirical basis. Platt's historical review of the juvenile justice system is unparalleled in its thoroughness but his basic thesis unnecessarily focuses on issues of class structure and his arguments often degenerate into political rhetoric.

This is not to suggest that a psychology paper should avoid an issue because there are political connotations. The literature review of this thesis, in addition to exploring purely psychological issues, reviews and is directed toward legislative change. This is not unusual in community psychology where the community psychologist is encouraged to be a social change agent (Rappaport, 1977, p. 13). It is necessary, though, to draw upon all available empirical literature, as this paper does, as well as articles of a less empirical nature in defining a thesis.

The lack of empirical literature in the area of juvenile justice explored in this paper is unfortunate because both legislators and participants in the criminal justice system could benefit from such research:

...[L]egal and scientific decision makers could profit from a bit more interaction. Participants in the legal justice system can improve their practice by learning about the psychology of personality ... and the psychology of attitude change .... We also believe that knowledge of more abstract psychological theories ... should be widespread among lawyers, judges and court officials, and that a scientifically "enlightened" court will conduct its business more efficiently and fairly.

(Saks & Hastie, 1978, p. 2)

Long-standing inequities in the way juveniles are being dealt with by the Courts are about to be corrected with the passage of the Young Offenders Bill. In fact, several changes have already occurred in spite of the delay in passage of this bill. The Constitution Act of 1982 and its entrenched Charter of Rights and Freedoms has been the basis of several recent Juvenile Court appeals from decisions handed down on the basis of the Juvenile Delinquents Act. In R. v. S. W.; R. v. W. L. (Reports of Family Law, 30 R.F.L., pp. 79-91) for example, it was held that the re-opening of a case under section 20 (3) of the Juvenile Delinquents Act (which had already been disposed of under section 20 (1)) violated section 11 (h) of the Charter which prohibits multiple punishment and was not "redeemed" by the "reasonable limits clause" of section 1. The American Gault decision was among the cases cited. In an Ontario Supreme Court ruling (Reports of Family Law, 29 R.F.L., pp. 1-9) it was held that section 12 (1) of the Juvenile Delinquents Act which provides for trials of children "without publicity" offended the "fundamental freedom of expression" guaranteed in the Charter and was, therefore, unconstitutional. The Juvenile Delinquents

Act is, as a result of such decisions, slowly being destroyed in a piecemeal manner in case law as a result of the permissive orientation of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Some changes in the legislation are not without problems. For example, legislators are currently planning to raise the age of criminal responsibility nationally, against the vocal opposition of some law enforcement organizations and without considering any of the issues raised in this paper. It would appear that this change is to be made without consideration of important psychological factors.

This study demonstrates that some of these factors can be tested and that assumptions can be explored empirically. This is not to imply that the opinions of juveniles concerning how they should be treated in law should be the major factor considered by legislators. However, we should not treat a group differently from how it feels it should be treated or differently from how other groups are treated, when there are not applicable measurable differences between them. Important legislative and policy decisions should not be made solely on the basis of untested assumptions.

## References

- Akman, D.D. A sociologist's view on the recent report. In Juvenile Delinquency in Canada. The Report of the Department of Justice Committee on Juvenile Delinquency. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1965.
- Anastasi, A. Psychological testing (4th ed.) New York: MacMillan Publishing, 1976.
- Arnold, W.R. Race and ethnicity relative to other factors in juvenile court dispositions. American Journal of Sociology, 1971, 77 (2), 211-227.
- Arnold, W.R. Grass roots justice in middle America: The "county courts" in Kansas. The Kansas Journal of Sociology, 1975, 11 (1), 15-27.
- Babbie, E.R. Survey research methods. Belmont, CA.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1973.
- Baldwin, C.P. & Baldwin, A.L. Children's judgements of kindness. Child Development, 1970, 41, 29-47.
- Bandura, A. Social learning of moral judgements. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 11 (3), 275-279.
- Bartlett, C., Quay, L., & Wrightsman, L. A comparison of two methods of attitude measurement: Likert-type and forced choice. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1960, 20 (4), 699-704.
- Bernstein, B.E. The lawyer and counselor as an interdisciplinary team: One lawyer's suggestions. Family Coordinator, 1974, 23 (1), 41-44.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. Reaction to social pressure from adults versus peers among Soviet day school and boarding school pupils in the perspective of an American sample. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 15, 179-189.
- Child Welfare Act, 1978, Bill 114.
- Chisholm, B. The child as citizen. Alumni Bulletin, University of Winnipeg, 1979, 9 (2), 24-25.
- Cohen, J. Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. New York: Academic Press, 1969.
- Cohen, L.E. Delinquency disposition: An empirical analysis of processing decisions in three juvenile courts. New York: Criminal Justice Research Center, 1975.

