

A SURVEY OF CONCENTRATED DELINQUENCY AREAS

IN

EUGENE, OREGON

by

MASON W. ROBISON

A THESIS

Presented to the School of Education
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science

June 1952

APPROVED:



(Advisor for the Thesis)

mm gift 3.07 Bd. 974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I INTRODUCTION	1
II RELATED STUDIES	4
Age of Related Studies	33
III PROCEDURE FOR RESEARCH	34
Definition of Delinquency	34
Dependency Cases	34
Research Procedure	35
Method of Research	35
History, Functions and Findings of	
Skipworth Home	37
Growth of Eugene	46
General Breakdown of Offenses	
for 1950	47
General Breakdown of Offenses	
for 1951	51
Geographical Distribution of	
Delinquents for the Years	
1950 and 1951	52
Housing Survey for Eugene and	
Springfield	54
Geographical Location of Dwelling	
Types in Eugene	56
Demolition of Buildings	60
Transient Areas	61
Recreational Facilities in Delinquent	
Areas	62
Ecological Distribution of School	
Age Children	62
IV INTERPRETATION OF DATA	67
Conclusions	67
Suggestions for Future Study	69
BIBLIOGRAPHY	70
APPENDIX	
A MAP SHOWING THE GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION	
OF JUVENILE DELINQUENTS IN EUGENE . . .	71

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I Delinquency in Rural Areas	26
II Kind and Number of Offenses Referred to the Detention Home Since June 1950	42
III Dispersion of Rural Commitment	45
IV Comparative Economic Survey for Eugene	46
V Distribution of Children in Eugene	65

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

An expression of deepest appreciation is due Mr. John A. Pierce-Jones for his inspiring and guiding help in the development of this project, and, with Mr. Arthur E. Hearn and Mrs. Bernice Madison, for their sincere assistance and suggestions.

To Mr. Louis Sherman, Lane County Probation Officer; Judge William East of the Circuit Court; Mr. Ray Baker, Superintendent of Lane County Detention Home; Mr. Fred Brenne, Secretary, Senior Chamber of Commerce; Mr. Harold Wood; Mr. Dean Lobaugh, Assistant Superintendent of Instruction for Eugene Public Schools; Mr. Ralph Patterson, Eugene Water and Electric Company; and my wife, Dolores, is given full recognition for any success this project may have achieved.

Due recognition is given to the numerous other organizations and individuals which have supplied necessary information concerning the community about which this report is concerned.

M. W. R.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The problem under consideration for this thesis is to find the geographic location of juvenile delinquents' home areas in Eugene, Oregon. Some attention is given to Springfield, namely, Glenwood. Mention is also made of other communities in Lane County, Oregon, but research in those communities in Lane County other than Eugene was not attempted.

The basic hypothesis for this study is that the homes of juvenile delinquents will be concentrated in certain areas outside of the business district in Eugene and that in these delinquent areas the following conditions will exist: low socio-economic residences and excessive inability within the area. Other factors, of course, will be present and will be discussed in a later chapter.

Initial data was obtained from the Lane County Juvenile Department, the Lane County Detention Home, Eugene Chamber of Commerce, Eugene City Planning Board, Eugene Water Board, interviews with community leaders, and personal observation with areas. The location of concentrated delinquency areas was determined by use of spot maps.

Areas that contribute to delinquency should be considered critically by a community. The assumption for this study is that the occurrence and frequency of juvenile crimes can be alleviated by controlling the total environment whence they originate. Before any action concerning the improvement of environmental conditions

found where concentrated juvenile delinquency exists, these areas must first be located. This indicated the importance of this study. There are strong indications for action among community leaders, enforcement officers and educative agencies to be primary forces toward the improvement of these contributing delinquency factors.

A separate study has been made concerning the geographic location of dependent children referred to the Juvenile Court. By use of spot-maps, it was found that specific areas harbored most of the homes where dependent children had lived. These areas, it was found, corresponded with the areas of concentrated delinquents' homes. Therefore, it is assumed that the inclusion of dependent children in this study is warranted, not only because of the congruency of areas, but also because the homes where delinquency is found generally serve as good "breeding grounds" for future delinquency.

It is assumed that the distribution of juvenile delinquents will follow patterns according to the physical structure of the city and that Eugene may be considered as a typical American city. Eugene, however, has enjoyed an increase in population of 71% over the past ten years, but most of the physical growth has taken place at the periphery of the city. The periphery, it has been found, contains the least juvenile offenders and the rate increases as the area next to business district is approached. The least growth then has been in the area next to the central business zone. The outstanding finding is that delinquent acts which are serious enough to appear in juvenile court are fixated in the city and tend to disappear toward the periphery of the city and in the better residential areas

which are usually on the outskirts.

One may criticize that most children at one time or another commit some act that may be considered delinquent behavior, but many of these problems are dealt with directly by the parents, by a guidance clinic, or by neighborhood action. In recognition of this criticism, the writer feels that it is with the cases which are serious enough to be referred to a court that the community should be concerned.

CHAPTER II

RELATED STUDIES

Studies which have been conducted to learn the incidence of recorded delinquency have been made within the last one hundred years and particularly during this century. These studies have indicated that delinquency and crime have varied in incidence from one community to another.¹ A monograph by Shaw² was one such study which employed the home addresses of some 60,000 male delinquents who had been treated as delinquents, truants, and criminals by the police, school authorities and the courts. The study clearly indicated that all three groups were concentrated in certain specific areas of the city. The area around the central business district or the concentrated industrial zones showed the greatest frequency of delinquent behavior. This study showed that these areas were low-income communities. Those areas on the outlying residential zones of higher economic status had little delinquent referrals and were uniformly consistent in being free from delinquency centers. The work by the same author entitled Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas, published in 1942, brought the previous volume up to that date and includes comparative data for several other large American cities. Both of these volumes will be discussed in greater detail

¹Shaw, Clifford R. and McKay, Henry D. Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942, p. 3, ff.

²Shaw, Clifford R. Delinquency Areas, 1929.

later, since these works are representative of most related studies and may be considered the most important.

In the earliest of studies which determined the relation between delinquency and crime with cultural and social background, attention was focused primarily upon the differences noted between large districts or cities within a country. These studies were then followed by research which revealed that there were not only differences in cities as a whole, but within the city itself; i.e., that there were zones within the city which had greater incidence of delinquency than other zones.

One of the early studies made was by Guerry in France. Guerry reported findings of crime rates for the 86 departments in France according to the number of persons accused of crime during 1825-30. As one may expect, the variations in rates were very marked and varied from one person out of 2,199 inhabitants who committed crime against the person in Corse to one out of 37,014 in Creuse. The average for all of the departments in France for crime against the person was one out of 17,085. For reported crimes against property, the variation was from one out of 1,368 inhabitants in Seine to one out of 20,235 in Creuse, with an average of 1 out of 6,031 for France.³

As early as 1839, Rawson made a study concerning the number of criminals in one county as compared to other counties in both England and Wales. He found that some counties contained as many as five

³Guerry, Andre Michel. Essai sur la statistique morale de la France, (Paris, 1833).

