

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

JAMES J. DAYE, Secretary

CHILDREN'S BUREAU

GRACE ABBOTT, Chief

JUVENILE-COURT STATISTICS  
1927

BASED ON INFORMATION SUPPLIED  
BY 42 COURTS



Bureau Publication No. 195



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1927

## CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of transmittal.....	v
A cooperative plan for obtaining national statistics of delinquency and of dependency and neglect.....	1
Courts furnishing statistical material for 1927.....	2
Analysis of cases dealt with.....	3
The cases reported.....	3
Number and types of cases.....	3
Methods by which cases were handled.....	5
Children involved in the cases.....	5
Race and nativity.....	5
Age distribution.....	7
Whereabouts.....	9
Delinquency cases.....	10
Sources of complaint.....	10
Place of care pending hearing or disposition.....	11
Charges.....	13
Dispositions.....	18
Cases discharged from probation.....	28
Dependency and neglect cases.....	28
Sources of complaint.....	28
Place of care pending hearing or disposition.....	29
Charges.....	30
Dispositions.....	31
Cases discharged from supervision.....	34
Appendix.—Trend in juvenile delinquency.....	35
Delinquency rates in 12 cities.....	35
Juveniles committed to institutions for juvenile delinquents and to penal institutions as reported by the United States Bureau of the Census.....	36

## JUVENILE-COURT STATISTICS, 1927

### A COOPERATIVE PLAN FOR OBTAINING NATIONAL STATISTICS OF DELINQUENCY AND OF DEPENDENCY AND NEGLECT

For some years the Children's Bureau has been at work on a plan for making available current information on a national scale concerning trends in juvenile delinquency. The United States Bureau of the Census at approximately 10-year intervals publishes statistics of juvenile delinquents in institutions, but no attempt is made by that bureau to procure statistics concerning delinquents dealt with by courts in other ways than by institutional commitment.<sup>1</sup> Relatively few juvenile courts print annual reports which include statistical material. Lack of uniformity in methods of compiling statistics used in the different courts and marked variations in inclusions and methods of presentation make the statistics practically valueless for purposes of comparing delinquency rates in various localities, though they are of value in determining trends in individual communities from year to year. Comparable statistics with reference to cases of dependency and neglect dealt with by the courts are even more difficult to obtain, because of wider variation in the type of cases within the jurisdiction of the courts.

The importance, therefore, of agreement on a uniform plan for recording and compiling statistics of juvenile delinquency is apparent. With the assistance of the committee on records and statistics of the National Probation Association the Children's Bureau has devised such a method.<sup>2</sup> The response to the plan has been gratifying. Cooperation by juvenile courts and State departments of public welfare has increased steadily since its presentation. In several States the department of public welfare or some other State agency has taken the plan into consideration in making revisions of annual and monthly reports required of courts, and in other States these agencies have been active in calling the plan to the attention of juvenile-court judges and probation officers. By July 1, 1928, about 100 juvenile courts in various parts of the country, and several State departments concerned with juvenile-court work, were cooperating. Forty-two courts sent in statistical data for the entire calendar year 1927, and these data form the basis of this report.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Children under Institutional Care, 1923, p. 260. U. S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, 1927.

<sup>2</sup> The basis of the plan is the filing of statistical cards—a yellow card for each case of delinquency disposed of during a calendar year, a blue card for each case of dependency or neglect disposed of, and a white card for each case of a child discharged from probation (in delinquency cases) or from supervision (in dependency or neglect cases). The yellow and blue cards differ only in the lists of charges and dispositions. The cards have been so arranged that little clerical work is involved; most of the information is entered by checking. Cards and a bulletin of instructions are furnished by the Children's Bureau without charge to cooperating courts, as are frank or addressed envelopes requiring no postage for use in mailing cards back to the bureau. Cards are returned to the bureau for tabulation at least once a year, and preferably several times each year.

The Children's Bureau prepares from the cards a set of 25 tables on printed forms for each court. These are sent to the courts for use in annual reports, if desired. The facts presented in these tables include charges, places children were cared for pending hearings, manner of dealing with cases, and dispositions. The number of different children dealt with, the number of reporters, and certain social facts are also shown. For cases discharged from probation or supervision the length of the probation period and the reason for discharge are given. In a few instances the court preferred to compile its own tables in accordance with the Children's Bureau plan, instead of sending in cards.

<sup>3</sup> Cards were also supplied for 1927 by the District of Columbia juvenile court, but these were not received in time to be included in the tabulations.

### LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,  
CHILDREN'S BUREAU,  
Washington, October 18, 1929.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith the summary for 1927 of reports of cases of delinquency and dependency supplied to the Children's Bureau by juvenile courts. During the calendar year 1927, the first full year during which the bureau's plan for obtaining comparable statistics in this field was in operation, 43 courts supplied reports regularly. Alice Scott Nutt, of the social-service division, has been in immediate charge of the development of the plan for assembling uniform statistics of juvenile delinquency, in cooperation with Dr. Elizabeth C. Tandy, director of the statistical division, and Agnes K. Hanna, director of the social-service division.

Respectfully submitted.

GRACE ABBOTT, *Chief.*

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS,  
*Secretary of Labor.*

v

## COURTS FURNISHING STATISTICAL MATERIAL FOR 1927

Cards were received from 41 courts in 15 States for the entire calendar year 1927, and tables were prepared by 1 court.<sup>1</sup> The names of these courts with the largest city or town in the area served by each court are given below. For convenience each court will be designated hereafter only by the name of the territory over which it has jurisdiction.

	Largest city or town in area served
California: Juvenile court of the city and county of San Francisco.....	San Francisco.
Connecticut:	
Juvenile court of the city of Bridgeport.....	Bridgeport.
Juvenile court of Hartford.....	Hartford.
Indiana:	
Juvenile court of Clay County.....	Brazil.
Juvenile court of Delaware County.....	Muncie.
Juvenile court of Jennings County.....	North Vernon.
Juvenile court of Lake County.....	Gary.
Juvenile court of Marion County.....	Indianapolis.
Juvenile court of Monroe County.....	Bloomington.
Juvenile court of Vermillion County.....	Clinton.
Juvenile court of Wayne County.....	Richmond.
Juvenile court of Wells County.....	Bluffton.
Juvenile court of White County.....	Monticello.
Massachusetts: Middlesex County superior court.....	Lowell.
Michigan: Kent County probate court, juvenile division.....	Grand Rapids.
Minnesota:	
Juvenile court of Hennepin County.....	Minneapolis.
Juvenile court of Ramsey County.....	St. Paul.
New Jersey:	
Juvenile court of the county of Hudson.....	Jersey City.
Juvenile court of the county of Mercer.....	Trenton.
New York:	
Children's court of Buffalo.....	Buffalo.
Clinton County children's court.....	Plattsburg.
Columbia County children's court.....	Hudson.
Delaware County children's court.....	Walton.
Dutchess County children's court.....	Poughkeepsie.
Erie County children's court.....	Lackawanna.
Franklin County children's court.....	Malone.
Children's court of the city of New York.....	New York.
Orleans County children's court.....	Medina.
Westchester County children's court.....	Yonkers.
North Carolina:	
Juvenile court of Buncombe County.....	Asheville.
Winston-Salem juvenile court.....	Winston-Salem.
Ohio:	
Franklin County juvenile court.....	Columbus.
Common-pleas court of Hamilton County, division of domestic relations, juvenile court and marital relations.....	Cincinnati.
Common-pleas court of Mahoning County, division of domestic relations.....	Youngstown.
Pennsylvania:	
Juvenile court of Berks County.....	Reading.
Juvenile court of Lycoming County.....	Williamsport.
Juvenile court of Montgomery County.....	Norristown.
Municipal court of Philadelphia, juvenile division.....	Philadelphia.
Tennessee: Juvenile court of Memphis.....	Memphis.
Virginia: Juvenile and domestic-relations court of Norfolk.....	Norfolk.
Washington: Pierce County juvenile court.....	Tacoma.
Wisconsin: Dane County juvenile court.....	Madison.

<sup>1</sup> Tables prepared by two other courts were not entirely comparable with tables prepared by the Children's Bureau and were not used in this report.

## ANALYSIS OF CASES DEALT WITH

### THE CASES REPORTED

#### Number and types of cases.

In order to obtain complete information on all cases, those disposed of by the courts or discharged from probation or supervision during the year were reported, rather than those referred to the courts or placed on probation or under supervision. Cards or tables for such cases, with a few exceptions, were received from each of the 42 courts during 1927.<sup>1</sup> The total number of cases reported by these courts was 46,750. (Table 1.) The number of cases reported by individual courts ranged from 14 to 11,281. This variation in number of cases was largely due to the area of jurisdiction; some of the courts had jurisdiction over densely populated areas in large cities, other courts served smaller cities, and others rural districts.

Delinquency cases were reported by each of the 42 courts, but 8 did not report cases of dependency or neglect. The total number of dependency and neglect cases (12,150) is less than half the number of delinquency cases (26,241) reported by the 34 courts sending cards or tables for both types of cases. The proportions of dependency and neglect and delinquency cases cared for by the different courts showed much variation. Eight of these 34 courts reported more dependency and neglect than delinquency cases; in the other 26 courts dependency and neglect cases constituted the smaller part of the court's work. The wide variation in the proportion of dependency and neglect cases appears to be due in part to the extent to which local agencies other than the court were caring for dependent and neglected children. The practice in some courts of filing the complaint against the adult responsible for dependency or neglect instead of instituting proceedings in the name of the children is also a factor. In some localities only those cases of dependency and neglect requiring court action were brought as a rule to the attention of the court, and these usually by social agencies, whereas in other communities a large proportion of the dependent and neglected children were referred to the court directly by parents and relatives, and the court became a general agency for dealing with such children. The proportion of cases of dependency and neglect for which source of complaint was reported, referred to the courts by parents and relatives in different localities, varied from zero to 67 per cent.

<sup>1</sup> The court in New York City sent in only those cases disposed of by the court that had been referred to the court during the year, and only those cases of children discharged from probation or supervision who had been placed on probation or under supervision during the year. No cards for girls were received from a few courts in which it is probable that girls' cases had been disposed of. A few courts failed to send in a separate card for each case when a child had been brought before the court more than once during the year. Eleven courts did not report cases of children discharged from probation or supervision.

TABLE 1.—Number of delinquency cases and of dependency and neglect cases of boys and girls and number of cases of boys and girls discharged from probation or supervision dealt with by 42 specified courts in 1927

Court	Cases dealt with									
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Delinquency cases			Dependency and neglect cases			Cases of children discharged from probation or supervision		
		Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls
Total.....	45,730	28,387	34,264	4,143	12,180	4,332	4,132	6,213	3,777	4,993
California: San Francisco City and County.....	2,058	950	873	77	687	364	343	431	204	187
Connetquot.....	750	516	449	76	53	39	47	151	140	11
Hartford.....	973	618	539	79	154	83	71	361	172	29
Indiana:										
Clay County.....	20	25	14	11	4	1	3	20	6	4
Delaware County.....	130	65	47	18				63	43	20
Jennings County.....	16	4			12	7	5			
Lake County.....	1,051	527	343	184	345	175	173	130	87	29
Marion County.....	1,322	892	399	303	261	146	143	149	65	54
Monroe County.....	36	15	10	5				21	7	14
Vermillion County.....	164	84	54	30				80	54	28
Wayne County.....	41	21	15	9	20	14	6			
Wells County.....	41	41	33	18						
White County.....	14	3			11	3	6			
Massachusetts: Middlesex County.....	27	27	24	3				20	20	
Michigan: Kent County.....	662	274	374		306	100	198		30	
Minnesota:										
Hennepin County.....	1,499	966	776	190	342	170	173	281	145	26
Ramsey County.....	621	342	370	73	111	52	39	171	123	16
New Jersey:										
Hudson County.....	1,920	1,668	1,482	303				225	204	31
Mercer County.....	317	215	197	18				102	68	4
New York:										
Buffalo.....	1,078	836	783	51	55	49	48	145	132	13
Cattaraugus County.....	198	28	18	5	79	40	23	1	1	
Columbia County.....	360	98	84	14	121	56	63	41	28	15
Delaware County.....	14	14	14							
Dutchess County.....	114	223	183	40	371	123	148	24	21	3
Erie County.....	317	177	150	18	54	28	26	36	43	3
Franklin County.....	54	34	25	9	24	16	6			
New York City.....	10,650	6,102	5,263	840	3,243	1,743	1,500	1,305	674	331
Orleans County.....	28	6	8	1	15	7	8	4	3	1
Westchester County.....	1,706	1,104	959	194	302	151	151	300	268	32
North Carolina:										
Rowan County.....	334	144	122	22	160	72	68			
Winston-Salem.....	319	286	239	26	24	9	15			
Ohio:										
Franklin County.....	1,492	883	674	308	232	148	116	347	300	38
Hamilton County.....	1,351	1,332	1,332	(?)	254	128	134	275	275	21
Macon County.....	2,017	1,684	1,301	293	223	105	118	110	69	21
Pennsylvania:										
Berks County.....	63	48	39	9	13	4	9	7	3	4
Lycoming County.....	29	10	6	4	17	7	10	2	1	1
Montgomery County.....	84	53	40	13	31	18	13			
Philadelphia.....	11,281	6,132	4,350	1,782	3,646	(?)	(?)	1,443	(?)	(?)
Tennessee: Memphis.....	1,552	832	672	160	663	328	235	57	31	26
Virginia: Norfolk.....	1,073	728	613	113	186	90	95	89	60	9
Washington: Pierce County.....	219	126	68	28	73	33	40			
Wisconsin: Dane County.....	194	87	55	32	73	34	39	31	13	21