- Cohen, L.E. Juvenile dispositions: Social and legal factors related to the processing of Denver delinquency cases. New York: Criminal Justice Research Center, 1975.
- Cohen, L.E. New directions in processing of juvenile offenders: The Denver model. New York: Criminal Justice Research Center, 1975.
- Crain, W. Theories of development: Concepts and applications. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1980.
- Crawford, P.L. Reliability and validity of the seibrecht attitude scale. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1968, 28, 609-613.
- Csapo, M. & Clarke, B. Probation officers for juveniles in Canada. Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, 1976, 18, (4), 290-301.
- Dootjes, I., Erickson, P., & Fox, R.G. Defence counsel in juvenile court: A variety of roles. Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, 1972, 14 (2), 132-143.
- Doyle, P. Quebec's juvenile crime soars and some cite protective law. Toronto Star, August 30, 1980, p. B6.
- Erikson, P.G. The defence lawyer's role in juvenile court: An empirical investigation into judges' and social workers' points of view. University of Toronto Law Journal, 1979, 24 (2), 126-148.
- Feld, B.C. The legal response to the "hard-core" juvenile -- The offender or the offence. In The Serious Juvenile Offender. Symposium held in Minneapolis, Minnesota, September, 1975. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Ferster, E.Z., Courtless, T.F., & Snethen, E.N. The juvenile justice system: In search of the role of counsel. Fordham Law Review, 1971, 39 (3), 375-412.
- Fisher, S.T., Weiss, D.J., & Dawis, R.V. A comparison of Likert and pair comparisons techniques in multivariate attitude scaling. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1968, 28, 81-94.
- Forer, L.G. The rights of children. Young Children, 1972, 27 (6), 332-339.
- Gamson, M.A. A delinquent's dilemma: Child advocacy vs. appropriate treatment. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 1978, 7 (3), 168-169.
- In Re Gault, 387 U.S. 1, 1967.

- Goldstein, M.S., & Drotman, D.P. Psychiatry and the children's movement. The Journal of Psychohistory, 1977, 5 (1), 107-119.
- Gordon, L.V. Validity of scoring methods for bipolar scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1967, 27 (4), 1099-1106.
- Griffiths, C.T., Klein, J.F., & Verdun-Jones, S.N. Criminal justice in Canada: An introductory text. Toronto: Butterworth & Co., 1980.
- Harvey, J.H. & Smith, W.P. Social psychology, an attributional approach. Saint Louis: C.V. Mosby, 1977.
- Hindelang, M., Hirschi, T., & Weiss, J.G. Correlates of delinquency: The illusion of discrepancy between self-report and official measures. American Sociological Review, 1979, 44, 995-1014.
- Huey, K. Legal problems of correctional, mental health, and juvenile detention facilities. Hospital and Community Psychiatry, 1975, 26 (6), 378-382.
- Jones, D. The young offender. London: Duckworth Publishing Co., 1967.
- Jurkovic, G.J. The juvenile delinquent as a moral philosopher: A structural-developmental perspective. Psychological Bulletin, 1980, 88 (3), 709-727.
- Justice for Children. Lawyers for children: Where are we going? A response to the second report of the Attorney General's Committee on the Representation of Children. January, 1979.
- Juvenile Delinquents Act, Amended 1972. In Martin's Annual Criminal Code, 1980. Aurora, Ontario: Canada Law Book Limited, 1980.
- Katz, S.N. (Ed.). The youngest minority: Lawyers in defense of children. Chicago: American Bar Association, 1974.
- Kerlinger, F.N. Foundations of behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973.
- Kerlinger, F.N. & Pedhazur, E.J. Multiple regression in behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973.
- Kohlberg, L. Development of moral character and moral ideology. In M.L. Hoffman & L.W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research (Vol. 1). New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.
- Kolker, P.R. The test case and law reform in the juvenile justice system. Yale Review of Law and Social Action, 1970, 1 (2-3), 64-71.