Other pertinent studies made in France include Joly, H.; La France iriminelle, Paris: 1891, and Tarde, Gabriel, Penal Philosophy, tr. by Howell, R. (Boston, 1912).

times more criminals than other counties.⁴ Various government reports were made during this period concerning the number of criminals in proportion to population. All of these reports indicated that certain areas in England and Wales harbored more criminals than other areas.⁵ In 1862, Mayhew reported his finding after a thorough and exhaustive research of crime and delinquency for England. Mayhew used a series of spot maps of England which showed areas of greatest concentration over a given period. His work with counties showed that in some counties the incidence of criminal acts was four times greater than in other counties. In the 41 counties of England and Wales, the rate of incidence ranged from .261% to .071% of the total population. There are reports of many similar studies made during this same period, but all the results are sufficiently alike that the above reports are representative.⁶

⁴Rawson, W. "An Inquiry into the Statistics of Crime in England and Wales," Journal of the Statistical Society of London, II (1839), 334-44.

⁵For similar studies during this period see Redgrove, S., "Abstract of Criminal Tables for England and Wales," I (1838), 231-45; Neison, F. G. P., "Statistics of Crime in England and Wales for the Years 1834-1844," Ibid. XI, (1848), 140-65; Fletcher, Joseph, "Moral and Educational Statistics of England and Wales," Ibid., pp. 344-66 and Ibid., XII (1849), 189-336; W. M. Tarrt, Ibid., XX (1857), 365-77; Carpenter, Mary, "Importance of Statistics to the Reformatory Movement, with Returns from Female Reformatories," Ibid., pp. 33-40; Bunce, J. Thackray, Ibid., XXVIII (1865), 518-26; Hammick, James T, "On the Judicial Statistics of England and Wales, with Special Reference to the Recent Returns Relating to Crime," Ibid., XXX (1867), 375-426; and Levi, Leone, "A Survey of Indictable and Summary Jurisdiction Offenses in England and Wales, 1857-1876," esp. IX, "Locality of Crime," Ibid., LXIII (1880), 423-56.

⁶Mayhew, Henry. London Labor and the London Poor (London; 1862), IV, 455.

As already mentioned, early methods of research in this field attempted to show the difference in rate of criminal and delinquent acts from one large area to another and these studies were, as a natural sequence, followed by other reports which proposed to determine differences between areas within corporate limits of a city or between any two small organized areas. Following these numerous studies which determined the difference in crime rates between counties in England and Wales, came studies of similar comparisons between districts within specific counties in England and Wales. In a study published in 1856 by John Glyde, comparison of the number of criminals in the 17 poor law unions in Suffolk County, England was established and a ratio of criminals ranged from 1 in 1,314 to 1 in 464 inhabitants for all the districts.⁷ The recognition that delinquency and criminal rates were discernible in smaller areas and related to socio-economic conditions was becoming evident among the researchers in this field during this period in England. Glyde also noted distinct differences between rural and urban incidences of crime rates within cities in the same county and concluded his report by saying that: "as tables of crime for all England include counties of various degrees of criminality, so does the average for the county of Suffolk include districts, towns, and villages of opposite moral tendencies as developed by their criminal aspects."

⁷"Locality of Crime in Suffolk," Journal of the Statistical Society of London, XIX (1856), 102.

Several decades later, interest was aroused among Italian students concerning incidence of criminals per unit of population. To mention only two of many researchers in Italy, Niceforo and Lombroso published their reports in 1897 and 1911, respectively. They found that the type of crime varies from city to city or province to province. Niceforo noted from his study on the island of Sardinia that the ratio of robbery and extortion cases, in proportion to the total population, varied widely among different districts of the island.⁸ Lombroso stated in his report concerning criminality in Italy that:

In every part of Italy, almost in every province, there exists some village renowned for having furnished an unbroken series of special delinquents. Thus, in Liguria, Lerice is proverbial for swindlers, Campofreddo and Masson for homicides, Pozzolo for highway robberies. In the province of Lucca, Capannori is noted for its assassinations, and Carde in Piedmont for its field thefts. In southern Italy, Saro, Melfi and St. Fele have always had their bandits since 1860, and the same is true of Partinico and Monreale in Sicily. . . . But the most famous of all is the village of Artena in the province of Rome It is to be noted that in Sicily brigandage is almost exclusively confined to that famous valley of the Canea d'Oro.⁹

Aschaffenburg conducted similar studies in Germany and Austria and summarized his findings in Germany by stating:

While in the whole of Germany there were 1104 convicted persons to every 100,000 persons of punishable age, the number of such convicts in the government districts was: Oppeln 1860, Bromberg 1842, Gumbinnen 1746, Bremen 1732, The Palatinate 1657, Danzig 1541, Upper Bavaria 1484, Posen 1424, and

⁸Niceforo, Alfredo. La Delinquenza in Sardegna (Palermo, 1897).

⁹Lombroso, Cesare. Crime: Its Causes and Remedies, New York: Little, Brown and Co., 1911, pp. 23-24.

Mannheim 1211. On the other hand, Schaumburg-Lippe had only 419, and Waldeck 439 convictions. Waldeck offers an excellent opportunity for comparison with a section containing approximately the same number of inhabitants. In 1890, Waldeck had a population of 38,986, Pirmasens 38,327. In Waldeck there were annually 172 convictions, while in Pirmasens there were 885;¹⁰

Although systematic studies concerning the incidence of crime and delinquency within particular districts of a city had not yet been made, there is conclusive evidence of an awareness by these early investigators that intramural differences did exist. In London, especially, early investigations emphasized higher crime rates in some "low neighborhoods" of that city. As early as 1840, Allison stated:

If any person will walk through St. Giles', the crowded alleys of Dublin, or the poorer quarters of Glasgow by night, he will meet with ample proof of these observations; he will no longer wonder at the disorderly habits and profligate enjoyments of the lower orders; his astonishment will be, not that there is so much, but that there is so little crime in the world. The great cause of human corruption in these crowded situations is the contagious nature of bad example and the extreme difficulty of avoiding the seductions of vice when they are brought into close and daily proximity with the younger part of the people. Whatever we may think of the strength of virtue, experience proves that the higher orders are indebted for their exemption from atrocious crime or disorderly habits chiefly to their fortunate removal from the scene of temptation; and that where they are exposed to the seductions which assail their inferiors, they are noways behind them in yielding to their influence. It is the particular misfortune of the poor in great cities that they cannot fly from these irresistible temptations, but that, turn where they will, they are met by the alluring forms of vice The rich, who censure their conduct, would in all probability yield as rapidly as they have done to the influence of similar causes. There is a certain degree of misery, a certain proximity to sin, which

¹⁰Aschaffenburg, Gustav. Crime and Its Repression, New York: Little, Brown and Co., 1913, p. 43.

virtue is rarely able to withstand, and which the young, in particular, are generally unable to resist. The progress of vice in such circumstances is almost as certain and often nearly as rapid as that of physical contagion.¹¹

In 1862, Mayhew again indicated the influence of "low neighborhoods," and stated:

There are thousands of neglected children loitering about the low neighborhoods of the metropolis, and prowling about the streets, begging and stealing for their daily bread. They are to be found in Westminster, Whitechapel, Shoreditch, St. Giles', New Cut, Lambeth, the Borough, and other localities. Hundreds of them may be seen leaving their parents' homes and low-lodging houses every morning, sallying forth in search of food and plunder. They are fluttering in rags and in the most motley attire. Some are orphans and have no one to care for them; others have left their homes and live in lodging-houses in the most improvident manner, never thinking of tomorrow; others are sent out by their unprincipled parents to beg and steal for a livelihood; others are the children of poor but honest and industrious people, who have been led to steal through the bad companionship of juvenile thieves. Many of them have never been at a day-school nor attended a Sunday school, and have had no moral or religious instruction. On the contrary, they have been surrounded by the most baneful and degrading influences, and have set a bad example by their parents and others with whom they came in contact, and are shunned by the honest and industrious classes of society

These juvenile thieves are chiefly to be found in Lucretia Street, Lambeth; Union Street, Borough Road; also at Whitechapel, St. Giles's, Drury Lane, Somers Town, Anderson Grove and other localities

The chief sources whence are pickpockets spring are from the low lodging houses--from those dwellings in low neighborhoods, where their parents are thieves, and where improvident and drunken people neglect their children, such as Whitechapel, Shoreditch, Spitalfields, New Cut, Lambeth, the Borough, Clerkenwell, Drury Lane, and other localities¹²

¹¹Allison, Archibald. The Principles of Population and the Connection with Human Happiness, Edinburgh: Wm. Blackwood and Son, 1840, II, 76-78.