<sup>1</sup> This column shows the total number of cards received from each court. Some duplication occurs between the columns showing delinquency and dependency and neglect cases disposed of and the column showing cases discharged from probation or supervision, since a child may have been placed on probation or under supervision in a delinquency, dependency, or neglect case and discharged from this probation or supervision during 1927.

<sup>2</sup> Not including Philadelphia.

<sup>3</sup> Tables for about 700 girls' cases not included.

<sup>4</sup> Sex not reported.

Cases of children discharged from probation or supervision during the year were reported by 31 courts. Eleven courts did not report cases of children discharged from probation or supervision during the year, and a number reported only a few. Some of these courts had failed to keep adequate probation records, and others took no cognizance of the termination of the probation period either by formal discharge or by removal of the case from the list or index of active probation cases.

The proportions of boys and girls were about equal in dependency cases. In delinquency cases the number of boys reported (24,244) was nearly six times the number of girls (4,143). There was, however, much variation in the proportion of delinquent girls in different localities.

#### Methods by which cases were handled.

Information was collected for what are usually described as official and unofficial cases, the same cards being used for both, but separate lists of dispositions were used. Unofficial cases may be defined as cases adjusted informally by the judge, referee, or probation officer without being placed on the court calendar by the filing of a petition or other legal paper for adjudication by the judge or referee. As is shown by the accompanying table (Table 2) the practice of the court in regard to unofficial handling of cases varied in different localities. Twenty-three courts reported delinquency cases disposed of unofficially, and 19 courts did not report any so disposed of. Only 16 of the 34 courts sending information concerning dependency and neglect cases reported such cases disposed of unofficially.

Slightly more than one-fourth of the delinquency cases reported were dealt with unofficially. In four courts handling 50 or more cases (1 in Indiana, 1 in North Carolina, and 2 in Ohio) from 76 to 97 per cent of the delinquency cases were handled unofficially. The total number of cases dealt with by two of these courts was large. In several courts there were differences in the practice of handling of boys' and girls' cases. This was especially marked in two courts. In Marion County, Ind., a much larger proportion of the girls' cases than of the boys' cases were handled unofficially, whereas in San Francisco, Calif., the situation was reversed.

One-fifth of the dependency and neglect cases reported were dealt with unofficially. In three courts (one in North Carolina, one in Ohio, and one in Tennessee) more than half of the dependency and neglect cases were so dealt with.

#### CHILDREN INVOLVED IN THE CASES<sup>2</sup>

##### Race and nativity.

As a number of children came before the courts more than once the 28,387 delinquency cases represented 25,456 children and the 12,150 dependency and neglect cases, 11,785 children. Of the 25,305 delinquent children for whom race was reported, 84 per cent were white and 16 per cent colored. As would be expected, the proportion of colored children was larger in the southern courts. In Winston-Salem, N. C., 73 per cent and in Norfolk, Va., 52 per cent of the delinquent children were colored. In the northern and mid-

<sup>2</sup> Information used in this section for each delinquent child is based on his first case of delinquency disposed of during the year, and for each dependent or neglected child on his first case of dependency or neglect disposed of during the year.

TABLE 2.—Number of official and unofficial delinquency cases and dependency and neglect cases dealt with by 42 specified courts during 1927

Court	Delinquency cases				Dependency and neglect cases			
	Total	Official	Unofficial		Total	Official	Unofficial	
			Number	Per cent <sup>1</sup>			Number	Per cent <sup>1</sup>
Total.....	23,387	20,827	7,590	27	12,180	9,777	2,373	20
California: San Francisco City and County.....	950	738	212	22	687	684	3	.....
Connecticut:								
Bridgport.....	516	331	185	36	83	70	13	16
Hartford.....	618	378	240	39	124	142	12	8
Indiana:								
Clay County.....	25	13	12	.....	4	4	.....	.....
Delaware County.....	65	38	27	42	.....	.....	.....	.....
Jennings County.....	4	4	.....	.....	12	12	.....	.....
Lake County.....	527	341	186	35	348	213	135	39
Marion County.....	892	679	223	25	291	291	.....	.....
Monroe County.....	15	10	5	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Vermillion County.....	84	9	75	89	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wayne County.....	24	13	11	.....	20	20	.....	.....
Wells County.....	41	12	29	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
White County.....	3	3	.....	.....	11	7	4	.....
Massachusetts: Middlesex County.....	27	27	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Michigan: Kent County.....	374	374	.....	.....	208	208	.....	.....
Minnesota:								
Hennepin County.....	931	936	.....	.....	342	342	.....	.....
Ramsey County.....	342	342	.....	.....	111	111	.....	.....
New Jersey:								
Hudson County.....	1,083	1,083	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Mercer County.....	215	215	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
New York:								
Buffalo.....	836	836	.....	.....	95	95	.....	.....
Clinton County.....	33	19	4	.....	79	48	31	39
Columbia County.....	93	97	1	1	121	121	.....	.....
Delaware County.....	14	14	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Dutchess County.....	231	219	4	2	271	259	12	4
Erie County.....	177	177	.....	.....	24	24	.....	.....
Franklin County.....	34	34	.....	.....	24	24	.....	.....
New York City.....	5,162	5,162	.....	.....	3,243	3,243	.....	.....
Orleans County.....	9	9	.....	.....	15	14	1	.....
Westchester County.....	1,504	657	447	40	303	297	6	2
North Carolina:								
Buncombe County.....	144	5	139	97	160	57	103	64
Winston-Salem.....	293	293	.....	.....	24	24	.....	.....
Ohio:								
Franklin County.....	883	883	.....	.....	262	262	.....	.....
Hamilton County.....	1,332	38	1,294	97	254	114	140	55
Mahoning County.....	1,484	469	1,015	76	223	190	33	15
Pennsylvania:								
Berks County.....	48	48	.....	.....	13	13	.....	.....
Lycoming County.....	10	10	.....	.....	17	17	.....	.....
Montgomery County.....	53	53	.....	.....	31	31	.....	.....
Philadelphia.....	5,152	3,248	2,904	47	3,699	3,312	1,374	37
Tennessee: Memphis.....	852	601	251	29	653	190	463	71
Virginia: Norfolk.....	728	728	.....	.....	186	186	.....	.....
Washington: Pierce County.....	238	123	3	2	97	79	18	18
Wisconsin: Dane County.....	67	60	27	31	73	43	30	41

<sup>1</sup> Not shown where base is less than 50.

western courts the percentages of colored children varied from zero to 29%. Of the 11,737 dependent or neglected children for whom race was reported, dealt with by the 34 courts (both northern and southern) reporting dependency or neglect cases, only 13 per cent were colored, as compared with 16 per cent of the delinquent children.

As might be expected from the differences in the racial groups living in the localities served by the courts, the proportions of children of native parentage and of foreign or mixed parentage com-

ing before the courts showed great variation. Forty-one courts reported nativity and parentage for 18,722 delinquent white children; one court is omitted because it reported an error in its method of checking nativity and parentage. Of the 15,005 boys in this group 39 per cent were native born of native parentage, 51 per cent were native born of foreign or mixed parentage, 4 per cent were native born of parentage not reported, and 6 per cent were foreign born. Of the 2,817 girls 50 per cent were native born of native parentage, 40 per cent were native born of foreign or mixed parentage, 3 per cent were native born of parentage not reported, and 7 per cent were foreign born. Among the 9,796 dependent and neglected white children for whom nativity and parentage were reported by these 41 courts, the proportion of native born of native parentage was much greater (55 per cent) than of native born of foreign or mixed parentage (37 per cent). The proportions of native-born children whose parentage was not reported (3 per cent) and of foreign-born children (6 per cent) were about the same as in delinquency cases.

The proportion of the children dealt with who were foreign born was small for all courts reporting except New York City, where 15 per cent of the delinquent white boys, 19 per cent of the delinquent white girls, and 18 per cent of the dependent and neglected white children, both boys and girls, were reported as foreign born.

#### Age distribution.

Of the 42 courts reporting to the Children's Bureau 20 had jurisdiction over children up to 16 years of age<sup>2</sup>; 2 (Kent County, Mich., and Memphis, Tenn.) had jurisdiction up to 17 years; 7 had jurisdiction up to 18 years<sup>3</sup>; and the jurisdiction of 1 (San Francisco City and County, Calif.) extended to 21 years. Of the remaining 12 courts 10 had jurisdiction over delinquent, dependent, and neglected boys up to 16, delinquent girls up to 18, and dependent and neglected girls up to 17<sup>4</sup>; 1 (Dane County, Wis.) had jurisdiction over delinquent boys up to 17, delinquent girls up to 18, and dependent and neglected children up to 16; and 1 (Middlesex County, Mass.) had jurisdiction over delinquent children between 7 and 17 years and neglected children under 16 years of age.

The age distribution of children dealt with on charges of delinquency by courts having original jurisdiction over children of specified ages is shown in Table 3. The largest percentages of both boys and girls were between 14 and 16 years of age, and the next largest percentages were between 12 and 14 years of age. That the number of girls and boys over 16, however, would probably have been larger had it not been for the limitation of the jurisdiction of many courts to children under that age is evident from the age distribution in courts having jurisdiction beyond 16 years. The inclusion in each group of a few children beyond the age of original jurisdiction specified is explained by the fact that some courts have jurisdiction beyond the age

<sup>2</sup> Bridgport and Hartford, Conn.; Hudson County and Mercer County, N. J. (girls up to 17 may be committed by the juvenile court to the State home for girls); Buffalo, Clinton County, Columbia County, Delaware County, Dutchess County, Erie County, Franklin County, New York City, Orleans County, and Westchester County, N. Y.; Buncombe County and Winston-Salem, N. C.; and Berks County, Lycoming County, Montgomery County, and Philadelphia, Pa.

<sup>3</sup> Hennepin County and Ramsey County, Minn.; Franklin County, Hamilton County, and Mahoning County, Ohio; Norfolk, Va.; and Pierce County, Wash.

<sup>4</sup> Clay County, Delaware County, Jennings County, Lake County, Marion County, Monroe County, Vermillion County, Wayne County, Wells County, and White County, Ind.

of original jurisdiction in certain situations; for example, a case in which the offense was committed before the age limit was reached, even though the case did not come to the attention of the court until afterwards, and a case in which a child made a ward of the court before reaching the age limit was before the court on a new charge.

Eight per cent of the delinquent boys and 4 per cent of the delinquent girls reported were under 10 years of age. Children of this age group were reported by 35 of the 42 courts. Nearly two-thirds of these boys (971 of the 1,552) were dealt with officially. The situation with regard to girls was similar; 78 of the 152 girls under 10 years were dealt with officially.