- Koocher, G.P. Children's rights and the mental health professions. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1976.
- Korn, H.A. & Giddan, N.S. Scoring methods and construct validity of the dogmatism scale. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1964, 24 (4), 867-874.
- Labovitz, S. Some observations on measurement and statistics. Social Forces, 1967, 46, 151-160.
- Langley, M., Thomas, B.J., & Parkinson, R. Youths' expectations of their initial juvenile court appearances. Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, 1976, 20, 43-53.
- Leon, J.S. Canadian children: Prospects for legal rights and representation. Family Law Review, 2 (1), 1979, 16-26.
- Lips, H.M. & Colwill, N.L. The psychology of sex differences. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1978.
- Lipsitt, P.D. The juvenile offender's perceptions. Crime and Delinquency, 1968, 14 (1), 49-62.
- MacDonald, J.A. Juvenile training schools and juvenile justice policy in British Columbia. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 1978, 20 (4), 418-436.
- May, D. Delinquency control and the treatment model: Some implications of recent legislation. British Journal of Criminology, 1971, 11 (4), 359-370.
- Mnookin, R. Children's rights: Beyond kiddie libbers and child savers. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 1978, 7 (3), 163-167.
- Murray, D.E. Family law. University of Miami Law Review, 1970, 24 (2), 296-329.
- Nie, N.H., Hull, C.H., Jenkins, J.E., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D.H. Statistical package for the social sciences (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill, 1975.
- Nitzberg, M. Development of Likert scale to measure salience of need for interpersonal relationships with parents and friends. Adolescence, 1980, 15 (60), 871-877.
- O'Brien, R. The use of Pearson's  $r$  with ordinal data. American Sociological Review, 1979, 44, 851-857.

- Oppenheim, A. Questionnaire design and attitude measurement. New York: Basic Books, 1966.
- Panneton, J.P. Children, commitment and consent - constitutional crisis. Family Law Quarterly, 1977, 10 (4), 295-334.
- Parker, G. A lawyer's view. In Juvenile Delinquency in Canada. The Report of the Department of Justice Committee on Juvenile Delinquency. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1965.
- Parker, G. Juvenile delinquency in Canada II. A lawyer's view. British Journal of Criminology, 1967, 7 (2), 216-221.
- Parker, G. An introduction to criminal law. Toronto: Methuen Publications, 1977.
- Piaget, J. The moral development of the child. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1932.
- Platt, A.M. The child savers. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1977.
- Presser, S. & Schuman, H. The measurement of a middle position in attitude surveys. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1980, 44 (1), 70-85.
- Procedure and practices in the provincial courts, family division. (Prepared for the use of Children's Aid Societies.) Supplement to training materials on the Child Welfare Act, 1978. Ministry of Community and Social Services, Children's Services Division, 1979.
- Rappaport, J. Community psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1977.
- Report of the task force on family court clinics. Ministry of Community and Social Services, Children's Services Division, 1978.
- Rokeach, M. The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Rubin, H.T. The juvenile court's search for identity and responsibility. Crime and Delinquency, 1977, 23 (1), 1-13.
- Russell, D.H. Juvenile delinquency. Part I: The juvenile and the court. Psychiatric Annals, 1975, 5 (1), 8-71.
- Saks, M.J. & Hastie, R. Social psychology in court. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1978.
- Scanlon, R. Canadian crime rates: Sources and trends. Impact, 1982, 1/1982, 1-10.

- Seward, J.P. & Seward, G.H. Sex differences: mental and temperamental. Toronto: Lexington Books, 1980.
- Shore, M. Legislation, advocacy, and the rights of children. American Psychologist, 1979, 34 (10), 1017-1019.
- Short, J., & Nye, F. Extent of unrecorded juvenile delinquency: Tentative conclusions. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, & Police Science, 1958, 49, 296-302.
- Shuster, S. Crime and the community - some possible future directions. Impact, 1982, 1/1982, 42-51.
- Silbert, J.D., & Sussman, A. Rights of juveniles confined in training schools. Crime and Delinquency, 1974, 20 (4), 373-388.
- Sobel, S. Psychology and the juvenile justice system. American Psychologist, 1979, 34 (10), 1020-1023.
- Stapleton, V., Wizner, S., & Teitelbaum, L.E. A social scientist's view of Gault and a plea for the experimenting society. Yale Review of Law and Social Action, 1970, 1 (2-3), 72-81.
- Statistics Canada. Crime and traffic enforcement statistics, 1980. Centre for Justice Statistics, Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1982.
- Steinhauer, P. The courts from the children's perspective. An unpublished paper presented at Family Law and Social Policy Workshop Series, Faculty of Law, University of Toronto, March, 1982.
- Storms, M.D. Sex role identity and its relationships to sex role attributes and sex role stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37 (10), 1779-1789.
- Wald, M.S. Legal policies affecting children - A lawyer's request for aid. Child Development, 1976, 47 (1), 1-5.
- Weiler, K. Unmanageable children and section 8. Interchange, 1977-78, 8 (1-2), 176-194.
- Young Offenders Bill C61.
- Young offenders bill tabled in House of Commons. News Release by the Solicitor General of Canada, February 16, 1981.
- Young persons in conflict with the law. Report of the Ministry of the Solicitor General Committee on Legislation. Ottawa: 1975.