¹²Mayhew, Op. Cit., IV, 273, 278, 304.

Among the first of the systematic studies within a city was made by Burt in London in 1925.¹³ Burt used the home address of each youngster reported as an industrial school case for over a two year period. These were plotted on a map of London which had been divided into electoral areas for use in the study. The ratio between the number of cases in each area and the total number of children on the rolls of the councils schools was established and ranged from 0.42 to 0.0 while the average for the whole city was 0.14. Those areas with the highest rates, 0.25 and up, were found to be located near the central business district and tended to disappear the farther away from the central business district the area was located. The areas of lowest rates, 0.05 and less, were located near the periphery of the city. These delinquent areas correspond with areas which were earlier described as "low neighborhoods" and with a study made by Booth in 1891 in which he showed poverty areas of London by map.¹⁴ It seemed quite evident to these early investigators that economic standing of a section of a city was undoubtedly a determinant of delinquency and crime rates for that section.

A great number of students began focusing their attention upon intramural delinquent areas in American cities after 1900. In 1912, a rather comprehensive study was made of the ecological distribution of juvenile delinquents in Chicago by Breckenridge and Abbott.

¹³Burt, Cyril. The Young Delinquent, London: D. Appleton and Co., 1925, pp. 67-90.

¹⁴Booth, Charles. Life and Labor in London, London, 1891, Vol. II, Appen., "Showing Map of London Poverty by Districts."

Using the files of the Juvenile Court of Cook County for a ten year period beginning in 1899, they plotted, among other things, the location of the homes of the juvenile offenders who were referred to the court. The plotted map showed disproportionately large numbers of delinquents' homes were in certain sections of Chicago and in regard to this they stated:

A study of this map makes possible several conclusions with regard to "delinquent neighborhoods." It becomes clear, in the first place, that the region from which the children of the court chiefly come is the densely populated West Side, and that the most conspicuous centers of delinquency in this section have been the congested wards which lie along the river and the canals

. . . . The West Side furnished the largest quota of delinquency across the river. These are chiefly the Italian quarter of the Twenty-Second Ward on the North Side; the First and Second Wards, which together include the district of segregated vice and a portion of the so-called "black belt" of the South Side; and such distinct industrial communities as the districts near the steel mills of South Chicago and near the Stockyards.¹⁵

But even as long ranged as this study was, it failed to show the proportion of delinquents to the total population in these delinquent neighborhoods and therefore it is impossible to conclude that these concentrated delinquent areas are due to anything other than greater density of population in these areas. Since this study, however, there have been numerous studies which did make a comparison to the total number of residents.

A survey of Lawrence, Kansas was made in 1915 by Ernest W. Burgess under the direction of Professor F. W. Blackmar. By the use of spot maps, delinquent areas were determined by six different wards in the

¹⁵Breckinridge, Sophonisba P. and Abbott, Edith. The Delinquent Child and the Home, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1912, pp. 150-53.

city and the number of delinquents was compared to the total number of juveniles in each ward. Wide variations among wards were noted both in the number and frequency of cases. The ratio of delinquents to the total population between 5 and 16 years of age varied from 8.36 to 0.82 and in this regard, Burgess comments:

The significant fact to be gathered from the records of the children of Lawrence is the large proportion of juvenile delinquents in the entire child population in the fourth ward. One child out of every twelve children five and over, but under seventeen years old, appeared in the juvenile court in the two-year period studied. If this proportion were maintained for a twelve-year period, comprising the age groups between five and seventeen, the presumption is that at least one-half of the children in the fourth ward would have appeared before the juvenile judge before reaching seventeen years. Since the proportion of juvenile delinquency in the fourth ward is three times as large as that in any other ward, the conclusion naturally follows that certain factors are at work here which are absent elsewhere in Lawrence

The low percentages of delinquency in ward 5 and 6, in North Lawrence, is to be accounted for by the semi-rural character of the community, with its opportunities for play, and by the distance from the industrial and business part of the community.¹⁶

In 1917, McKenzie conducted a more general study of Columbus, Ohio in which he not only indicated the ecological distribution of delinquent children's homes, but also rates of delinquency in the various wards of the city. A thorough study of a community was also included. The ratio between the number of delinquents and the number of registered voters in each of the 16 wards of the city ranged from 1.66 to 0.35.¹⁷

¹⁶Blackmar, F. W. and Burgess, E. W. Lawrence School Survey, Lawrence: University of Kansas, 1917, pp. 71-72.

¹⁷McKenzie, R. D. The Neighborhood: A Study of Local Life in the City of Columbus, Ohio, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1923.

Just prior to the war, quite a number of ecological studies were made of crime and delinquency. The findings of these studies quite closely correspond to Shaw and McKay's earlier study reported in Delinquency Areas.¹⁸

¹⁸For other related studies, see Halpern, Irwin W.; Stanidaus, John N.; and Botein, Bernard; A Statistical Study of the Distribution of Adult and Juvenile Delinquents in the Boroughs of Manhattan and Brooklyn, New York: Polygraphic Co. of America, 1934; White, R. Clyde; "The Relation of Felonies to Environmental Factors in Indianapolis," Social Forces, Vol. X; Lottier, J. B. "Distribution of Criminal Offenses in Metropolitan Regions," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, Vol. XXIX; Adler, Herman; Fahn, Frances; and Stuart, Johannes, The Incidence of Delinquency in Berkeley, 1928-32, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1934; Trauger, Donald; Kral, L.; and Rauscher, W. Social Analysis of Des Moines, Des Moines: Iowa State Planning Board, 1935; Keyes, Vernon Q. Survey of Juvenile Delinquency in Evanston, Illinois, W. P. A. Report, 1940; Frankel, Emil, New Brunswick Delinquency Areas Study, W. P. A. Report, 1936; Taft, Donald R. "Testing the Selective Influence of Areas of Delinquency," American Journal of Sociology, XXXVIII, 1833; Elmer, M. C. "Maladjustment of Youth in Relation to Density of Population," Proceedings of the American Sociological Society, Vol. XXII; Green, Howard W. Population Characteristics by Census Tracts, Cleveland, Ohio, Cleveland: Plain Dealer Pub. Co., 1931; Shelton, H. D. "Problems in the Statistical Study of Juvenile Delinquency," Metron, XII, 1934; Frazier, E. Franklin, The Negro Family in Chicago, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933, pp. 204-19; Ellis, William J. Delinquency Areas in Essex County Municipalities, Trenton, 1938; Schroeder, Clarence W. Delinquency in Peoria, Peoria, Illinois: Bradley Polytechnic Institute, 1939; Sutherland, Edwin H. "Ecological Survey of Delinquency and Crime in Bloomington, Indiana," Indiana University, 1937; Maller, J. B. Juvenile Delinquency in the State of New York, Legislative Document No. 62, 1940, 115 pages; Young, Kimball; Gillan, John; and Dedrick, Calvin, The Madison Community, Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1934; and Weaver, W. W. West Philadelphia: A Study of Natural Social Areas, Ph. D. Thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1930.