TABLE 3.—Ages of boys and girls dealt with in delinquency cases by 42 courts during 1927, by age limitation of original court jurisdiction

Age and sex of child	Children dealt with by courts							
	Total		Having specified age limitations of original jurisdiction					
			Under 10 years <sup>1</sup>		Under 15 years <sup>2</sup>		15 years and over <sup>3</sup>	
	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution
Total.....	25,494	.....	17,492	.....	7,129	.....	895	.....
Boys.....	21,839	.....	15,243	.....	5,985	.....	791	.....
Age reported.....	20,373	100	14,262	100	5,327	100	763	100
Under 10 years.....	1,552	8	1,204	8	399	8	29	5
10 years, under 15.....	3,117	15	2,456	17	639	11	61	8
15 years, under 14.....	5,575	27	4,301	31	1,069	20	115	15
14 years, under 16.....	7,929	39	5,092	43	1,647	31	280	36
16 years and over.....	2,300	11	290	2	1,622	32	268	37
Age not reported.....	1,196	.....	980	.....	178	.....	8	.....
Girls.....	3,917	.....	2,219	.....	1,624	.....	74	.....
Age reported.....	3,713	100	2,071	100	1,573	100	69	100
Under 10 years.....	152	4	102	5	48	3	2	3
10 years, under 15.....	261	7	188	9	71	5	3	4
15 years, under 14.....	773	21	527	25	238	15	8	12
14 years, under 16.....	1,848	50	1,186	57	641	41	21	30
16 years and over.....	670	18	68	3	575	37	36	52
Age not reported.....	204	.....	148	.....	51	.....	5	.....

<sup>1</sup> Includes Westchester County, N. Y., where jurisdiction extends to 13 in truancy cases; also Hudson County and Mercer County, N. J., where girls up to 17 may be committed to the State school for girls by the juvenile court.

<sup>2</sup> Includes Middlesex County, Mass., Kent County, Mich., and Memphis, Tenn., where jurisdiction is under 17 years, and Dane County, Wis., where jurisdiction is under 17 years for boys.

<sup>3</sup> Includes San Francisco City and County, Calif., only.

<sup>4</sup> 41 courts (exclusive of Philadelphia) reported 59 boys and 28 girls as "15 years of age and over."

As the following table shows, the number of children before the courts on dependency and neglect charges was about the same for each 2-year age period up to 14 when there was a distinct falling off.

Age	Number of children	Per cent distribution
Total.....	11,795	.....
Age reported.....	10,796	100
Under 2 years.....	1,367	13
2 years, under 4.....	1,413	13
4 years, under 6.....	1,455	13
6 years, under 8.....	1,584	15
8 years, under 10.....	1,418	13
10 years, under 12.....	1,430	13
12 years, under 14.....	1,304	12
14 years, under 16.....	858	8
16 years and over.....	97	1
Age not reported.....	999	.....

#### Whereabouts.<sup>4</sup>

Two-thirds of the delinquent boys and almost one-half of the delinquent girls for whom whereabouts was reported were living with both own parents when referred to the court. The whereabouts of the delinquent children was as follows:

Whereabouts	Boys		Girls	
	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution
Total.....	16,694	.....	3,008	.....
Whereabouts reported.....	15,256	100	3,040	100
With both own parents.....	10,947	67	1,454	48
With parent and step-parent.....	1,410	9	367	12
With mother only.....	2,088	13	527	17
With father only.....	810	5	198	7
In adoptive home.....	72	(1)	34	1
In other family home.....	714	4	334	11
In institution.....	143	1	68	2
In other place.....	68	(1)	48	2
Whereabouts not reported.....	1326	.....	968	.....

<sup>1</sup> Less than 1 per cent.

Among the delinquent boys and girls reported as living with only one parent the absence of the other parent, in the majority of instances, was due to death. Almost three-fourths of the boys and the same proportion of the girls living with one parent only were with their mothers. Of the children living with a parent and a step-parent about two-thirds were with a mother and a stepfather, the proportion being slightly higher for boys than for girls.

<sup>4</sup> Figures are omitted in this section for 1 court in which the proportion of children living with both own parents was so large as to indicate inaccuracy in the reporting of this item.

The following table shows with whom dependent and neglected children were living when referred to the court:

Whereabouts	Number of children	Per cent distribution
Total.....	8,428	
Whereabouts reported.....	8,421	100
With both own parents.....	1,804	21
With parent and step-parent.....	344	4
With mother only.....	2,758	33
With father only.....	1,860	22
In adoptive home.....	90	1
In other family home.....	1,491	17
In institution.....	449	5
In other place.....	38	(1)
Whereabouts not reported.....	67	

<sup>1</sup> Less than 1 per cent.

Among dependent and neglected children living with only one parent, the absence of the other parent was due to death in slightly more than one-fourth of the cases. Desertion was a much greater factor in dependency and neglect than in delinquency, as was also a group of miscellaneous conditions classed as "other" which included separation without divorce and confinement of one parent in a hospital or a correctional institution. Among dependent and neglected children living with their mothers only, the number of instances in which the absence of the father was due to desertion and to "other" conditions was greater than the number due to death. As among delinquent children, the majority of dependent and neglected children living with one parent only were with their mothers.

#### DELINQUENCY CASES

##### Sources of complaint.

The source from which cases are received is some indication of the court's relation to the community. It is to be expected that a large proportion of complaints in delinquency cases would be received from the police. The number received from school departments is an indication of the extent to which the school handles its truancy and behavior problems or refers them to the juvenile court. It is necessary to make a distinction between the person or agency that brings the case to the attention of the court or probation office by making the initial complaint and the person who signs the petition or legal paper necessary to institute court action. Since the signing of the petition may be dependent on court policy the former is more significant and was used as the basis of tabulation so far as courts were able to give this information. Some courts, for instance, prefer that the probation officer should not sign such a paper lest his later contact with the family be rendered more difficult thereby.

The police made the complaint in 62 per cent of the delinquency cases for which source of complaint was reported. In one court practically all the complaints (99.6 per cent) were received from the police. In another court only 15 per cent of the complaints were received from this source, the smallest percentage reported by the police in any court. The highest percentages for sources of complaint

other than police in any court reporting 50 or more cases were: Individual other than parent or relative, 57; probation officer, 47; school department, 30; social agency, 8.

The sources of complaint in delinquency cases were as follows:

Source of complaint	Number	Per cent distribution
Total.....	33,387	
Sources of complaint reported.....	27,967	100
Police.....	17,319	62
Parents or relatives.....	2,775	10
Other individual (not probation officer).....	2,749	10
School department.....	2,032	7
Probation officer.....	894	3
Social agency.....	533	2
Other source of complaint.....	465	2
Sources of complaint not reported.....	420	

##### Place of care pending hearing or disposition.

In more than half the delinquency cases, as is shown by Tables 4 and 5, the children were not detained but were allowed to remain in their own homes pending hearing, or their cases were disposed of on the day the complaint was made. Detention was not used to any extent in most of the smaller courts; in the larger courts the practices varied considerably. The cases in which children remained in their own homes or which were disposed of within one day varied in courts handling 50 or more cases from 97 per cent of all the cases in Winston-Salem, N. C., to 27 per cent in Hamilton County, Ohio. Twenty-four of the forty-two courts used boarding homes for children who were not left in their own homes pending hearing, but the number of children thus cared for was very small. Detention homes and other institutions (including receiving homes or shelters of private agencies and hospitals) were used in more than one-third of the delinquency cases in which place of care was reported. The courts reporting the greatest use of detention homes were those in Hamilton County, Ohio, Montgomery County, Pa., and Memphis, Tenn. New York City, which does not maintain a municipal detention home, using instead the shelter of a private agency, reported the majority of the cases in which children were cared for in other institutions.

Almost a thousand children (4 per cent of the number for whom place of care was reported) were held in jails or police stations pending hearing or disposition of their cases. Cases of jail or police-station detention were reported by 26 courts; 69 per cent of the cases so detained were reported by 3 courts. If all these cases were of actual detention overnight or longer these figures would represent a serious situation. But from a comparison of the dates on which the cases had been referred to and disposed of by the courts, it was evident that a few courts reported detention care when the child was held in the jail or police station for a few hours pending arrival of parents or attention from the court. Included in these figures also were 158 cases in which the child was held for only part of the detention period in the jail or police station and the remainder of the time elsewhere. Although the largest numbers of children detained in jail were reported by courts having jurisdiction over children up to 18



years of age, many young children had been detained. Seventy detained children were under 14 years of age, 305 were between 14 and 16 years, and 590 were 16 years of age or over.

TABLE 4.—Place of care pending hearing or disposition of case in delinquency cases dealt with by 42 specified courts during 1927

Court	Delinquency cases								
	Total	Place of care							
		Own home or case disposed of same day	Boarding home	Detention home <sup>1</sup>	Other institution <sup>2</sup>	Jail or police station <sup>3</sup>	More than 1 place of care <sup>4</sup>	Other place of care	Not reported
Total.....	35,387	14,751	99	5,585	2,201	979	274	112	2,438
California: San Francisco City and County.....	950	527	8	334	15	21		22	25
Connecticut:									
Bridgeport.....	356	472	3		39	19			2
Hartford.....	619	561	3	58	5			1	
Indiana:									
Clay County.....	25	7	2	8					8
Delaware County.....	65	29		27		9			
Jennings County.....	4	4							
Lake County.....	537	438	10	53	2	14		4	8
Marion County.....	892	705	4	152	2	20	1	7	1
Monroe County.....	15	6			2	1			6
Vermillion County.....	54	75	6	1	1	1			
Wayne County.....	34	18		5					
Wells County.....	41	26		5					
White County.....	3	3							
Massachusetts: Middlesex County.....	37	25	1						1
Michigan: Kent County.....	374	190		181					
Minnesota:									
Hennepin County.....	986	810	1	83	7	69	3	5	25
Ramsey County.....	342	167	2	53	13	100	1	1	6
New Jersey:									
Hudson County.....	1,451	1,171	8	500	3	1		3	2
Mercer County.....	215	197				17		1	
New York:									
Buffalo.....	836	526		310					
Clinton County.....	23	10		7					
Columbia County.....	98	81		10	4	2			1
Delaware County.....	14	14							
Dutchess County.....	223	208	5		3	4		3	
Erie County.....	177	144	3	1	21		8	2	
Franklin County.....	34	25	2		4			1	
New York City.....	6,180	2,751	1		2,037		50	3	340
Orleans County.....	9	9							
Westchester County.....	1,194	718	1		98	1	191	20	5
North Carolina:									
Brunswick County.....	144	121	1	8	1	3			
Winston-Salem.....	295	288	4	5					
Ohio:									
Franklin County.....	883	302	1	235	1	221	18	2	3
Hamilton County.....	1,322	552		945		25	1		6
Mahoning County.....	1,654	1,026	3	261	11	358	1	10	22
Pennsylvania:									
Berks County.....	48	25		11		2			1
Lycoming County.....	10	7	1			1			
Montgomery County.....	52	17		26					
Philadelphia.....	6,152	1,844		1,371	23	6		3	2,915
Tennessee: Memphis.....	852	303		543	6	7	1	3	22
Virginia: Norfolk.....	728	377	2	274	6	64		3	2
Washington: Pierce County.....	156	38		33	1	9		1	4
Wisconsin: Dane County.....	87	62	1	6	7	2	1	2	6

<sup>1</sup> Including cases of children cared for part of the time in detention home and the remainder of the time elsewhere, but not including cases of children also held at jail or police station.

<sup>2</sup> Including cases of children cared for in receiving home or shelter of private agency and other institution.

<sup>3</sup> Including cases of children cared for part of the time in police station or jail and the remainder of the time elsewhere.

<sup>4</sup> Not including detention home, police station, or jail.

<sup>5</sup> Place of care not reported for unofficial cases. According to information received from the court chil-

A larger percentage of the boys than of the girls were permitted to remain in their own homes, or their cases were disposed of on the same day. (Table 5.) Detention homes or other institutions were used more frequently in girls' cases than in boys' cases, but in only 2 per cent of the girls' cases as compared with 4 per cent of the boys' cases were the offenders detained in jail or police station.