APPENDIX "A"

Likert Scale

Date of Birth:

\_\_\_\_\_  
mo. yr.

Sex:

\_\_\_\_\_  
M F

Each of the following 20 statements is followed by five numbered spaces. Place ONE checkmark in the space next to the number which best describes how you feel about the statement.

In each case the numbered spaces indicate:

- |                   |                      |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1. agree strongly | 4. disagree          |
| 2. agree          | 5. disagree strongly |
| 3. undecided      |                      |

1. A person my age should never be tried in an adult court.

1. \_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_

2. When a person my age goes to court, the court should look at what the person is like, not just at what he or she did wrong.

1. \_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_

3. When a person my age destroys another's property, the court should make the young person, not his parents, pay for the damage.

1. \_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_

4. If a person my age refused to go to school, the courts should send him or her to a reform school.

1. \_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_

5. A person my age should be held fully responsible for any criminal act he or she commits.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_\_

6. A person my age should never go to jail, no matter what he or she does.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_\_

7. A lawyer for a person my age should do what the lawyer thinks is best, no matter what the young person wants.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_\_

8. It should not be against the law for a person my age to play pinball during school hours.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_\_

9. The courts should make a person my age who has committed a crime do work in the community to pay the community back.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_\_

10. It should be against the law for a boy my age to leave home to live with his girlfriend.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_\_

11. A judge in a court for people my age should be more like a parent than a judge for older people should be.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_\_

12. A person my age who breaks the law needs more help than he or she needs punishment.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_\_

13. A person my age should be able to choose any lawyer he or she wants, as long as the lawyer agrees to take the case.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_\_

14. It should be against the law for a girl my age to leave home to live with her boyfriend.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_\_

15. A person my age should be able to get a lawyer for free if he or she needs one.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_\_

16. The law is more fair for adults than it is for people who are too young to go to an adult court.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_\_

17. It would not be right for a lawyer to get a person my age "off" a criminal charge on a technicality.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_\_

18. Sometimes the law has to stop a person my age from doing things which are too grown up.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_\_

19. A person my age who commits a serious crime should go to jail.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_\_

20. A person my age is too young to really be a criminal.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_\_

Please answer the following questions by checking either "yes" or "no" after each one.

- |  |        |       |
|--|--------|-------|
| 1. Have you ever committed a criminal act for which you were not caught? | 1. yes | _____ |
|  | 2. no  | _____ |
| 2. Have you ever been arrested?  | 1. yes | _____ |
|  | 2. no  | _____ |
| 3. Have you ever been to juvenile court?                                 | 1. yes | _____ |
|  | 2. no  | _____ |
| 4. Have you ever been to adult court?                                    | 1. yes | _____ |
|  | 2. no  | _____ |
- 

Note: Items 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, and 20 are protective.

Items 3, 5, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, and 19 are permissive.



APPENDIX "B"