The comprehensive study of Shaw and McKay, published in 1942 was essentially a continuation of Shaw's first study of delinquency centers in Chicago, twenty years earlier. This later study includes twenty cities and tens of thousands of juvenile delinquents. In regard to the hypothesis and method of research, the authors state:

The findings of the study establish conclusively a fact of far-reaching significance, namely, that the distribution of juvenile delinquents in space and time follows the pattern of the physical structure and of the social organization of the American city.

The method employed by the authors to test this hypothesis is ingenious but simple. If the main trend in city growth expansion is from the center to the periphery, then two consequences follow. Physical deterioration of residences will be highest around the central business district, lowest at the outskirts, and intermediate in between. Social disorganization will correspondingly be greatest in the central zone, least in the outer zone, and moderate in the middle zone. the incidence of juvenile delinquency would be expected to be highest in the residential areas of the center of the city and to decrease regularly to the periphery.¹⁹

Shaw and McKay's findings were very uniform for every city studied. The highest rates of delinquency were found near the central business district and tended to disappear at the periphery. The authors recognize that other factors forming the physical structure of city are street plans, topography, railway and rapid-transit lines, early settlements and early location of industry.

This study is corroborated by other ecological studies including the study made of New York City by Maller.²⁰ Dr. Maller's study

¹⁹Shaw and McKay, Op. Cit., Intro. p. ix.

²⁰Maller, J. B. Maladjusted Youth, Legislative Document No. 75, 1939, 201 pages.

followed the same pattern as Shaw's.

Shaw and McKey used several criteria to indicate evidences of differentiation resulting from city growth in Chicago.

a. Demolition of substandard housing. Many buildings were condemned or demolished during the year 1935 in Chicago and a map showing where most of these old buildings are or were before demolition shows a very close association with areas of highest delinquency, i.e., that the oldest buildings were near the central business district.

b. Increase and decrease of population. Many areas in Chicago were being depopulated while the city as a whole was growing rapidly from 1920 to 1930. It was noted that the areas of greatest depopulation were invariably located around the central business district, while the new residential areas near the city limits had the greatest increase in population.

c. Segregation of population on an economic basis. The areas of decreasing population are correlated with lower economic status of the group living in those areas when the indexes of economic status are: home ownership; percentage of families on relief; median rentals; dependent families; number owning radios and occupation.

d. Families on relief. The highest percentage of families on relief were found near the central business district and the lowest percentage were found on the outlying and newer districts of the city. To put it another way, most families on relief came from the areas of greatest physical deterioration within the city.

e. Median rentals. This is the median equivalent monthly rentals for 140 areas into which Shaw divided Chicago. They are based upon the monthly rental and value of the homes as compared to the total number of homes in each square mile. As one may expect, the areas of lowest monthly rentals are concentrated around the central business district and become higher as one moves away toward the city limits.

f. Occupation groups. A disproportionate number of industrial and ordinary workers live around the central business district in the area of greatest physical deterioration. Clerical and professional workers tend to live in the outlying residential districts. This occupation segregation is further evidence of segregation of members of different economic status in various areas of the city.

g. Segregation of racial and nationality groups as a product of economic segregation. Racial and nativity group separation is a contributor of economic separation. In Chicago, the foreign born and the Negroes are in the areas of greatest physical deterioration while the native white members tend to live outward from the central business district because, this group belongs, as a whole, in a higher economic bracket. These lower income groups tend to live around concentrated industrial areas as well, not only because it is cheaper, but also because it is more convenient to be near their work. The Negroes do not fall into the same convenient distribution as closely as the whites largely because of racial barriers which prevent their movement.

h. Concentration of most recent immigrants and migrants. Newest immigrant arrivals tend to be located around the central business districts while older and more established immigrant groups are more

dispersed throughout the city. In a study by Frazier, he found that recent Negro migrants tend to settle in the most deteriorated sections of the Negro districts. In regard to this, he states:

Although nearly four-fifths of all the Negroes in Chicago were born in the South, the proportion of southern-born inhabitants in the population diminishes as one leaves these sections of the Negro community nearest the heart of the city. It is in those zones just outside of the Loop where decaying residences and tattering frame dwellings presage the inroads of industry and business that the southern migrant is able to pay the cheap rents that landlords are willing to accept until their property is demanded by the expanding business area.²¹

By the use of spot maps, Shaw clearly indicated that the area of highest juvenile delinquency in Chicago was near the central business district. Those areas of concentrated delinquency not located near the central business district were, for the most part, located near outlying industrial areas.

The areas of highest infant mortality were found to be in the same areas of highest juvenile delinquents. Spot maps formed for areas of greatest rates of tuberculosis and mental disorders were found to correspond with spot maps of juvenile delinquency.²²

It is evident that juvenile delinquency is not an isolated problem but is closely associated with truancy, crime, infant mortality, tuberculosis and mental disorder.

Philadelphia, unlike Chicago, expanded as a city in a planned

²¹Shaw and McKay, Op. Cit., pp. 27-32.

²²Ibid., pp. 93-101.

sequence. A close examination of spot maps of juvenile delinquency in Philadelphia reveals that the main concentration of juvenile delinquents is around the central business district except in some small portions which had a small juvenile population. Other strong concentration of delinquents are noted throughout the city, but these are in districts which were separate towns or cities before the consolidation of Philadelphia in 1854 and these areas, of course, have their own central business districts. These areas of concentrated juvenile delinquents are also areas of high rates of delinquent activity. The area around the central business district of Old Philadelphia is marked by the following characteristics: population decrease; physical deterioration of buildings; greatest demolition of condemned buildings; lowest house rentals; less home ownership; a disproportionate number of foreign-born and Negro population, and greatest number of older-boy criminals.²³

It is not necessary to include a detailed analysis of each city included in this study for each one took on a characteristic pattern. The other cities studied besides Chicago and Philadelphia were Boston, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Richmond, Columbus, Birmingham, Little Rock, Denver, Peoria, Baltimore, Seattle, Portland, Vancouver, Spokane and Tacoma. In each of these cities the areas of concentrated juvenile delinquency was found in the central part of the city around the main business section. These areas were characterized by physical deterioration.

²³Ibid., pp. 191-215.

Weeks and Smith made a study of Spokane and arrived at the same major conclusions concerning ecological distribution of delinquents. They divided Spokane into tiers to show contrasting areas of delinquents whose addresses were obtained from the Juvenile Court. In regard to zonal distribution, they comment:

All school districts which included and immediately surrounded the center of the city were grouped in Tier I. The districts contiguous to these formed Tier II; in like manner were formed Tiers III and IV. The delinquency rates in these tiers of districts were found to be, respectively, 6.88, 4.74, 3.21, and 2.52 per hundred males. Thus, even with the crude units with which it was necessary to deal, the delinquency rates decreased decidedly toward the periphery of the city.²⁴

Shaw's work in Baltimore which attempted to show a difference in race distribution agreed with the conclusions of Moses in his study of Negro delinquents in Chicago.²⁵ Shaw found that Negro delinquents tend to concentrate on deteriorated sections around the central business district. In this respect, he comments:

This concentration in deteriorated areas at comparable distances from the central business district reveals a geographic pattern of delinquency that is similar for both Negro and White delinquents. A difference may be noted, however, in the concentration of white male delinquents around industrial property on the periphery of the city. This difference in distribution is due primarily to the restriction of the Negro population to rather compact areas.