TABLE 5.—Places of care pending hearing or disposition of delinquency cases of boys and girls dealt with by 42 courts during 1927

Place of care	Delinquency cases					
	Total		Boys		Girls	
	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution
Total.....	25,387		24,244		4,143	
Places of care reported.....	24,071	100	21,722	100	2,729	100
Own home or case disposed of same day.....	14,751	61	12,620	61	1,901	61
Boarding home.....	99	( <sup>1</sup> )	40	( <sup>1</sup> )	29	1
Detention home or other institution.....	5,585	23	17,188	81	1,605	43
Detention home.....	5,585	22	4,611	22	974	26
Other institution.....	3,201	13	2,573	12	629	17
Jail or police station.....	979	4	898	4	81	2
Only place of care.....	821	3	747	4	74	2
One of the places of care.....	158	1	151	1	7	( <sup>2</sup> )
More than one place of care.....	274	1	234	1	40	2
Other place of care.....	112	( <sup>3</sup> )	47	( <sup>3</sup> )	65	2
Places of care not reported.....	2,438		3,012		404	

<sup>1</sup> Less than 1 per cent.

<sup>2</sup> Including cases of children cared for part of the time in detention home and the remainder of the time elsewhere, but not including cases of children also held at jail or police station.

<sup>3</sup> Not including detention home, police station, or jail.

<sup>4</sup> Including Philadelphia's unofficial cases for which place of care was not reported.

#### Charges.

Though an attempt is being made to secure uniformity in the use of terms, the charges on which children were dealt with as delinquents by the courts give a very incomplete picture of their behavior problems. A child may have committed several offenses at or about the same time but be referred to court on only one of them. The specific offense with which he is charged may be much less serious than offenses discovered in the course of the social investigation. When the case is investigated before the filing of a petition instead of afterward the formal charge is usually more accurate, but even in such cases the offense stated in the complaint may reflect the desire of the court to protect the child. For instance, in some courts a girl is charged with incorrigibility instead of a sex offense, and a boy with trespassing and taking the property of another instead of with "breaking and entering" or "burglary."

As is shown by the recorded offenses the boys and girls present quite different delinquency problems. More than two-thirds of the boys were charged with stealing or with acts of carelessness or mischief. With the girls "running away," "ungovernable or beyond parental control," and "sex offense" were the most frequent charges, two-thirds of them having been charged with these offenses.

TABLE 6.—Charges in boys' delinquency cases dealt with by 48 specified courts during 1927

Court	Boys' delinquency cases																		
	Total	Charge on which referred to court																	
		Total reported	Stealing or attempted stealing		Truancy		Running away		Ungovernable or beyond parental control		Sex offenses		Injury or attempted injury to person		Act of carelessness or mischief		Other		Not reported
			Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>24,244</b>	<b>24,054</b>	<b>10,033</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>1,859</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1,735</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1,733</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>814</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5,915</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>743</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>190</b>	
California: San Francisco City and County.....	873	872	408	46	78	9	46	5	119	14	4	39	3	138	16	21	2	1	
Connecticut:																			
Bridgeport.....	440	438	111	25	49	11	28	9	25	6	3	4	1	195	45			2	
Hartford.....	339	339	173	52	23	4	22	6	30	6	4	15	3	240	45	6	1		
Indiana:																			
Clay County.....	14	12	9		1											1		3	
Delaware County.....	47	47	39		3		4									1			
Jennings County.....	4	4			4														
Lake County.....	348	331	199	47	42	12	19	0	40	12	11	5	1	30	9	4	1	7	
Marion County.....	859	859	303	35	63	11	7	1	61	10	2	17	3	112	19	14	2		
Monroe County.....	10	7																3	
Vermillion County.....	54	54	27	50	1	2	4	7	1	2	2	2	4	14	26	4	7		
Wayne County.....	15	15	12		1		1		1										
Wells County.....	23	23	11		1							4		7					
White County.....	3	3							1										
Massachusetts: Middlesex County.....	24	24	19		1									2		1			
Michigan: Kent County.....	374	373	193	52	59	8	4	1	28	8	5	2	1	92	25	3	1	1	
Minnesota:																			
Bennequin County.....	778	778	305	47	66	0			75	10	3	25	3	105	25	28	4	1	
Ramsey County.....	270	270	104	38			0	2	30	13	4	6	2	36	13	12	4		
New Jersey:																			
Hudson County.....	1,412	1,412	620	35	232	24	14	1	134	9	1	51	3	400	27	2	(?)		
Mercer County.....	197	197	102	52	9	5	0	3	0	3	1	5	3	5	3				
New York:																			
Buffalo.....	753	734	540	69	1	(?)	30	4	28	4	1	13	2	160	29	12	2		
Clinton County.....	18	18	16				1		1					4					
Columbia County.....	84	84	38	46	1	6	2	2	1	1	5	8	10	23	27	2	2		
Delaware County.....	14	14	8		1				2			4		2					
Dutchess County.....	183	182	48	22	33	18	6	4	12	7	2	1	1	85	46			1	

Erie County.....	159	158	75	47			4	3	12	8								
Franklin County.....	25	25	21				1		1									
New York City.....	8,262	8,106	2,103	41	48	1	190	13	439	9								
Orleans County.....	8	8	0		1				1									
Westchester County.....	930	930	295	31	129	20	10	2	83	9								
North Carolina:																		
Buncombe County.....	122	122	71	58	20	15	1	1	4	3								
Winston-Salem.....	239	235	95	40	60	28	1	(?)	9	4								
Ohio:																		
Franklin County.....	674	673	372	55	80	13	18	2	48	7								
Hamilton County.....	1,332	1,330	587	44	40	4	209	8	31	4								
Mahoning County.....	1,391	1,391	442	32	241	17	90	6	112	8								
Pennsylvania:																		
Berks County.....	30	30	24				1							7		2		
Lycoming County.....	6	6	3		1													
Montgomery County.....	40	40	28		4		2		1									
Philadelphia.....	2,386	2,338	1,038	38	272	5	840	10	307	5								
Tennessee: Memphis.....	672	668	302	39	65	10	112	17	34	5								
Virginia: Norfolk.....	615	613	194	32	22	4	34	4	20	8								
Washington: Pierce County.....	98	98	00	01	0	0	4	4	4	4								
Wisconsin: Dane County.....	55	55	36	65	3	0	2	4										

<sup>1</sup> Not shown where base is less than 60.

<sup>2</sup> Less than 1 per cent.

1	9	6	27	36														1
1	1		1															
1	245	5	1,483	59	104	2												126
1	23	2	303	32	24	3												
1	11	9	12	10	2	2												
1	13	6	44	19	7	8												4
1	26	2	48	7	17	8												1
1	10	1	349	26	158	10												9
1	38	3	374	27	60	4												
1	5		7		2													
1	1																	
1	2		1															
1	144	3	1,827	34	213	4												6
1	59	0	97	11	24	4												2
1	34	0	243	40	42	7												
1			9	6	9	9												
1			12	22														

TABLE 7.—Charges in girls' delinquency cases dealt with by 37 specified courts during 1927<sup>1</sup>

Court	Girls' delinquency cases																		
	Total	Charge on which referred to court																	
		Total reported	Stealing or attempted stealing		Truancy		Running away		Ungovernable or beyond parental control		Sex offense		Injury or attempted injury to person		Act of carelessness or mischief		Other		Not reported
			Number	Per cent <sup>2</sup>	Number	Per cent <sup>2</sup>	Number	Per cent <sup>2</sup>	Number	Per cent <sup>2</sup>	Number	Per cent <sup>2</sup>	Number	Per cent <sup>2</sup>	Number	Per cent <sup>2</sup>	Number	Per cent <sup>2</sup>	
Total.....	4,143	4,105	525	13	430	10	760	19	1,130	28			114	3	283	7	89	2	38
California: San Francisco City and County.....	77	77	4	5	4	5	25	32	17	22					1	1	5	6	
Connecticut:																			
Bridgeport.....	76	76	31	41	8	11	6	8	13	17					10	13			
Hartford.....	70	70	22	32	5	6	2	3	15	19			2	4	2	3	1	1	
Indiana:																			
Clay County.....	11	11	2				3												
Delaware County.....	18	18	2		4		5		2								1		
Lake County.....	184	183	14	9	13	7	25	14	22	12					4	2	2	1	1
Marion County.....	303	303	4	14	4	8	10	7	153	50			5	2	10	5	10	3	
Monroe County.....	5	2							1										3
Vermillion County.....	30	30	3		3		1		3				2		1		2		
Wayne County.....	9	9					2												
Wells County.....	18	18	2		1		2		1						3		1		
Massachusetts: Middlesex County.....	3	3	1										2						
Minnesota:																			
Hennepin County.....	190	190	21	11	17	9			71	37			3	2	6	3	18	9	
Ramsey County.....	72	71	11	15			4	0	37	52									1
New Jersey:																			
Hudson County.....	203	203	7	3	100	50	6	3	16	28			4	2	3	1	1	(?)	
Morris County.....	18	18	3				3		4				1						
New York:																			
Buffalo.....	51	51	10	51			14	27	10	20							1	2	
Clinton County.....	5	5			1				2										
Columbia County.....	14	14	2				3		1										
Dutchess County.....	41	40	5		18		2		9						3				
Erie County.....	18	17	2				3		9				2						1
Franklin County.....	11	9							8										
New York City.....	641	612	136	17	6	1	223	34	273	34			35	4	40	5	7	1	28
Orleans County.....	1	1					1												
Westchester County.....	174	154	10	6	52	34	8	5	10	6			8	5	17	11	9	1	

North Carolina:																			
Buncombe County.....	23	22	2		1		5		3										
Winston-Salem.....	56	55	14	25	13	24	2	4	9	16									
Ohio:																			
Franklin County.....	209	209	17	8	15	7	11	5	31	15									
Mahoning County.....	253	232	26	9	72	25	19	7	67	23									
Pennsylvania:																			
Berks County.....	9	9	5				2												
Lycoming County.....	4	4					1												
Montgomery.....	13	13	4				1												
Philadelphia.....	756	738	77	10	49	6	253	33	202	27			10	1	160	12	10	5	1
Tennessee: Memphis.....	180	179	21	12	18	10	45	25	38	21			10	6	13	7	5	3	
Virginia: Norfolk.....	113	113	7	0	6	5	4	4	49	43			19	17	10	9	1	1	
Washington: Pierce County.....	28	28	1		1		2		3						1				
Wisconsin: Dane County.....	32	31	5		1		4		12										

<sup>1</sup> Only 37 of the 42 courts reported girls' delinquency cases.

<sup>2</sup> Not shown where base is less than 10.

<sup>3</sup> Less than 1 per cent.

The great variation in the types of offenses with which children were charged in the different courts, as is shown by Tables 6 and 7, indicates differences in the attitude and practices of the court as well as in social conditions. For example, in boys' cases (Table 6) stealing constituted 42 per cent of all cases and was the most frequent charge in all except five courts reporting 50 or more cases. In Mercer County, N. J., stealing was the charge in 82 per cent of the boys' cases and acts of carelessness or mischief in 3 per cent; in Dutchess County, N. Y., stealing was the charge in 22 per cent of the cases and acts of carelessness or mischief in 46 per cent. Acts of carelessness or mischief were reported more often than stealing in Bridgeport and Hartford, Conn.; Dutchess County and Westchester County, N. Y.; and Norfolk, Va. Apparently in some courts the charge for petty stealing is "mischief" rather than "stealing." Although charges of truancy represented only 8 per cent of all charges they formed 20 per cent or more of the cases reported by Hudson County, N. J.; Westchester County, N. Y.; and Winston-Salem, N. C. Other charges constituting rather large proportions of the cases in certain courts were "running away," 17 per cent in Memphis, Tenn., as compared with 7 per cent in all the courts; "sex offense," 11 per cent in Lake County, Ind., and 10 per cent in Franklin County, Ohio, as compared with 2 per cent in all the courts.