# Inter-Item Correlations from JLAM Scale

## PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(1) 1.0000 S=.001	.2316 S=.007	-.0428 S=.329	-.2439 S=.005	-.2657 S=.003	.2747 S=.002	.0315 S=.372	-.0121 S=.450	-.0893 S=.177	.0355 S=.356
(2) .2316 S=.007	1.0000 S=.001	.2387 S=.006	-.0351 S=.358	-.1010 S=.147	.1700 S=.038	.1651 S=.042	.1115 S=.123	-.1303 S=.087	-.1661 S=.041
(3) -.0428 S=.329	.2387 S=.006	1.0000 S=.001	.2441 S=.005	.1378 S=.076	-.0710 S=.231	-.0150 S=.438	.0305 S=.376	.1576 S=.050	-.0697 S=.235
(4) -.2439 S=.005	-.0351 S=.358	.2441 S=.005	1.0000 S=.001	.1178 S=.110	-.3561 S=.001	.1577 S=.050	.0301 S=.377	.1945 S=.021	.1247 S=.097
(5) -.2657 S=.003	-.1010 S=.147	.1378 S=.076	.1178 S=.110	1.0000 S=.001	-.0671 S=.243	-.0823 S=.196	-.1926 S=.022	.0863 S=.185	.1655 S=.042
(6) .2747 S=.002	.1700 S=.038	-.0710 S=.231	-.3561 S=.001	-.0671 S=.234	1.0000 S=.001	.1790 S=.001	-.0367 S=.352	-.1325 S=.084	.0373 S=.350
(7) .0315 S=.372	.1651 S=.042	-.0150 S=.438	.1577 S=.050	-.0823 S=.196	.1790 S=.031	1.0000 S=.001	.1190 S=.108	.2658 S=.003	.1920 S=.022
(8) -.0121 S=.450	.1115 S=.123	.0305 S=.376	.0301 S=.377	-.1926 S=.022	-.0367 S=.352	.1190 S=.108	1.0000 S=.001	-.1136 S=.119	-.1843 S=.027
(9) -.0893 S=.177	-.1303 S=.087	.1576 S=.050	.1945 S=.021	.0863 S=.185	-.1325 S=.084	.2658 S=.003	-.1136 S=.119	1.0000 S=.001	.1828 S=.028
(10) .0355 S=.356	-.1661 S=.041	-.0697 S=.235	.1247 S=.097	.1655 S=.042	.0373 S=.350	.1920 S=.022	-.1843 S=.027	.1828 S=.028	1.0000 S=.001
(11) .2908 S=.001	.2281 S=.008	-.0484 S=.308	-.2179 S=.011	-.0983 S=.154	.2995 S=.001	.1867 S=.025	-.0291 S=.381	-.0965 S=.158	.1241 S=.098
(12) .2239 S=.009	.3192 S=.001	.0161 S=.434	-.0619 S=.260	-.1203 S=.105	.1350 S=.080	.2411 S=.006	.0599 S=.267	.0568 S=.278	.0193 S=.421

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(13) -.0981 S=.154	.0097 S=.460	.1096 S=.127	-.0727 S=.225	.0801 S=.203	-.1399 S=.072	-.0360 S=.354	.2049 S=.016	.0279 S=.386	-.3026 S=.001
(14) .0591 S=.270	-.1299 S=.100	-.0741 S=.221	.0603 S=.266	.0801 S=.203	.1867 S=.025	.2707 S=.002	-.1133 S=.119	.1338 S=.082	.7215 S=.001
(15) .0491 S=.305	.1788 S=.031	-.0110 S=.455	-.1559 S=.052	-.1743 S=.034	.2545 S=.004	.2395 S=.006	.0748 S=.219	.1380 S=.075	-.1641 S=.043
(16) .2554 S=.004	.1173 S=.111	-.2182 S=.011	-.1860 S=.026	-.2181 S=.011	.2993 S=.001	.0903 S=.174	.0292 S=.381	-.0338 S=.363	.0543 S=.287
(17) .0354 S=.357	-.0923 S=.169	.1469 S=.063	.0012 S=.495	.0826 S=.196	-.0108 S=.455	.0454 S=.319	-.1929 S=.022	.0348 S=.359	.2305 S=.008
(18) -.1017 S=.145	-.1301 S=.088	-.0665 S=.245	.3211 S=.001	.1493 S=.060	-.1944 S=.021	.1256 S=.095	-.1728 S=.036	.2104 S=.014	.3444 S=.001
(19) -.2289 S=.008	-.1419 S=.070	.1551 S=.053	.1772 S=.032	.1337 S=.082	-.4665 S=.001	-.0272 S=.389	.1742 S=.034	.1064 S=.134	.0037 S=.485
(20) .1523 S=.056	.1392 S=.073	-.3366 S=.001	-.2681 S=.002	-.3067 S=.001	.3293 S=.001	.0304 S=.376	.0077 S=.468	-.2195 S=.011	-.1581 S=.050

# PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
(1)	.2908 S=.001	.2239 S=.009	-.0981 S=.154	.0591 S=.270	.0491 S=.305	.2554 S=.004	.0354 S=.357	-.1017 S=.145	-.2289 S=.008	.1523 S=.056
(2)	.2281 S=.008	.3192 S=.001	.0097 S=.460	-.1229 S=.100	.1788 S=.031	.1173 S=.111	-.0923 S=.169	-.1301 S=.088	-.1419 S=.070	.1392 S=.073
(3)	-.0484 S=.308	.0161 S=.434	.1096 S=.127	-.0741 S=.221	-.0110 S=.455	-.2182 S=.011	.1469 S=.064	-.0665 S=.245	.1551 S=.053	-.3366 S=.001
(4)	-.2179 S=.011	-.0619 S=.260	-.0727 S=.225	.0603 S=.266	-.1559 S=.052	-.1860 S=.026	.0012 S=.495	.3211 S=.001	.1772 S=.032	-.2681 S=.002
(5)	-.0983 S=.154	-.1203 S=.105	.0801 S=.203	.0801 S=.203	-.1743 S=.034	-.2181 S=.011	.0826 S=.196	.1493 S=.060	.1337 S=.082	-.3067 S=.001
(6)	.2995 S=.001	.1350 S=.080	-.1399 S=.072	.1867 S=.025	.2545 S=.004	.2993 S=.001	-.0108 S=.455	-.1944 S=.021	-.4665 S=.001	.3293 S=.001
(7)	.1867 S=.025	.2411 S=.006	-.0360 S=.354	.2707 S=.002	.2395 S=.006	.0903 S=.174	.0454 S=.319	.1256 S=.095	-.0272 S=.389	.0304 S=.376
(8)	-.0291 S=.381	.0599 S=.267	.2049 S=.016	-.1133 S=.119	.0748 S=.219	.0292 S=.381	-.1929 S=.022	-.1728 S=.036	.1742 S=.034	.0077 S=.468
(9)	-.0965 S=.158	.0568 S=.278	.0279 S=.386	.1338 S=.082	.1380 S=.075	-.0338 S=.363	.0348 S=.359	.2104 S=.014	.1064 S=.134	-.2195 S=.011
(10)	.1241 S=.098	.0193 S=.421	-.3026 S=.001	.7215 S=.001	-.1641 S=.043	.0543 S=.287	.2305 S=.008	.3444 S=.001	.0037 S=.485	-.1581 S=.050
(11)	1.0000 S=.001	.2385 S=.006	-.1299 S=.088	.2666 S=.002	.0683 S=.239	.2727 S=.002	-.0575 S=.275	-.296 S=.379	-.2381 S=.006	.3342 S=.001
(12)	.2389 S=.006	1.0000 S=.001	.0565 S=.279	.0452 S=.320	.2202 S=.010	.1258 S=.095	-.0844 S=.190	-.0361 S=.354	-.1351 S=.080	.0396 S=.340

	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
(13)	-.1299 S=.088	.0565 S=.279	1.0000 S=.001	-.1012 S=.146	.0968 S=.157	.0254 S=.396	.0224 S=.408	-.1072 S=.132	.1206 S=.105	-.0377 S=.348
(14)	.2666 S=.002	.0452 S=.320	-.1012 S=.146	1.0000 S=.001	.0068 S=.472	.0113 S=.453	.1509 S=.058	.2909 S=.001	-.0240 S=.402	-.1230 S=.100
(15)	.0683 S=.239	.2202 S=.010	.0968 S=.157	.0068 S=.472	1.0000 S=.001	.0684 S=.239	-.0568 S=.278	-.2137 S=.013	-.0681 S=.240	.1673 S=.040
(16)	.2727 S=.002	.1258 S=.095	.0254 S=.396	.0113 S=.453	.0684 S=.239	1.0000 S=.001	-.1480 S=.061	-.0795 S=.205	-.3467 S=.001	.3232 S=.001
(17)	-.0575 S=.275	-.0844 S=.190	.0224 S=.408	.0509 S=.058	-.0568 S=.278	-.1480 S=.061	1.0000 S=.001	.1554 S=.052	.0865 S=.184	-.1421 S=.069
(18)	.0296 S=.379	-.0361 S=.354	-.1072 S=.132	.2909 S=.001	-.2137 S=.013	-.0795 S=.205	.1554 S=.052	1.0000 S=.001	.0110 S=.455	-.1620 S=.045
(19)	-.2381 S=.006	-.1351 S=.080	.1206 S=.105	-.1240 S=.402	-.0681 S=.240	-.3467 S=.001	.0865 S=.184	.0110 S=.455	1.0000 S=.001	-.3630 S=.001
(20)	.3342 S=.001	.0396 S=.340	-.0377 S=.348	-.1230 S=.100	.1673 S=.040	.3232 S=.001	-.1421 S=.069	-.1620 S=.045	-.3630 S=.001	1.0000 S=.001

APPENDIX "C"

# Raw Input Data for Regression Analysis

This list depicts the data as entered for regression analysis.