Just as there is a general similarity in the geographic distribution of Negro and White delinquents, a similarity exists in rates of delinquency for comparable Negro and White areas located approximately equidistant from the central business district. One consistent difference is found, however,

²⁴Weeks, Ashley and Smith, Margaret G. "Delinquency Areas in Spokane, Washington," Research Studies, State College of Washington, VI, No. 3, (September, 1938), p. 112.

²⁵Moses, Earl R. "Community Factors in Negro Delinquency," Master's Thesis, University of Chicago, p. 70.

namely, that the rates of delinquency in the Negro areas are somewhat higher than those in comparable white areas. A similar pattern in rates is found also for Chicago.²⁶

Schmid made a comparison of the two cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis to determine delinquency areas. In addition, he pointed out the differences between the nationalities of the Twin Cities. Neither the difference in nationalities nor the difference in racial heritage caused any apparent effect upon delinquency. Concerning delinquency areas in the Twin Cities, Schmid points out:

As usual in such areas, many situations of an unwholesome nature are to be found here vice resorts masquerading as legitimate residential establishments.

In such transitional areas a high degree social disorganization prevails. The original community consciousness has gradually faded out and anonymity and impersonalism have very largely taken its place. Traditions and mores of former days have been "lost in the shuffle." Stability has been upset and a looseness in the fabric of social structure has developed. On one hand is to be found a class of fine old gentility who have lost their money or who, for sentimental reasons of association and attachment, dislike to move out; also numerous respectable middle-aged childless couples who wish to reside close to the central business district. On the other hand, there are many and various elements necessitating frequent raids by the "morals squad" or other agencies of the police department.²⁷

From a descriptive account written by Weinlick regarding the delinquency areas in St. Paul comes the following statement:

This area was originally settled by people of German, French, and English extraction, many of whom were foreign born. The district maintained a relatively high economic and social status over a half century, when the people of this area began to move into newly laid out districts to the west and south. By the

²⁶ Ibid., pp. 71-76.

²⁷ Schmid, Calvin F. Social Saga of Two Cities, Minneapolis: Minneapolis Council of Social Agencies, 1937, p. 75.

turn of the century this area began to undergo a pronounced metamorphosis. Families of the lower socio-economic status began to invade this district in large numbers.

. . . . The Negroes moved in, gradually spreading out over the entire area

Today the people living in this blighted area consist largely of low-salaried seasonal workers, W. P. A. families, and others living on charity grants of one sort or another. A study of incomes and rentals in the city places this area definitely at the bottom

A spot map of the Department of Public Health indicates that the greatest concentration of tuberculosis cases is located in this area. The highest tuberculosis mortality rate is also in the district.

The 1934 Real Property Inventory shows that housing conditions are very poor and that a large number of the housing units are without basements, running water, gas, electricity and inside toilets. Many are in need of major repairs and unfit for habitation.

According to the police and court records, (this area) tract 37 has the largest number of adult offenders as well as juvenile delinquents.²⁸

Shaw and McKay conclude their study by stating:

It is clear from the data included in this volume that there is a direct relationship between conditions existing in local communities of American cities and differential rates of delinquents and criminals. Communities with high rates have social and economic characteristics which differentiate them from communities with low rates. Delinquency--particularly group delinquency, which constitutes a preponderance of all officially recorded offenses committed by boys and young men--has its roots in the dynamic life of the community.

. . . . However, the high degree of consistency in the association between delinquency and other characteristics of the community not only sustains the conclusion that delinquent behavior is related dynamically to the community but also appears to establish that all community characteristics, including delinquency, are products of the operation of general processes more or less common to American cities

²⁸From an account written by Elsie R. Weinlick, resident director of the Unity Settlement House in Minneapolis.

From the data available it appears that local variations in the conduct of children, as revealed in the differential rates of delinquents, reflect the differences in social values, norms, and attitudes to which the children are exposed.²⁹

The United States Federal Bureau of Investigation publishes a series of Uniform Crime Reports which, among other items, gives differences in the composition of the population by age, sex and race differences in economic status, and percentage of kind of crimes in all cities in the U. S. which have a population greater than 100,000. The quarterly bulletin issues recognize that greater crime in some cities is not due to the lack of police enforcement, but is peculiar to the deteriorated physical condition of the city.

To even attempt to mention all of the related studies in this field would be impossible. Most of the important studies have been considered and it is noted that there is a very close resemblance of findings in all of them. Delinquency centers are located around the main business district when the city has grown in concentric circles away from the center of the city. In other words, the typical American city has grown outward in all directions at about an equal rate. Since this concentric growth of cities is true, then the oldest part of town would invariably lie around the central business district.

The previous discussion of ecological juvenile studies has been given to present the historical development of research and thought in this field. It was noted that the first studies were more general

²⁹Shaw and McKay, Op. Cit., p. 435.

and included large areas. Later studies, however, began to include smaller areas within the corporate limits of a city and included many possible contributing factors for delinquency. The following studies are presented in order to bring out new conceptions or different findings in delinquency studies. They will resemble closely, of course, all such studies; the main difference being the local area where they were conducted.

Johnson completed a study of rural-urban delinquency in which he recognized that most delinquency studies were conducted in large cities using large numbers of delinquents, but that the problem of crime is not a unique function of the large city.³⁰ In order to study small towns, delinquents are studied in detention homes which draw children from a large area which included many small towns around Rochester, Buffalo and Syracuse. Those families of the rural group tended to have more native born, higher economic status, more skilled labor and consequently a higher standard of living than the city families. These factors have previously been determined by other studies as possible contributing agents of delinquency and since the rural area tends to be free from dependency, poverty, crowding, and low status employment, it may be concluded with restrictions that the absence of these contributing factors may be the cause for limited juvenile delinquency in rural areas. An obvious restriction is that there is far less population concentration

³⁰Johnson, Williard F. "A Study of Urban-R ural Delinquency," The Delinquent Child and the Institution, No. 2, pp. 27-37, passim.

in these areas. Yet based upon percentages of delinquencies per total population, the following tables from Johnson's study are interesting to point out that delinquency is a problem in rural areas.

These tables may be misleading if just the percentage of commitments is considered. In view of this, Johnson concludes:

By and large, we find the rural delinquent far less of a problem than the urban delinquent. In our clinical studies certain individuals are found whom, because of the mildness of their delinquent behavior, the lack of any delinquent history beyond one or two episodes for which they have been committed, and the complete absence of any delinquent ideation or antisocial outlook on life, we tend to classify as accidental delinquents or as essentially non-delinquent. About 30% of the rural cases fall in this classification, as compared to but 2% to 3% of urban cases. Other individuals appear who because of the length of the delinquent career, the seriousness of their history, the impossibility of correcting them by community resources, and the presence of delinquent ideation and anti-social philosophies of life, we classify as serious delinquents. For these individuals the future outlook is bad under any community situation. From 44% to 48% of our urban cases fall into this classification. Only 14% of our rural cases are so classified.³¹

Reckless³² made some rather interesting observations in a monograph which proposed to study the causes of criminal behavior. He brought out the following points: That criminality was not a factor of inheritance,³³ it was not closely related to subnormal

³¹Ibid., p. 37.