Variations similar to those in boys' cases were evident in the types of offenses with which girls (Table 7) were charged. Five of the courts reporting 50 or more girls' cases showed an unusually large proportion of cases in which girls were referred to the court as runaways. These courts were San Francisco City and County (32 per cent), Buffalo (27 per cent), New York City (34 per cent), Philadelphia (33 per cent), and Memphis (26 per cent). Stealing was the charge in only 13 per cent of all the girls' cases but was the most frequent charge in three courts, occurring in 41 per cent of the girls' cases in Bridgeport, Conn., in 51 per cent in Buffalo, N. Y., and in 25 per cent in Winston-Salem, N. C. Similarly, although charges of truancy formed only 10 per cent of all charges in girls' cases, they constituted 50 per cent of the cases in Hudson County, N. J., and 34 per cent of the cases in Westchester County, N. Y., 29 per cent of the cases in Winston-Salem, N. C., and 25 per cent of the cases in Mahoning County, Ohio. Other charges which were reported in large proportions by certain courts were "injury to person" in Norfolk, Va.; "carelessness or mischief" in Winston-Salem, N. C.; "ungovernable" in Marion County, Ind., Ramsey County, Minn., and Norfolk, Va.; and "sex offense" in Lake County, Ind., and Franklin County, Ohio. The contrast between Lake County, Ind., and Marion County, Ind., so far as the charges "ungovernable" and "sex offense" are concerned, is especially striking. In Lake County the charge was "ungovernable" in 12 per cent of the girls' cases and "sex offense" in 55 per cent; in Marion County it was "ungovernable" in 50 per cent and "sex offense" in 11 per cent. This contrast no doubt reflects in some measure a difference in stating the charge rather than in the types of offenses reported to the courts.

#### Dispositions.

*Official cases.*—An analysis of the dispositions, which were reported for 20,679 of the 20,827 delinquency cases dealt with officially by the 42 courts, shows that nearly nine-tenths were (1) dismissed or

continued indefinitely (35 per cent), (2) placed on probation (39 per cent), or (3) committed to institutions for delinquent children (15 per cent). A number of different but related methods of treatment of delinquent children are included under each of these terms. For example, the entry "case dismissed" was made for cases closed without any further action, cases referred to other courts for commitment to institutions for the feeble-minded, and cases dismissed because of lack of jurisdiction in the juvenile court. Cases were considered as "continued indefinitely" when no further action was taken or supervision given the children but when jurisdiction was maintained so that if a like situation arose later the case might be brought into court again without the filing of a new petition. Cases of children placed on probation to parents or committed to institutions with commitment suspended when no further action was contemplated were also classed as "continued indefinitely."

The dispositions of 20,827 official delinquency cases were as follows (the numbers and per cent distribution for boys and girls are shown in Tables 8 and 9 respectively):

Disposition	Number	Per cent distribution
Total.....	20,827	-----
Disposition reported.....	20,679	100
Dismissed or continued indefinitely.....	7,179	35
Child placed on probation.....	8,261	39
Child committed to institution for delinquent children.....	5,046	15
Restitution, fine, or costs.....	1,262	6
Fine imposed or payment of costs ordered.....	684	4
Restitution or reparation ordered.....	218	2
Other disposition.....	1,061	5
Child placed under supervision of individual other than probation officer.....	285	1
Child committed to other institution.....	126	1
Child committed to board, department, or agency.....	408	2
Child returned home <sup>1</sup> .....	174	1
Child referred for criminal prosecution.....	35	( <sup>2</sup> )
Case otherwise disposed of.....	62	( <sup>2</sup> )
Disposition not reported.....	148	-----

<sup>1</sup> Applies only to runaways or children living away from own home at the time referred to court.

<sup>2</sup> Less than 1 per cent.

The courts showed wide variation in the extent to which different types of dispositions were used. Such variations are due in many instances to differences in court procedure and practice. For instance, the number of official cases dismissed or continued indefinitely is small if cases are investigated before the filing of a petition and trivial cases are dealt with unofficially or dropped. The proportion of cases in which the child is placed on probation is influenced by several factors, among them the number of cases dismissed or continued indefinitely upon first hearing, the extent to which unofficial probation is used, the local institutions available for short-time commitments, and the care with which children are selected for probation both as to those likely to profit by it and as to the court's facilities for giving such supervision.

Analysis of the percentages of cases disposed of in various ways by courts handling 50 or more official cases shows more clearly the variations from court to court. Each of the courts reported some cases dismissed or continued indefinitely. The percentage so disposed of ranged from 5 in Mercer County, N. J., to 54 in Memphis, Tenn.,

TABLE 8.—Dispositions in boys' official delinquency cases dealt with by 42 specified courts during 1927

Court	Boys' official delinquency cases												
	Total	Total reported	Dismissed or continued indefinitely		Child placed on probation		Child committed to institution for delinquent children		Restitution, fine, or costs		Other		Not reported
			Number	Per cent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Per cent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Per cent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Per cent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Per cent <sup>1</sup>	
Total.....	17,738	17,610	6,344	36	4,822	27	2,430	14	1,121	7	808	5	128
California: San Francisco City and County.....	663	632	324	51	159	25	137	20			22	3	21
Connecticut:													
Bridgeport.....	277	275	87	32	150	55	26	9	10	4	2	1	2
Hartford.....	320	320	179	56	173	54	12	4	1	(?)	3	1	
Indiana:													
Clay County.....	7	7					7						
Delaware County.....	27	27			25		2				1		
Jennings County.....	4	4	4	100									
Lake County.....	232	232	61	26	71	31	60	26	1	(?)	20	17	
Marion County.....	524	523	74	14	269	51	305	58	63	10	22	4	1
Monroe County.....	7	7					7						
Vermillion County.....	3	3			2						1		
Wayne County.....	8	8			4		3		1				
Wells County.....	4	4			3		1						
White County.....	3	3	3	100									
Massachusetts: Middlesex County.....	24	24			24								
Michigan: Kent County.....	374	373	123	33	195	45	60	13	20	5	14	4	1
Minnesota:													
Hennepin County.....	770	770	355	46	341	44	75	10			5	1	
Ramsey County.....	270	269	35	9	195	72	37	14			12	4	1
New Jersey:													
Hudson County.....	1,482	1,481	612	41	385	26	168	11	61	24	9	1	1
Mercer County.....	197	197	5	3	143	73	43	22	5	3	1	1	
New York:													
Buffalo.....	785	785	412	52	149	19	136	17	67	11	1	(?)	
Clinton County.....	15	15	3	20	8	53	4						
Columbia County.....	83	83	39	47	10	12	6	7	22	27	6	7	
Delaware County.....	14	14	1	7	10	71	2				1		
Dutchess County.....	179	179	61	34	48	27	13	7	42	23	16	8	
Erie County.....	159	159	33	21	111	70	19	12			6	4	
Franklin County.....	25	25	8	32	2		5				10		
New York City.....	4,262	4,262	2,499	58	1,773	41	890	21	66	6	29	1	72
Orleans County.....	8	8	3	38	3		1				1		
Westchester County.....	362	362	202	56	225	62	31	14	26	8	28	8	

North Carolina:													
Buncombe County.....	4	4					4						1
Winston-Salem.....	259	259	65	25	121	47	27						
Ohio:													
Franklin County.....	674	674	48	7	452	67	143	21					2
Hamilton County.....	30	30			8		31						
Mahoning County.....	335	335	90	27	138	41	54	16					
Pennsylvania:													
Berks County.....	39	39	4	10	17		5						
Lycoming County.....	6	6	1	17			15						
Montgomery County.....	40	40	2	5	10	25	34						
Philadelphia.....	2,808	2,808	567	20	1,454	52	110	4					
Tennessee: Memphis.....	459	463	276	59	114	25	38	8					
Virginia: Norfolk.....	615	614	175	29	314	51	38	6					
Washington: Pierce County.....	67	67	23	34	35	52	19						
Wisconsin: Dane County.....	30	30	7	23	40	133	1						

<sup>1</sup> Per cent not shown where base is less than 50.

<sup>2</sup> Less

TABLE 9.—Dispositions in girls' official delinquency cases dealt with by 36 specified courts during 1927<sup>1</sup>

Court	Girls' official delinquency cases										
	Total	Total reported	Dismissed or continued indefinitely		Child placed on probation		Child committed to institution for delinquent children		Restitution, fine, or costs	Other	Not reported
			Number	Per cent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Per cent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Per cent <sup>1</sup>			
Total.....	1,089	1,059	835	78	1,269	41	626				
California: San Francisco City and County.....	78	78	27	35	17	22	10				
Connecticut:											
Bridgeport.....	51	54	26	48	19	35	5				
Hartford.....	58	58	12	21	23	43	19				
Indiana:											
County.....	0	0	1				5				
Greene County.....	11	11			9		2				
Marion County.....	199	209	33	16	33	16	19				
Montgomery County.....	195	195	9	5	114	58	17				
Posey County.....	3	3			1		2				
Union County.....	6	6					6				
Vanderburgh County.....	8	8					8				
Warrick County.....	8	8	1	13	1		4				

<sup>1</sup> 37 of the 42 courts reported girls' delinquency cases and 1 court did not report girls' cases disposed of officially.

	3	2	11	0						
	7	1	24	4						2
	35	10	18	5						
										1
	3		1							
	32	1	26	14						
	1	(?)	36	7						16
	135	22	68	11						1
	5	5	15	13						
			2	4						

per cent.

during 1927<sup>1</sup>

Court	Total	Total reported	Dismissed or continued indefinitely		Child placed on probation		Child committed to institution for delinquent children		Restitution, fine, or costs	Other	Not reported
			Number	Per cent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Per cent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Per cent <sup>1</sup>			
Total.....	1,089	1,059	835	78	1,269	41	626				
California: San Francisco City and County.....	78	78	27	35	17	22	10				
Connecticut:											
Bridgeport.....	51	54	26	48	19	35	5				
Hartford.....	58	58	12	21	23	43	19				
Indiana:											
County.....	0	0	1				5				
Greene County.....	11	11			9		2				
Marion County.....	199	209	33	16	33	16	19				
Montgomery County.....	195	195	9	5	114	58	17				
Posey County.....	3	3			1		2				
Union County.....	6	6					6				
Vanderburgh County.....	8	8					8				
Warrick County.....	8	8	1	13	1		4				

per cent not shown where base is less than 50.

TABLE 9.—Dispositions in girls' official delinquency cases dealt with by 36 specified courts during 1927—Continued

Court	Girls' official delinquency cases													
	Total	Total reported		Dismissed or continued indefinitely		Child placed on probation		Child committed to institution for delinquent children		Restitution, fine, or costs		Other		Not reported
		Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	
Massachusetts: Middlesex County.....	3	3												
Minnesota:														
Hennepin County.....	190	720	42	26	65	45	26	29	29					
Ramsey County.....	72	72	7	10	31	42	26	40						
New Jersey:														
Hudson County.....	202	202	100	40	32	16	22	10	28	14	10	5		
Morris County.....	16	16	5		0		7							
New York:														
Rutland.....	31	31	24	47	16	21	0	16	3	4				
Clinton County.....	4	4	1		3		0							
Columbia County.....	14	14	4		3		2		1					
Dutchess County.....	40	40	20		7		8		11					
Schenectady County.....	16	16	1		7		8		8					
Franklin County.....	9	9	1		7		0		2					
New York City.....	842	827	27	33	309	43	309	37	161	20	10	7	13	
Westchester County.....	93	93	18	10	25	27	25	27	20	21	22	23		
North Carolina:														
Winston-Salem.....	1	1							1					
Ohio:														
Franklin County.....	36	36	13	26	31	86			3	8	8	15		
Washington County.....	200	200	15	7	137	62			49	25	13	6		
Madison County.....	68	67	17	25	33	37			10	21	9	13		
Pennsylvania:														
Berks County.....	4	4	1						0		2			
York County.....	4	4							4					
York County.....	13	13			1				0					
York County.....	40	40	11	27	37	44			48	11	1	1	20	
Philadelphia.....	107	107	28	26	20	34			20	19	18	13	3	
Philadelphia.....	112	111	24	21	48	44			11	10	11	11	3	
Philadelphia.....	36	36	5	14	6				9	25	9	25		
Philadelphia.....	10	10	9		0				1					

<sup>1</sup> Less than 1 per cent.

and was more than 40 per cent in six other courts. Similarly the child was placed on probation in 39 per cent of all cases, but for individual courts this percentage ranged from 12 per cent in Memphis, Tenn., to 77 per cent in Dane County, Wis. In 10 courts the children dealt with were placed on probation in more than half the cases.