Columns 1 through 3 indicate JLAM scale scores.

Columns 4 through 8 indicate subject age to 2 decimal places.

Column 9 indicates subject sex: 0 for female; 1 for male.

0112.670

00112.670

00312.670

-0412.750

00712.670

00712.750

-0312.830

00413.080

-0113.250

-0113.250

00213.250

00213.250

00513.330

00713.420

-0313.580

00113.870

-0413.670

-0213.920

-1314.000

-0314.000

01014.170

00614.250

-0114.250

00214.250

00314.250

-0414.250

-0114.420

-0215.080

-0515.080

-0512.421

-1212.751

00612.921

-0213.001

01613.001

-1413.081

00513.171

00513.421

-0113.671

-0913.831

-1013.921

0313.921

00314.001

-0214.081

-0114.331

00014.331

00514.581

00414.751

00115.251

0415.331

-0115.501

0614.330

01015.420

-0914.580

-1814.670

00414.750

-0214.750

-0915.000

-1115.170

-0515.250

00215.420

-0615.580

-1015.750

-0415.920

-0516.000

-0816.000

-1016.000

-1416.080

00116.170

-1116.250

00516.250

-1016.250

-0416.330

-0616.420

-0116.580

-0216.670

-0816.670

-1216.750

-1516.830

01016.830

-1917.080

-0817.330

-1017.580

-1012.921

-1314.501

-0115.001

-1216.081

-0116.081

-1516.251

-1316.331

-0416.501

-1316.501

-0116.581

-1416.671

-1816.751

-0217.001

-1517.001

00017.081

00017.081

-0117.171

-0917.171

-1417.251

-0717.421

-1317.421

-0817.501

00317.501

00217.501

-1817.671

-2617.831

-1018.001

00418.171

APPENDIX "D"



# Raw Input Data for Pearson Correlation Coefficients

The following data list indicates the score for each JLAM scale item for each subject. Two columns are allowed per item and the scores are read from left to right. PS refers to public school and SS refers to secondary school. Male and female respondents are designated by the letters M and F respectively.

```
020102-2020202-20202010200-102020200-2-2 PSF
0101020100-201-101000102010001-1010202-2
010101-20100-2-201020100-102-100-10100-1
00-200-1010101-10102-20101020002010100-2
000101-2010201-1000101010101010101-102
000102-102-100-20200-100-100-2-2010001-2
000202-10102-10001020101000200000001-1-2
00-100-20201-100010201000202-101020201-1
00-100-2000100-1-1-2020000-1020000-2-202
010101-101020001010101010101010000-1-200
000102-100-101-1010002010100-1-200020000
020102-2020200-202020102000202000002-2-1
020202-202-2-201-200010101-1-200020101-2
020001-200-1-1-102-1000201-200000102-202
-10101-101000101-100000101000101010101-1
01-102-10200-101-10100000201-1-1010101-1
-202010002-2-2-201-2-10202-2-1-1-20101-2
00-102-10100-2-202020100010201000101-1-2
-20202000202020202020002-20201-20202-2-1
01-1020202-20200020201000102-20002020000
010001-20101-10001010202000102020000-100
02-201-201-1-2-201020001020201-20202-2-2
010201-20101000001010202000101020000-2-1
020202-202-2-201-200020101-2-20002-20201
-102020101000101-100000201000101020101-2
020202-2010201020200010101010101-101-1-1
020002-102-2-20001020100010201-2000202-2
```

```
-2-2020202-2-2-20002-2-20002-2-2010202-2 PSM
-2-2020202-2-2-20202-2-200-2-2-1010202-2
01020201-1-20200-10100-1-20001-1000200-2
01-1010001-200-102010001000101-10001-1-2
010202-10002-2-2-2020202-20200-202-20000
-1-2020102-1-1010101-1000101-200-2-101-2
0202020200-102-20202020102020201000202-2
010102-1020101-202020200-101-1-1010102-2
-10102-100-10201020202020202000201-1-1-1
-1-201-101-10002-1000001010001-1-1-1-1-1
-20000-201-1-1010201010101010200-1010202
020102-202-1020202-1020101-1-100-10002-2
02 2010000020002-1000001-2000100-10002-2
010201-2-101-10001-101010100-10000010001
020101-2-101-102-1-1010001-10001-100-101
0001020101-1000001-1000101-1-2-10001-1-1
01020101020001-2010001000100-102000000-2
010202-201020101010201010002-1020002-1-2
0102010102-1010000010101010101020100-101
0002010101-1000001-1000101-1-1-10001-2-1
020201-2-2000002-1-2-20102-2000001-10102
020201-2-201-102-1-1010001-10101-100-101
```