³²Reckless, Walter C. The Etiology of Delinquent and Criminal Behavior, New York: Social Science Research Council, Bulletin 50, 1943, passim.

TABLE I
DELINQUENCY IN RURAL AREAS

	Rural	Per cent of Cases ³³		
		Buffalo	Rochester	Syracuse
Petit larceny	66	72	72	84
Burglary	27	50	34	56
Auto Stealing	6	8	12	12
Robbery	1	6	6	8
Forgery	3	4		
Ungovernability	34	40	15	18
Running away	31	30	38	28
Truancy	29	54	54	62
School behavior	16	24	46	28
Sex misconduct	14	6	18	8
Malicious mischief	7	12	8	4
Assault	4	6	4	
Others	9	6	4	8
<u>Commitment Offenses</u> ³⁴				
Stealing	54	62	66	72
Petit larceny	28	26	42	36
Burglary	18	15	16	26
Auto stealing	6	4	4	8
Robbery	1	2	4	6
Forgery	1			
Ungovernable and runaway	22	26	26	12
Ungovernable	17	20	24	
Running away	5	6	2	12
School behavior and truancy	7	6	2	8
Truancy	6	4	2	8
School behavior	1	2		
Others	17	8	8	4
Sex misconduct	9	2	2	
Arson	2		4	
Assault	2	4	2	2
Malicious mischief	1			
Driving without license	1			
Attempt to derail train	2			
Trespassing				2
Violation probation rules		2		

³³Johnson, Op. Cit., p. 35.

³⁴Ibid., p. 36.

intelligence, mental abnormality, endocrine function, body build and physical type, but some basis for delinquency and crime may be found in motivating forces of human conduct. Further mention was made of the following factors:

1. The Broken Home Factor. The broken home as a cause of delinquency was not as important as internal conflict and discord in the family. The fact was clearly brought out in Shaw and McKay's study and later Week's study in Spokane.

2. Sibling Position. Various studies have pointed out that the second child in the family committed the most serious crimes and that the next to the youngest child tends to become the least delinquent. It was argued by Sletto that sibship position can have a direct bearing on intrafamily interaction which in turn affects the personality and behavior characteristics of the child.

3. Unsatisfactory Relationships in the Family. Healy and Bronner and Brushong have contended that abnormal home conditions produce many more delinquents than normal home conditions.

4. Presence of Demoralized Persons in the Home. Some studies have attempted to enumerate the importance of immoral, drunken vicious, and criminals in the home, but the conclusions are not definite. Some children, of course, are affected by demoralized family members, but it is not known what kind of children do succumb.

5. The Companionship Factor. Studies have brought to attention that lonewolf offenders are definitely in the minority and that crime and delinquency is primarily a group activity. The implication here is that bad companionship is an important factor in crime

especially in the perpetuation of criminal careers.

6. Community Disorganization. Reckless believes that the studies of Thomas, Thorndike, and Shaw have validity in showing that social disorganization is related to delinquency areas in spite of their statistical crudity.

7. Urban-Rural Differences, Regional Differences, Mass Impression, Migration, and Inflation. All of these factors have certain bearing upon the incidence of crime and delinquency according to Reckless although much further work is warranted to find specific factors which directly cause crime.

Tannenbaum³⁵ recognized the total societal approach on delinquency and crime and states:

In dealing with the delinquent, the criminal, therefore, the important thing to remember is that we are dealing with a human being who is responding normally to the demands, stimuli, approval, expectancy, of the group with whom he is associated. We are dealing not with an individual but with a group.

Thrasher's study of over 1300 gangs in Chicago in 1927, reveals efforts to place the most frequent environment of gangs.³⁶ In this regard, he stated:

The most important conclusion suggested by a study of the location and distribution of the 1,313 gangs in Chicago is that gangland represents a geographically and socially interstitial area in the city

³⁵Tannenbaum, Frank. Crime and the Community, Boston: Ginn and Co., 1938, p. 20.

³⁶Thrasher, Frederick M., The Gang, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1927, p. 22 and 23.

The gang is almost invariably characteristic of regions that are interstitial to the more settled, more stable and better organized portions of city. The central tripartite empire of the gang occupies what is often called "the poverty belt"-- a region characterized by deteriorating neighborhoods, shifting populations, and the mobility and disorganization of the slum. Abandoned by those seeking homes in the better residential districts, encroached upon by business and industry, this zone is a distinctly interstitial phase of the cities growth. It is to a large extent isolated from the wider culture of the larger community by the processes of competition and conflict which have resulted in the selection of its population. Gangland is a phenomenon of human ecology.³⁷ As better residential districts recede before the encroachments of business and industry, the gang develops as one manifestation of the economic, moral, and cultural frontier which marks the interstice.

Shaw's first study³⁸ was restated and continued in his later work, Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas, in 1942 which has been discussed in this chapter. In his first study, emphasis is placed upon the cultural approach to the study of juvenile delinquency.

Shaw means by a cultural approach that:

Behavior can be studied profitably in terms of the situation out of which it arises. . . . customs, tradition, folkways, mores are thought of as results of the experiences of the group which have become common and habitual in the group. These are passed on from generation to generation and are accepted more or less unconsciously. A part of any study of behavior, therefore, must consist of an understanding of this cultural setting of the person or group whose behavior is studied.

This point is made clear by Sapire in an article published in

³⁷ See Burgess, E. W. "The Growth of the City," and McKenzie, R. D. "The Ecological Approach to the Study of the Human Community," in Robert E. Park, et al., The City, See Figure 1, p. 24.

³⁸ Shaw, Clifford R., Delinquency Areas, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1929.

1927.³⁹ He felt that all cultural behavior is patterned or, in other words, society has influenced the individual into a mode of conduct.

Thomas has pointed out the patterning of behavior of whole populations arises in social interaction and become social patterns.⁴⁰

Park feels that the processes of competition within the city itself effect the natural segregation of the population into economical, vocational and cultural groups: Park makes the following interesting observations:

The city plan establishes metes and bounds, fixes in a general way the location and character of the cities constructions Within the limitations prescribed, however, human nature proceeds to give these regions and these buildings a character which it is less easy to control Personal tastes and conveniences vocational and economical interest, infallably tend to segregate and thus to classify the populations of the great cities

As the city increases in population, the subtler influences of sympathy, rivalry and economic necessity tend to control the distribution of population. Business and industry seek advantageous locations and draw around them certain portions of the population. There spring up fashionable residence quarters from which poorer classes are excluded because of increased value of land. Then there grow up slums which are inhabited by great numbers of the poorer classes who are unable to defend themselves from associations with the derelict and vicious.⁴¹

Park indicates further that the city sections take on the character of its inhabitants. There are natural areas in each city

³⁹Sapir, Edward. "The Unconscious Patterning of Behavior in Society," The Unconscious: A Symposium, New York: A. A. Knept, 1927, pp. 118-20.

⁴⁰Thomas, W. I. "Behavior Pattern and the Situation," Proceedings of Twenty-second Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Society, XXII, 1927, 12-13.