Although commitments to institutions for delinquent children were made in only 15 per cent of all cases the proportion of such commitments was more than 20 per cent in seven courts. Orders for restitution, fines, and payment of costs when not accompanied by more significant dispositions, such as probation, were resorted to in a small proportion (6 per cent) of the cases. In four courts, however, such orders were made in about one-fifth of the cases.

Tables 8 and 9 show the extent to which different types of dispositions were used in boys' and in girls' cases. In general, the dispositions of boys' and girls' cases showed no striking differences except in a few courts. Although 36 per cent of the boys' cases and only 27 per cent of the girls' cases were dismissed or continued indefinitely, in Bridgeport, Conn., 32 per cent of the boys' cases and 48 per cent of the girls' cases, and in Lake County, Ind., 26 per cent of the boys' cases and 36 per cent of the girls' cases were so disposed of. Probation was used in a slightly larger proportion of the girls' cases than of the boys' cases, but in 10 of the 17 courts which reported a total of 50 or more girls' cases probation was used more frequently in boys' cases. This was especially noticeable in Bridgeport, Conn., and Ramsey County, Minn. In 14 per cent of the boys' cases as compared with 20 per cent of the girls' cases the child was committed to an institution for delinquent children. This difference between the sexes in the use of such institutions was even greater in Hartford, Conn., and in Ramsey County, Minn. In the former 4 per cent of the boys' cases and 33 per cent of the girls' cases and in the latter 14 per cent of the boys' cases and 49 per cent of the girls' cases were disposed of by commitment to such institutions. Commitments to other institutions or to agencies and use of individuals other than parents or court officers for supervision, which formed part of the group "other disposition" were most commonly used in Lake County, Ind., and Philadelphia, Pa., for boys; and in San Francisco City and County, Calif.; Lake County, Ind.; Westchester County, N. Y.; and Philadelphia, Pa., for girls. Each of these courts reported one and in some instances all of these types of dispositions.

A study of the relation of charges to dispositions in official cases as shown in Table 10 (boys' cases) and Table 11 (girls' cases) reveals some interesting facts as to methods of treatment of different types of offenses. Table 10 shows that in boys' cases dismissal or indefinite continuance was the type of disposition most often used where the charge was injury or attempted injury to person (63 per cent), acts of carelessness or mischief (59 per cent), running away (37 per cent), and a group of miscellaneous charges classified as "other" (59 per cent). Probation was used more often than any other type of disposition in the cases of boys charged with stealing (47 per cent), truancy (36 per cent), sex offense (51 per cent), violating a liquor or drug law (47 per cent), and being ungovernable or beyond parental control (42 per cent). Commitment to an institution for delinquent children

<sup>1</sup> These tables are based on the cases reported by the 41 courts that sent cards to the bureau and do not include figures for Philadelphia, which reported on standard table forms in place of cards.

TABLE 10.—Charge, by type of disposition, in boys' official delinquency cases dealt with by 41 courts during 1927<sup>1</sup>

Disposition	Boys' official delinquency cases																				
	Total	Charge on which referred to court																			
		Stealing or attempted stealing		Truancy		Running away		Ungovernable or beyond parental control		Sex offense		Injury or attempted injury to person		Act of carelessness or mischief		Violating liquor or drug law or intoxication		Other		Not reported	
		Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution
Total	14,930	6,740	1,210	861	1,201	355	551	1	100	54	69	201	177	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Disposition reported	14,862	6,677	1,207	852	1,192	350	545	1	100	54	68	201	177	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Dismissed	4,872	1,562	291	204	317	21	73	21	73	21	308	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Continued indefinitely	878	326	139	32	87	7	34	7	34	7	40	5	15	13	9	4	5	5	3	3	
Restitution or reparation ordered	288	117	2																		
Fine or payment of costs	833	138	2	2	(?)																
Child referred for criminal prosecution	32	27	(?)																		
Child placed on probation	4,438	3,141	47	432	36	294	33	496	42	180	61	188	1	15	46	47	31	16	49	30	
Child placed under supervision of individual other than probation officer	192	66	1	28	3	11	1	22	2	8	2	3		(?)	5	5	8	2			
Child committed to board, department, or agency	61	18	(?)	8	1	5	1	14	1	4	1			(?)					1	1	
Child committed to institution for delinquent children	2,086	1,263	18	218	18	190	22	305	26	48	14	20		(?)	3	7	7	13	6	20	
State institution	770	599	8	57	5	54	6	88	7	27	8	9		(?)	1	3	3	5	2	4	
County or city institution	498	351	4	111	9	28	3	40	3	4	1	10		(?)	1	3	2	2	1	3	
Private institution	571	363	4	35	3	60	7	143	13	13	4	4		(?)	1	3	2	5	2	9	
Type not reported	277	158	3	12	1	50	6	34	3	4	1	3		(?)	3	2	1	(?)	4	2	
Child committed to other institution	54	24	(?)	3	(?)	7	1	18	1	1	(?)			(?)							
Child returned home <sup>2</sup>	50	6	(?)	2	(?)	39	5	1	(?)			1	(?)								
Other disposition	33	12	(?)	4	(?)			2	(?)	3	1	1	(?)								
Disposition not reported	128	62		3		0		0		6		6								14	

<sup>1</sup> Philadelphia not included. <sup>2</sup> Less than 1 per cent. <sup>3</sup> Applies only to runaways or children living away

from homes at the time referred to court.

TABLE 11.—Charge, by type of disposition, in girls' official delinquency cases dealt with by 85 courts during 1927<sup>1</sup>

Disposition	Girls' official delinquency cases										
	Total	Charge on which referred to court								Not reported (number) <sup>1</sup>	
		Stealing or attempted stealing		Truancy		Running away		Ungovernable or beyond parental control			Sex
		Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution		
Total	2,649	381	267	417	723	506					
Disposition reported	2,626	379	266	414	718	506					
Dismissed	588	107	38	102	38	84	20	108	18	71	
Continued indefinitely	146	23	6	33	13	31	6	42	6	13	
Restitution or reparation ordered	6	4	1								
Fine imposed or payment of costs ordered	44	1	(?)	34	9	1	(?)	1	(?)	1	
Child referred for criminal prosecution	2										
Child placed on probation	1,066	381	48	85	32	178	43	327	46	312	
Child placed under supervision of individual other than probation officer	79	11	3	7	3	10	2	25	3	21	
Child committed to board, department, or agency	34	4	1	(?)		5	1	7	1	21	
Child committed to institution for delinquent children	578	46	13	13	5	89	21	194	27	238	
State institution	229	19	5	5	2	11	3	66	8	131	
County or city institution	77	4	1			7	2	29	4	29	
Private institution	214	16	4	7	3	50	14	86	12	49	
Type not reported	88	7	2	1	(?)	15	4	23	3	11	
Child committed to other institution	33	1	(?)			2	(?)	12	2	11	
Child returned home <sup>2</sup>	32					22	5	4	1	1	
Other disposition	18	1	(?)	1	(?)	2	(?)	1	(?)	1	
Disposition not reported	20	2		1		3		8		1	

<sup>1</sup> Of the 85 courts reporting girls' delinquency cases, one court did not report girls' cases disposed of officially; 6 courts where base is less than 50. <sup>2</sup> Applies only to runaways or children living away from own home at the time referred to court.

TABLE 12.—Charge, by type of disposition, in girls' official delinquency cases dealt with by 85 courts during 1927<sup>1</sup>

Disposition	Girls' official delinquency cases										
	Total	Charge on which referred to court								Not reported (number) <sup>1</sup>	
		Stealing or attempted stealing		Truancy		Running away		Ungovernable or beyond parental control			Sex
		Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution		
Total	2,649	381	267	417	723	506					
Disposition reported	2,626	379	266	414	718	506					
Dismissed	588	107	38	102	38	84	20	108	18	71	
Continued indefinitely	146	23	6	33	13	31	6	42	6	13	
Restitution or reparation ordered	6	4	1								
Fine imposed or payment of costs ordered	44	1	(?)	34	9	1	(?)	1	(?)	1	
Child referred for criminal prosecution	2										
Child placed on probation	1,066	381	48	85	32	178	43	327	46	312	
Child placed under supervision of individual other than probation officer	79	11	3	7	3	10	2	25	3	21	
Child committed to board, department, or agency	34	4	1	(?)		5	1	7	1	21	
Child committed to institution for delinquent children	578	46	13	13	5	89	21	194	27	238	
State institution	229	19	5	5	2	11	3	66	8	131	
County or city institution	77	4	1			7	2	29	4	29	
Private institution	214	16	4	7	3	50	14	86	12	49	
Type not reported	88	7	2	1	(?)	15	4	23	3	11	
Child committed to other institution	33	1	(?)			2	(?)	12	2	11	
Child returned home <sup>2</sup>	32					22	5	4	1	1	
Other disposition	18	1	(?)	1	(?)	2	(?)	1	(?)	1	
Disposition not reported	20	2		1		3		8		1	

<sup>1</sup> Philadelphia are not included in this table.

was reported in 26 per cent of the cases of boys described as ungovernable or beyond parental control and in 22 per cent of the cases in which the boy was charged with running away. Fines or costs were ordered chiefly in the cases of boys charged with acts of carelessness or mischief (16 per cent).

As is shown in Table 11, the treatment of girls for certain offenses was similar to that of boys. Dismissal or indefinite continuance was the disposition most frequently used in cases where the offense was injury to person (56 per cent) or act of carelessness or mischief (69 per cent); probation was used more often than any other type of disposition in the cases of girls charged with stealing (48 per cent), and with being ungovernable (46 per cent); and the proportions of cases in which girls were committed to institutions for delinquent children as ungovernable (27 per cent), or as runaways (21 per cent), were about the same as those for boys. In girls' cases, however, dismissal or indefinite continuance was the disposition most frequently used when the charge was truancy (50 per cent) and probation when the charge was running away (43 per cent). Commitment to an institution was used proportionately more frequently for sex offenses of girls than for any other offense among either boys or girls; the contrast in treatment of boys and of girls for this offense is striking. In 14 per cent of the cases of boys charged with sex offenses the boy was committed to an institution for delinquent children and in 51 per cent he was placed on probation, whereas in 37 per cent of the cases of girls who were sex delinquents the girl was committed to an institution for delinquent children and in 36 per cent she was placed on probation. On the other hand, when truancy was the charge, children were sent to such institutions in only 5 per cent of the girls' cases as compared with 18 per cent of the boys' cases, and girls less frequently than boys were committed to institutions on charges of stealing. The percentages of institution commitments for the two sexes were about the same in cases of runaways and ungovernable children.

*Unofficial cases.*—Of the 7,525 unofficial delinquency cases for which the disposition was reported more than one-half (58 per cent) were closed because the difficulty was adjusted; in approximately one-seventh (14 per cent) the children were placed unofficially under the supervision of probation officers; and a large proportion of the remaining cases were apparently dropped without action of any sort ("dismissed" or "no action taken" was frequently reported under "other disposition").

The following table shows the dispositions of unofficial delinquency cases dealt with by the 23 courts reporting such cases:

Disposition	Number	Per cent distribution
Total.....	7,560	
Disposition reported.....	7,525	99
Placement of child in institution recommended.....	200	3
Placement of child elsewhere recommended.....	72	1
Child placed on unofficial probation.....	1,073	14
Referred to agency or other court.....	176	2
Child returned home <sup>1</sup> .....	286	4
Difficulty adjusted.....	4,356	58
Other disposition.....	1,379	18
Disposition not reported.....	35	

<sup>1</sup> Applies only to runaways or children living away from own home at the time referred to court.