2-201-102-202-102010000010200-1010201-2. SSF  
102-1-2010201-200010201-1010200-2-1-102  
101020101-1-1010201-1-2010102-2020101-2  
1-1020001-2000102-2-10102-2-1-1000002-2  
01-10201010102-1020100010102-1-10001-1-1  
10000-101-2-1-1000100010101010001020100  
2000201000201-202-200-100-202020202-202  
00202-202-1-1-20200-201-1-200-100-200-2  
10202-101-101010001-102010001-1000101-2  
1-101-101-101-101020101-2-2000000020001  
1-1020001-10000020001-10100-1-1010102-1  
1-1010001-1-1010100-101010101-1-10101-1  
102020202-202020202-102020201-2000102-2  
102020201-202010201-102020102-1010102-2  
102020201-202010201-102020102-1010102-2  
000202-10202020001-2000202-20100-2-1-2-2  
0001010002-2000101-1-10001-1-100000101-1  
1-102-201-1-1-101-1-1-1-1-101-101-101-1  
101020000-102-102010002-10001-2000202-2  
20102-202-2-1-20100-2-10101-1-1020102-2  
2020101-1-2020202010002-20002-2010202-2  
20101-2020001-202-2010102-202-2-2010101  
101020102-2-2-1020001010000-1-1010201-2  
20002-20200-1-202-1020101020200020202-2  
20202-101-101-101010101010101-1-1-101-1  
202020001-1-101-1-1000201-1-100-101-1-1  
10101-2-10001-202-1-10101-1010101-102-2  
202020002-2-2-202-2-20202-202000001-1-2  
2-1010002-201-10200-2-1010002-2010002-2  
1010200-102000001-101020101-1-10101-100  
1-102-201-1-10101-1-10000-101-1-1-101-2  
20101-101-2-1010001-1-101-1-2-1010102-2  
010202-201-1-2010202000101000101-1-10101

020202-20201-1-102-2-20101-20200020100-2 SSM  
000001-1010100020100-1-10200010100-20000  
020102-2000000-10102000101020101000102-1  
10102-20100010202-201-2020002-200010000  
02010200020102010201-1020100020001010102  
020002-2-100-10202-1000002-1010001-201-2  
1-102-102-1010102-10101020002-2020002-2  
020202000202000202-1020201-102-202-202-1  
202020202-2-10201-100-100-100-1-20101-1  
02020200000101-201-10101-1020202-2-20002  
20202000100-10201-2020100-20202-2000101  
000102-101-1-10201-2-10001-201-101-102-2  
020202-2-2-1020102-101020200020001-20001  
20102-202-2-2-2-1-2000202-201-201-201-2  
100001-102010200010101000100010100010000  
02-2-1-201-101010101-101-101-1-1010102-1  
020200-2-1-1010201-101010100010100010000  
10202-2020202020202-201020202-200-102-2  
10102010200-20200-2-20101-200-1-10001-2  
10202-202010202-2-20201020202-2000002-2  
01-2010002-1-1000200-101010000-1-10002-2  
0001010102-2-10201-1000001-10000-10201-2  
01020201010000-102000102000001-2010001-1  
001010100-100000201-1-1-10100-10100-1-2  
020202-200-2-10201-2000001-20201-1-200-1  
20200-2-2-20202-2-20202-20200-1-102-2  
010102-20202-2-2-2-2-202-202-202-20000  
020201-10101-1-1-2-2000101-101-1-101-201

**END**

2	6	0	3	8	5
---	---	---	---	---	---

**FIN**