⁴¹Park, R. E. "Human Behavior in Urban Environment," in The City, by Park, R. E., Burgess, E. W., et al., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925, pp. 4-6.

which are inhabited by certain groups of people, i.e., some areas have almost no children, other areas are characterized by unmarried people, regions of higher divorce rate, region of few voters, or regions of a large number of gangs and delinquents.⁴²

The Gluecks conducted an eleven year study of various types of peno-correctional treatment with emphasis upon factors of causation and with a view to determine the bases for crime-preventative programs and effective treatment.⁴³ In this study, they point out the inadequacy of ecological determinations of juvenile delinquency areas. They recognize that there are delinquency areas but ecological studies fail to furnish any edifying or unifying substitutes for the crumbling behavior and authority patterns. They further comment, regarding geographical location of delinquency areas, that:

This kind of approach to the problem of delinquency, although of much aid in studying the phenomena in the mass, is of relatively little help in explaining the mechanisms of causation. These mechanisms are operative, not in the external area or culture, but in the mental life of the individual and in detail as well as en masse. The area-studies establish that a region of economic and cultural disorganization tends to have a criminogenic

⁴²For other studies of societal approach, see Park, R. E. "The Urban Community as a Spatial Pattern and a Moral Order," The Urban Community, edited by Burgess, E. W., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926; Thomas, W. I. The Unadjusted Girl, Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1923, Burgess, E. W. "Family Tradition and Personality Development," Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1928, p. 322; Thrasher, Frederick M. in The Gang, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927; Cooley, Charles H. Human Nature and the Social Order, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922; Faris, Ellsworth, "The Nature of Human Nature," The Urban Community, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926; Thomas, W. I. and Thomas, Dorothy S. The Child in America, New York: A. A. Knopf, 1928, p. 571.

⁴³Glueck, Sheldon and Glueck, Eleanor, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency, New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1950.

effect on people residing therein, but the studies fail to emphasize that this influence affects only a selected group comprising a relatively small proportion of all the residents. They do not reveal why the deleterious influences of even the most extreme delinquency area fail to turn the great majority of its boys into persistent delinquents. They do not disclose whether the children who do not succumb to the evil and disruptive neighborhood influence differ from those who become delinquents and if so, in what respects.⁴⁴

In this writer's opinion, the Gluecks have made the unfounded assumption that delinquency areas studies proposed to determine the causes of juvenile delinquency. On the contrary, they propose to indicate that juvenile delinquency tends to arise from specific areas in a typical American city and that certain economic and sociologic conditions accompany these areas. These studies hint that somewhere in the child's surroundings, whether parent initiated or environment influenced, is the possible cause of delinquency and crime. The environmental influences of slum areas are obviously poor, but to say "that a region of economic and cultural disorganization tends to have a criminogenic effect on people" is not sound. One may not state that any region causes juvenile delinquency or crime; one may state that something within certain deteriorated areas influence delinquent behavior. It should be obvious that if delinquency and crime are concentrated in certain localities, and if some action is to take place to correct unlawful behavior, then one must first determine where these areas are within the city.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 5.

Age of Related Studies

It may be observed that most of the related studies are not recent, but this does not detract from their value since the same theoretical values are involved as would be in a recent study. An attempt has been made to outline major historical developments in this type of study, important and representative studies, and studies which bear out pertinent and varied comments noted during investigations of this nature. It should be emphasized that studies which propose to determine the geographic location of delinquency areas in large American cities almost invariably reveal that these areas are located around the central business district and that these areas are characterized by deterioration as previously pointed out. Therefore, no attempt has been made to discuss all of the related studies because of the endless number of repetitions involved in such a pursuit.⁴⁵

⁴⁵For further related studies and criticisms, see Elmer, M. C., "Century-Old Ecological Studies in France," American Journal of Sociology, XXXIX (1933-1934), 63; Robison, S. M., Can Delinquency Be Measured? New York: Columbia University Press, 1936; Davis, M. R., "The Pattern of Urban Growth," in Murdock (Ed.) Studies in the Science of Society, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937; Hayner, N. S., "Delinquency Areas in the Puget Sound Region," American Journal of Sociology, XXXIX (1933-34) 314, 319; "Social Factors in Oriental Crime," American Journal of Sociology, XLIII (1938) 908-919; Taft, D. R., Criminology, New York: Macmillan, 1942, p. 156; Bonger, W. A., Criminality and Economic Conditions, tr. by Horton, H. P., Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1916; Radzinowicz, L., "A Note on Methods of Establishing the Connection Between Economic Conditions and Crime," Sociological Review, XXXI, No. 3 (1939), 260-280.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE FOR RESEARCH

Definition of Delinquency

For the purposes of this study, a juvenile delinquent is anyone who is seventeen years old or under and who has violated the law. An attempt was made to segregate serious offenders from those delinquents who committed only minor infractions of the law, and, as will be discussed later, it was found that both classes of delinquents tended to live in the same areas in Eugene. This study does not propose to distinguish between the seriousness of the offense, although types of offenses will be listed and discussed; but rather to determine the geographic location in Eugene where the mass total of juvenile offenders resided in the years 1950 and 1951.

Dependency Cases

At the beginning of this study, data were obtained from the Lane County Detention Home and, among other items, the addresses and types of offense were gathered for all the entrants to the Home from June of 1950 to November of 1951. A spot map was prepared separately for cases of delinquency and for cases of dependency. It was found that the two maps closely coincided, i.e., that children who had willfully violated legal statutes tended to reside in the same areas as children who came from undesirable homes. Undesirable homes includes such

varied conditions as immoral homes, poor parental guidance, inadequate care or love, or homes where children had been abandoned. This phase of the study was not intended to be conclusive evidence that dependent and delinquent children invariably reside in the same neighborhoods or that dependent children will probably become delinquent children as they grow older, but rather, it was a convenient means to classify the many dependent children who were referred to the Detention Home. It was assumed from this crude comparison that areas which have a higher incidence of delinquent children also have a higher incidence of homes where parents do not care for their younger children properly or neglect them entirely. It may be further assumed, but without evidence, that areas which contain neglectful families may, by the same token of parental neglect, tend to produce a disproportionate amount of delinquent youth.

Research Procedure

The determination for the geographic distribution of juvenile delinquents in Eugene and possible contributing factors for these delinquent areas, proceeded in a more or less logical manner. As problems arose in the course of the research, this writer attempted to solve them according to the apparent need. Therefore, this chapter will follow closely the sequence involved in gathering data.

Method of Research

For the most part, the causal-comparative method of research is employed in this thesis. This type of research attempts to establish

causal relationships by comparing circumstances noted with observed effects and by noting factors accompanying these instances in which a given effect occurs or does not occur. If, for example, a delinquent area is characterized by certain other factors, like poverty, run-down homes, and family dependency, and these factors do not accompany regions where there is an absence of delinquency, then this method indicates possible causal factors for delinquency are poverty, run-down homes, and family dependency. This type of research is readily adaptable to social research since controlled experimentation is not generally feasible because of factors involving human emotions. The basic logic underlying the casual-comparative method began in the nineteenth century by John Stuart Mill, in his first and third canons of logic. These canons were named by Mill, respectively, the principle of agreement and the principle of double agreement. The first is stated as follows: "If two or more instances of the phenomenon under investigation have only one circumstance in common, that circumstance may be regarded as the probable cause (or effect) of the phenomenon."¹

Mill's second canon of double agreement is stated as follows:

If two or more instances in which the phenomenon occurs have only one circumstance in common, while two or more instances (in the same department of investigation), in which it does not occur, have nothing in common save the absence of that circumstance,

¹Westaway, F. W. Scientific Method: Its Philosophic Basis and Its Modes of Application, London: Blackie and Son, Ltd., 1924, p. 203.

the circumstance in which alone the two sets of instances differ is the effect, or the cause, or an indispensable part of the cause, of the phenomenon.²

Obviously, these canons should not be followed to the letter because of the dichotomy represented, i.e., if an instance is always accompanied by a circumstance, then that circumstance is the probable cause of the instance, and conversely, the consistent absence of the circumstance indicates that the instance is independent of the circumstance. There are too many intermediate factors, or circumstances which may contribute to the cause of the instance if it were present. Its presence may fluctuate and the investigator is forced to eliminate this circumstance as a causal factor. Whereas, an aggregate of such factors may form the largest percentage of cause for the instance.