As is shown by Table 12, with the exception of cases in which children were charged with running away and simply returned home, and the four cases of girls charged with violating liquor or drug laws, "difficulty adjusted" was the disposition most frequently reported for all types of offenses both in boys' cases and in girls' cases. More than half the cases in which boys were charged with injury to person, mischief, and miscellaneous offenses classified as "other," and more than half the cases in which girls were charged with stealing, truancy, injury to person, mischief, being ungovernable, and miscellaneous offenses were so disposed of. Unofficial probation was used more frequently for boys than for girls.

TABLE 12.—Charge, by disposition and sex of child, in unofficial delinquency cases dealt with by 23 courts during 1927<sup>1</sup>

Disposition	Unofficial delinquency cases										
	Charge on which referred to court										
	Total	Stealing or attempted stealing	Truancy	Running away	Ungovernable or beyond parental control	Sex offense	Injury or attempted injury to person	Act of carelessness or mischief	Violating liquor or drug law	Other charge	Charge not reported
Total.....	4,558	1,223	474	434	470	216	145	3,243	57	186	18
Boys.....	3,728	1,255	357	334	265	91	119	3,256	53	175	13
Total reported.....	3,660	1,245	353	330	262	90	119	3,250	53	175	13
Placement of child in institution recommended.....	144	65	4	30	11	4	3	12	3	4	.....
Placement of child elsewhere recommended.....	54	34	4	7	4	1	.....	3	1	.....	
Child placed on unofficial probation.....	733	363	68	17	63	22	20	117	17	30	6
Referred to agency or other court.....	101	45	9	15	6	4	.....	11	3	1	3
Child returned home <sup>1</sup> .....	137	15	2	178	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	1	.....
Difficulty adjusted.....	1,548	421	143	69	85	34	73	749	18	61	4
Other disposition.....	943	254	124	21	81	20	24	356	11	48	.....
Disposition not reported.....	28	10	4	4	3	1	.....	6	.....	.....	
Girls.....	728	68	117	60	205	125	26	87	4	11	6
Total reported.....	721	68	116	60	203	124	26	85	4	11	6
Placement of child in institution recommended.....	16	1	.....	4	5	4	.....	.....	.....	1	1
Placement of child elsewhere recommended.....	18	3	1	1	8	5	.....	.....	.....	.....	
Child placed on unofficial probation.....	111	12	18	14	35	10	5	12	3	1	2
Referred to agency or other court.....	37	3	8	3	11	9	.....	3	.....	.....	
Child returned home.....	41	.....	.....	23	7	4	.....	.....	.....	.....	
Difficulty adjusted.....	347	88	41	26	111	50	.....	21	44	7	1
Other disposition.....	139	37	28	9	36	24	.....	26	.....	3	1
Disposition not reported.....	7	.....	1	1	2	1	.....	2	.....	.....	

<sup>1</sup> Nineteen of the 23 courts did not report delinquency cases disposed of unofficially; figures for Philadelphia, which reported on standard table forms instead of cards, are not included in this table.



#### Cases discharged from probation.

The 31 courts sending in cards or tables for cases of delinquent children discharged from probation reported 5,029 such cases. The majority (4,493) of these were discharged from official probation. The number of such cases discharged from probation was considerably less than the number officially placed on probation (7,905). Unofficial probation cases were reported by only 15 courts, and almost one-half (273) of these cases were reported by one Ohio court (Hamilton County). The probation period was in most instances of brief duration, usually only a few months. The preponderance of cases in which the length of the probation period was less than one year is partly due to the fact that several courts, among them one large court, made cards only for those cases in which the children were both placed on probation and discharged therefrom during 1927. The figures for children discharged from probation who had been placed on probation before the courts began to use the statistical plan which forms the basis for this report doubtless were less complete in some courts than the figures for children placed on and discharged from probation the same year.

The reasons for discharge from probation were as follows:

Reason for discharge	Number	Per cent distribution
Total.....	5,029	
Reason for discharge reported.....	4,907	100
Child reached age limit.....	258	5
Further supervision not recommended <sup>1</sup> or discharged with improvement.....	2,359	66
Child committed to institution for delinquent children.....	763	16
Child committed to other institution, agency, or individual.....	126	4
Other reason.....	481	10
Reason for discharge not reported.....	22	

<sup>1</sup> The first edition of card No. 3 read "Further probationary supervision not recommended." This item was found to be generally used to note the termination of the period with improvement and a later print of the card was changed to read "Discharged with improvement before age limit."

The extent to which children who had been on probation were committed to institutions for delinquent children varied greatly in the different courts, the proportion of such commitments ranging in courts reporting 50 or more cases from 3 per cent to 28 per cent. In most of the courts for which the number of commitments was high the courts used county or private institutions for short-term commitments, the purpose of which was chiefly disciplinary; upon release from the institution the child was likely to be placed again on probation.

#### DEPENDENCY AND NEGLECT CASES

##### Sources of complaint.

In some localities where many social agencies exist the court may prefer to have dependency and neglect cases investigated first by a social agency so that only cases needing court action are brought to court. In other localities, especially where there are few agencies, the court may make its own investigation of cases and receive complaints from any interested person, including parents and relatives.

Of the 12,063 dependency and neglect cases for which the source of complaint was reported 48 per cent were referred to court by social agencies and 36 per cent were referred by parents or relatives. The differences in practice among the 34 courts dealing with dependency and neglect cases are indicated by the variations in the percentages of cases received from social agencies and from parents and relatives in the various localities. In general, when the proportion referred by a social agency was large the proportion referred by parents or relatives was small, and vice versa.

The sources of complaint in dependency and neglect cases were as follows:

Source of complaint	Number	Per cent distribution
Total.....	12,150	
Sources of complaint reported.....	12,063	100
Social agency.....	5,787	48
Parents or relatives.....	4,350	36
Other individual (not probation officer).....	167	1
Police.....	66	1
Probation officer.....	458	4
School department.....	280	2
Other source of complaint.....	216	2
Sources of complaint not reported.....	87	

The percentage of dependency and neglect cases referred to court by social agencies (48 per cent for the 34 courts) ranged in individual courts reporting 50 or more cases from 10 to 100 and was more than 80 per cent in eight courts.<sup>2</sup> The proportion referred by parents or relatives (36 per cent of all cases) also showed great variation, ranging from no cases to 67 per cent. The number of cases received from other sources was generally small and showed no unusual variations except in three courts, where large proportions were referred by probation officers—Lake County, Ind. (51 per cent); Norfolk, Va. (21 per cent); and Pierce County, Wash. (28 per cent).

##### Places of care pending hearing or disposition.

The situation with regard to detention of children in dependency and neglect cases was similar to that in delinquency cases, except that practically no children (7 in 10,611 cases for which place of care was reported) were detained in jail. More than half the children were not detained; they were allowed to remain in their homes pending hearing or their cases were disposed of on the day the complaint was made. Boarding homes were used by most of the courts, but the number of cases so cared for was small. Detention homes, receiving homes or shelters of private agencies, and other institutions were used in slightly more than one-third of the cases. Most of the cases reported as cared for in receiving homes or other institutions were reported by New York City.

<sup>2</sup> San Francisco City and County, Calif.; Bridgeport, Conn.; Hennepin County and Ramsey County, Minn.; Buffalo, Dutchess County, and Westchester County, N. Y.; and Mahoning County, Ohio.

The places where children were cared for pending hearing or disposition in dependency and neglect cases were as follows:

Place of care pending hearing	Number	Per cent distribution
Total.....	12,150	
Places of care reported.....	10,611	100
Own home or care disposed of same day.....	5,890	55
Boarding home.....	540	5
Detention home or other institution.....	3,763	35
Detention home.....	559	5
Other institution.....	3,204	30
Jail or police station.....	7	( <sup>1</sup> / <sub>100</sub> )
Only place of care.....	4	( <sup>1</sup> / <sub>100</sub> )
One of the places of care.....	3	( <sup>1</sup> / <sub>100</sub> )
More than one place of care <sup>2</sup> .....	92	1
Other place of care.....	289	3
Places of care not reported <sup>3</sup> .....	1,539	

<sup>1</sup> Less than 1 per cent.

<sup>2</sup> Not including detention home, police station, or jail.

<sup>3</sup> Including Philadelphia unofficial cases, for which place of care was not reported.

#### Charges.

More than one-third (38 per cent) of the dependency and neglect cases were referred to court because of improper conditions in the home, including conditions such as immorality or intoxication. More than one-fourth (30 per cent) were referred for insufficient parental care, including lack of care because of illness or death of parents. In only a small proportion of cases (13 per cent) was financial need the chief reason for bringing the child to court. Great variation occurred in charges reported by different courts. For example, in courts reporting 50 or more cases, the percentages referred because of improper conditions ranged from 11 to 77 and those referred because of insufficient parental care ranged from 5 to 68. Four courts reported that more than half their cases were referred because of insufficient parental care. Explanation of these variations may be differences in local procedure. For example, the neglect cases may be referred to the court while dependency cases are handled by other social agencies, and there may be differences of interpretation as between insufficient parental care and financial need.

The charges on which dependency and neglect cases were referred to court were as follows:

Charge	Number	Per cent distribution
Total.....	12,150	
Charge reported.....	12,074	100
Abandonment or desertion.....	938	7
Abuse or cruel treatment.....	357	3
Improper conditions in home.....	4,552	38
Insufficient parental care.....	3,620	30
Financial need.....	1,572	13
Question of custody.....	639	5
Other charge.....	578	5
Charge not reported.....	76	

Dependency and neglect cases were tabulated not only on the basis of the individual children concerned but also on the basis of different families represented. That is, in the latter tabulations each family was counted only once for each time it was dealt with by the court on a new charge involving one or more of the children. The distribution according to charge is somewhat different when based upon families than when based upon children's cases. If the figures are omitted for the New York City court—for which no attempt was made to group cards by families and which handles only cases of neglect, dependency cases being cared for by other agencies—the number of cases of dependent and neglected children reported was 8,907, representing 4,566 families. Of the 4,540 of these families for which charge was reported 20 per cent were referred to court because of alleged improper conditions in the home, 34 per cent because of insufficient parental care, 15 per cent because of financial need, 10 per cent because of questions of custody, 10 per cent because of abandonment or desertion, and 10 per cent because of other reasons.

#### Dispositions.

The three types of disposition used in 99 per cent of the official dependency and neglect cases were commitment to institutions or agencies, placement under supervision of the court or of an individual, and dismissal or indefinite continuance of the case. As is shown by Table 13, almost half (49 per cent) of these dependency and neglect cases dealt with by the 34 courts reporting cases of dependency and neglect were disposed of by the commitment of the child to the care of an agency or an institution, most of which were maintained for the care of dependent children. Such commitments varied in the different courts reporting 50 or more cases from 18 per cent of the cases in Norfolk, Va., to 97 per cent in Hamilton County, Ohio. The relative proportions of commitments to agencies and to institutions by the individual courts indicate differences in local facilities for caring for dependent children as well as differences in court policy with regard to use of institutions or other methods of care for these children. Some courts probably committed the children to agencies, which then may have placed them in institutions. Commitment to an agency represented 50 per cent or more of the dispositions in Hennepin County, Minn., and Buffalo, Erie County, and Westchester County, N. Y.; commitment to an institution represented 50 per cent or more of the dispositions in Marion County, Ind., and Franklin County, Hamilton County, and Mahoning County, Ohio.

Children were placed under the supervision of court officers or of individuals in one-fourth of the cases, court supervision being used more frequently. The most striking variations from the average were Ramsey County, Minn., which reported 62 per cent of its cases disposed of by placing the child under the supervision of a court officer, and Buncombe County, N. C., which reported 65 per cent of its cases disposed of by placing the child under the supervision of an individual other than a court officer. A few courts did not use either of these two types of supervision to any considerable extent.

One-fourth of the official cases were dismissed or continued indefinitely. The percentage of cases so disposed of in the different courts ranged from none in Pierce County, Wash., and Buncombe County, N. C., to 46 per cent in Bridgeport, Conn., and Columbia County, N. Y., and was more than 30 per cent in 7 courts.

TABLE 13.—Dispositions of official dependency and neglect cases dealt with by 34 specified courts during 1927

Court	Official dependency and neglect cases														
	Total	Disposition													
		Total reported	Dismissed or continued indefinitely		Child placed under court supervision		Child placed under supervision of individual		Child committed to board, department, or agency		Child committed to institution		Other		Not reported
			Number	Per cent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Per cent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Per cent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Per cent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Per cent <sup>1</sup>	Number	Per cent <sup>1</sup>	
Total.....	9,777	9,744	2,368	25	1,698	19	593	6	2,106	22	2,639	27	119	1	33
California: San Francisco City and County.....	684	684	228	33	65	10	8		39	106	15	17	2		
Connecticut:															
Bridgeport.....	70	69	32	46	4	6			4	29	42	1	1	1	
Hartford.....	143	143	38	26	4	3	4		22	66	46	9	6		
Indiana:															
Clay County.....	4	4								4					
Jennings County.....	13	13	10		1					1					
Lake County.....	213	213	30	14	18	8	64		23	46	22	7	3		
Marion County.....	291	291	3	1	48	16	10		28	145	50	6	2		
Wayne County.....	20	20								2					
White County.....	7	7	4		3										
Michigan: Kent County.....	208	207	63	30	29	14	22		1	80	38	1	(?)	1	
Minnesota:															
Hennepin County.....	342	342	134	39			6		50	42	12				
Ramsey County.....	111	111	7	6	49	44	3		24	4	4	1	1		
New York:															
Buffalo.....	65	65	4	6	1	1			65	26	29				
Olliston County.....	48	48	3	6	10	21	7			28					
Columbia County.....	121	121	35	29	34	28	4		2	19	16	8	5		
Dutchess County.....	239	239	70	29	80	33	34		22	3	1	9	3		
Erie County.....	54	54	15	28					72						
Franklin County.....	24	24	0				6			6					
New York City.....	3,243	3,223	1,007	31	913	28	8		1	1,357	42	6	(?)	20	
Orleans County.....	14	14	3	21	2		1			3					
Westchester County.....	297	297	80	27			25		37	13	4	5	2		
North Carolina:															
Buncombe County.....	37	37					37			30	35				
Winston-Salem.....	24	24	1	4	6		11			4		7			
Ohio:															
Franklin County.....	263	261	24	9	20	9	47		10	135	52	0	3	1	
Hamilton County.....	114	106	1	1			2		41	61	55			3	
Mahoning County.....	190	190	25	13	2	1	23		10	113	61	4	3		
Pennsylvania:															
Berks County.....	13	13								3					
Lycoming County.....	17	17			1		17			0					
Montgomery County.....	31	31													
Philadelphia.....	2,312	2,312	404	17	693	30	145		39	343	15	9	(?)	3	
Tennessee: Memphis.....	190	185	62	34	36	19	39		19	37	20	1	3	3	
Virginia: Norfolk.....	183	180	68	37	22	12	41		9	17	9	21	11		
Washington: Pierce County.....	79	79					24		9	39	49	3	4		
Wisconsin: Dane County.....	43	43	2	5	12		9			5					

<sup>1</sup> Not shown where base is less than 50.

1 per cent.

Of the 2,192 unofficial dependency and neglect cases for which dispositions were reported more than half (58 per cent) were reported as closed because some social adjustment was made to relieve the situation. The dispositions in the remainder of the cases were as follows: Referred to an agency or another court, 16 per cent; placement of child in an institution or elsewhere recommended, 6 per cent; child placed under supervision of a probation officer, 3 per cent; and other disposition, 17 per cent.

#### Cases discharged from supervision.

Sixteen courts reported 1,184 cases of dependent and neglected children discharged from court supervision (which corresponds to probation in delinquency cases), but most of these cases were reported by three courts (San Francisco City and County, 192; New York City, 405; and Philadelphia, 461). In all but 21 of the cases discharged from supervision the child had been placed under supervision by official court order. The contrast between the number of cases of children placed under court supervision and the number of cases in which children were discharged therefrom was not so great in dependency and neglect cases as in delinquency cases. The number officially placed under court supervision by the courts which reported cases discharged from official supervision was 1,677. As in probation cases, the period of supervision was brief, usually only a few months. In 60 per cent of the cases the child was reported as discharged because the situation improved or further supervision was deemed unnecessary and in 23 per cent because he was committed to an institution or agency.

The reasons for discharge from supervision were as follows:

Reason for discharge	Number	Per cent distribution
Total.....	1,184	100
Child reached age limit.....	5	1
Further supervision not recommended <sup>1</sup> or child discharged with improvement.....	710	60
Child committed to institution or agency.....	208	18
Child committed to individual.....	30	3
Other reasons.....	108	14

<sup>1</sup>The first edition of card No. 3 read "Further probationary supervision not recommended." This item was found to be used generally to note the termination of the period with improvement, and a later print of the card was changed to read "Discharged with improvement before age limit."

## APPENDIX.—TREND IN JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The statistics for the year 1927 published in the body of this report are the first to be compiled by the Children's Bureau in accordance with the uniform plan outlined, and there are no figures for previous years with which they can be compared. For several years, however, the Children's Bureau has compiled such information as could be obtained concerning juvenile delinquency<sup>1</sup> from the annual reports of the juvenile courts throughout the country. Lack of uniformity in methods of compiling statistics used in the different courts and marked variations in inclusions and methods of presentation make the statistics practically valueless for purposes of comparing delinquency rates in one city with those of other cities. Such figures are, however, of value in determining the trend in juvenile delinquency in a given city over a period of years. This fragmentary evidence concerning trend indicates that assertions regarding increase of delinquency have little or no basis in fact, though much unnecessary delinquency exists, and a scientific approach to the problem becomes increasingly important.

The material now available which is of significance in connection with a consideration of trends in juvenile delinquency is summarized under the following headings: Delinquency rates in 13 cities, in different parts of the country, based on annual reports of courts; and statistics of juvenile delinquents committed to institutions during the first six months of 1923 as reported by the United States Bureau of the Census (Children under Institutional Care, 1923).

### DELINQUENCY RATES IN 13 CITIES

The table on page 36 shows the number of delinquency cases per 1,000 children of juvenile-court age in 13 cities for which statistics are available for the years 1915 to 1925 or 1926. (For some of these cities statistics can be obtained for part of the period only.) The notes to the table explain the sources from which the statistics were compiled. As has been pointed out, these figures are of value in determining the trend in juvenile delinquency in a given city, but they can not be used for the purpose of comparing delinquency rates in different cities. Great confusion exists with reference to types of cases included, some cities reporting only cases officially heard by the court and others reporting, in addition, cases adjusted unofficially by the probation department. There is also much difference in the extent to which the police of the different cities turn over to their courts the children whom they have apprehended.

The data in this table indicate for most of the cities lower delinquency rates at the end of the period than at the beginning. Slight

<sup>1</sup> Several editions of a mimeographed statement entitled "Trend in Juvenile-Delinquency Statistics," the last dated October 21, 1927, have been issued. Because of the more comprehensive plan in which the Children's Bureau is now engaged this statement will no longer be kept in circulation.

fluctuations from year to year are to be expected and are not especially significant. The decrease in New York has been quite marked, the rate at the beginning of the period being 11.1 as compared with 6.3 in 1926. Providence and Boston, like several other cities, had higher rates during 1918 and 1919, but the Providence rate has declined markedly since 1919. The Boston figures show a marked decrease since 1918 and 1919 except for a slight rise in the period 1923 to 1925, declining again in 1926. The Boston rates for the years since 1920 are considerably lower than the rates for any previous year. The Philadelphia rate has shown little change from 1921 to 1926, though slightly higher rates were reported in 1923 and 1924 than in earlier or later years. The Seattle rate increased rather consistently.

Number of delinquency cases<sup>1</sup> per 1,000 children of juvenile-court age (over 6 years of age and within the juvenile-court age<sup>2</sup>); 13 cities, 1915-1926

Year	Boston	Buffalo	Chicago	Detroit	Minneapolis	New Orleans	New York	Philadelphia	Providence	Richmond	St. Louis	Seattle	Washington
1926	15.9	10.8	4.9	14.8	14.0	6.3	20.1	10.4	40.2	-----	20.8	41.4	-----
1925	17.2	10.4	5.7	13.6	15.0	13.4	7.2	19.3	10.8	43.8	-----	18.7	45.6
1924	10.5	10.5	5.1	11.0	14.1	13.7	6.4	22.1	13.3	40.1	13.3	18.9	42.8
1923	15.8	13.1	4.4	11.4	13.9	12.1	8.9	28.9	14.1	41.2	16.9	17.9	41.0
1922	14.5	9.8	4.2	9.6	17.8	16.4	8.8	20.0	13.0	30.0	12.4	17.4	46.9
1921	18.9	-----	5.6	9.8	-----	20.7	7.4	20.9	13.9	48.4	12.5	18.9	44.5
1920	18.7	14.7	5.0	11.2	-----	20.8	8.6	-----	16.1	46.0	12.7	16.3	33.1
1919	26.5	12.9	7.5	13.0	-----	22.3	10.1	-----	20.4	49.3	18.1	10.8	34.4
1918	24.8	23.8	5.8	12.5	-----	18.7	10.6	-----	20.9	34.6	10.1	7.7	28.4
1917	20.9	14.3	5.8	10.1	-----	20.3	10.9	-----	18.6	43.7	17.8	10.0	-----
1916	20.4	13.5	5.5	6.7	-----	22.9	8.9	-----	15.3	43.3	14.3	11.5	-----
1915	20.6	-----	5.0	8.6	-----	22.8	11.1	-----	13.3	-----	-----	13.8	-----

<sup>1</sup> The numbers of cases were compiled from the annual reports of the courts, either printed or in manuscript, with the exception of the Boston figures, which were compiled from the annual reports of the State department of correction (formerly bureau of prisons); the Detroit figures, which were compiled from the annual reports of the Michigan State Welfare Commission; and the Minneapolis figures for 1926, which were compiled from the statistical cards sent to the Children's Bureau in connection with the bureau's plan for obtaining uniform juvenile-court statistics. The delinquency figures relate to males, not children, with the exception of the Richmond figures, which relate to children; that is, if the same child was in court twice during the year he was counted twice. Cases dealt with unofficially as well as official cases are included.

<sup>2</sup> Population estimates were based on the 1910 and 1920 censuses. If the court exercised jurisdiction over a county the population of the county was used.

<sup>3</sup> Chicago, fiscal year Dec. 1 to Nov. 30; Detroit and Washington, fiscal year ending June 30, of the year indicated; Boston, some years calendar, other years fiscal.

<sup>4</sup> Figures shown here differ from those in earlier editions of this table owing to changes in the courts' methods of counting cases.

#### JUVENILES COMMITTED TO INSTITUTIONS FOR JUVENILE DELINQUENTS AND TO PENAL INSTITUTIONS AS REPORTED BY THE UNITED STATES BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Published census reports of juvenile delinquents in institutions or committed to institutions are available for the years 1880, 1890, 1904, 1910, and 1923. Differences in methods of taking the census make the figures for the earlier years only roughly comparable, but the statistics for 1910 and 1923 are not seriously affected by such differences. The figures include persons in or committed to institutions for juvenile delinquents and persons under 18 years of age in or committed to prisons and reformatories, jails, and workhouses.

The number of persons 10 to 17 years of age enumerated on a given date in institutions of the kind specified per 100,000 population of the same age was 143.4 in 1880, 149.2 in 1890, and 154.5 in 1923.

The relatively slight increase reflects the more adequate provision of institutional care especially adapted to juvenile delinquents in 1923 as compared with the earlier period. It is not possible to present similar ratios for 1904 and 1910, but considering only persons in institutions for juvenile delinquents and not persons in penal institutions the ratio per 100,000 population has been practically stationary since 1904. The growth of the probation system has come mainly within the period since that date.

A more significant figure is the number of commitments during a given period. The total number of delinquent persons 10 to 17 years of age admitted to institutions of all types during the entire year 1910 was 24,854, or 171.7 delinquents per 100,000 of the same age. The corresponding figure for 1923 (estimate based on exact figures for first six months) was 25,565, a ratio of 156.5 per 100,000 population of the same age. (The ratio in 1923 would have been 161 if the small number of dependent children admitted to institutions for juvenile delinquents had been included as it was in 1910.) There has thus been a decline in delinquent children committed to institutions if growth in population is taken into consideration.