History, Functions, and Finding of Skipworth Home

Since the preliminary data for this research was begun at the Lane County Detention Home, commonly referred to as the Skipworth Home, a brief history is warranted.

In 1945 a reorganization of the Juvenile Court was initiated by Senior Judge Skipworth of the Circuit Court. The reorganization was so constructed that any county judge could establish a Juvenile Department. Previous to this, juvenile delinquents were arrested and retained by the police until families had been contacted. What was determined to be done to the child was directed by a Probation

²Ibid., p. 207.

Officer, who was charged with the direction of this program. In 1948, Mr. Louis Sherman, the Probation Officer sought to establish a better Juvenile Department by founding a detention home for the young offenders of more serious charges. Also at this home, children, who were products of unsatisfactory home conditions, could be retained until a better home could be located or until the original home trouble had been alleviated. Under the direction of Judge Skipworth, funds for the home were solicited, and the home was started in June of 1948. In 1950, a mill levy of 45 mills was established for the home. The only other income for the home is derived from private donations; it is not a community project and therefore receives no funds from the Community Chest. This countywide mill levy was presented for vote and favorably passed three to one in May, 1950, and the Detention Home began operations in June of the same year. The chain of command for the home is: Judge Skipworth, Senior Judge of Circuit Court; Judge East; Louis Sherman, Chief Probation Officer; and Ray Baker, Superintendent of Detention Home. The chief functions of the Circuit Court are deciding civil, criminal and juvenile cases for the county and it is the therefore expected head of the reorganized Juvenile Department.

The Detention Home has three major purposes: to hold the child for court hearing; to diagnose and administer treatment; and to retain the child for foster placement.³

³Based on statements made by Ray Baker, Superintendent of Skipworth Home.

The home has a special school which is in actuality a special education clinic for working ability. The working ability of the students is determined at the time the child enters the home by a tester who is a psychology student at the University of Oregon. The school does not have grades; instead, the student strives to maintain his working ability under careful guidance.

The age range of the detained children is from about eight to eighteen. If the delinquent is over eighteen, he is referred to the adult court. Very young children from six to ten, are generally not considered delinquent, although some children this age have been retained for very serious misdemeanors. Young children are generally classed as "dependents" which includes anything from parental difficulties and non-support of child to the child violently reacting against the parents. These children, like most of the others, find the Detention Home pleasant.

The home maintains a constant schedule for each child to follow. He rises at 8:00 A. M. and spends the morning doing chores and indoor or outdoor recreation. After lunch, he attends school until 4:15 P. M. and enjoys further recreation. Each evening is outline with many varied activities so designed to fulfill the interest of the child. The school publishes its own paper called the "Skipworth Skipper."

It is interesting to note that most commitments to the home occur around the tenth of each month varying according to when the first or second week-end falls. This is not a hard and fast rule and would probably be more accurate to say that there are more commitments to the home during the first half of the month than during the second

half of the month. There is no specific evidence available to explain this cyclic action. A possible suggestion may be that wages are generally paid during the first of the month thus causing the parents to leave the home and permitting more freedom to the child, or the child himself may be earning wages and become more wayward with a reimbursed pocketbook. Whatever the reason for higher delinquency at the beginning of the month, it is more obvious why this higher delinquency occurs on week-ends and during the summer months. The child is given more freedom when not restricted by school, working days, or cold nights.

Girl delinquents tend to be older than boy delinquents according to the records at the Detention Home. The average age of girls taken in the home is $15\frac{1}{2}$ years while the average age of boys is $13\frac{1}{2}$ years. Of the girls, 95%⁴ are placed because of sex offenses, often because of their desire for affection which they do not receive from the parents.

For the purposes of this study, "out of town" delinquents will refer to those individuals who are not in Eugene or Springfield or in the immediate vicinity of these cities. Although the purpose of the study was to determine the geographical location of delinquents in Eugene, some mention should be made of the delinquents from outside of Eugene. The definite concentration of delinquents is located within and between Eugene and Springfield. "Out of town" delinquents may

⁴This percentage is an estimate of Ray Baker. It is probably not too accurate since sex offenses are generally classed as delinquency.

therefore be from within the county and it is to be expected that one or two delinquents may come from small towns within Lane County. For example, from a working total of 263 delinquents,⁵ 170 were "out-of-towners." Of this number, one was from Goshen, two were from Noti, two were from Florence, one was from McKenzie Bridge, etc. Cottage Grove, however, revealed a larger amount of delinquency for its size since it claimed eight delinquents. It must be kept in mind that most of the out of town delinquents who committed acts other than running away are from towns within the near proximity of Springfield or Eugene. This should emphasize that not all serious delinquent charges are referred to the Detention Home. Runaway entrants come from many locations ranging from nearby out-of-county cities like Portland to states across the nation like New York.

From this data, it is shown that 47% of the out of town offenses are runaways. This is, of course, an apparent reason for having so many out-of-town delinquents at the home. All of these runaways are apprehended in Lane County, however. Highway 99 offers a good medium of travel for those who are running away but they meet a "snag" in their travel in Eugene or Springfield and particularly in Glenwood which is the "bottleneck" between the two cities. Here the traffic is congested and moves fast and therefore offers poor opportunity for a hitch-hiker. Here, also, the police are ever-watchful for the unwary delinquent runaways. There is little wonder that most of the runaways are taken from Glenwood. The fact that

⁵Based entirely upon entrants admitted to the Detention Home between June of 1950 and November, 1951.

TABLE II
 KIND AND NUMBER OF OFFENSES REFERRED TO THE
 DETENTION HOME SINCE JUNE, 1950

Offense	Out-of-Town	Eugene and Springfield
Runaway	71	9
Delinquency	17	34
Dependency	27	25
Vagrancy	8	0
Larceny	7	13
Car theft	6	9
Burglary	4	10
After hours	1	6
Shoplifting	1	4
Drunkenness	1	2
Held for authorities	1	2
Disobedience	3	0
Forgery	1	0
Rape	1	0
Fighting	0	4
Break and enter	0	6
Cruelty to animals	0	1
Molesting	0	1
Car prowling	0	2
Medical attention	0	1

most runaways are caught here may have influenced a previous study of the same purpose as this one. This previous study located the center of delinquency in Glenwood. Limitation of that study will be discussed later.

Delinquency as listed above, is a very ambiguous term and may include charges ranging from loitering to rape. Quite often it is listed as a means of convenience for the records. All but one of the charges, excluding dependency, on the above list are acts of delinquency. A juvenile delinquent in the state of Oregon is anyone under eighteen years of age who fails to comply with the law and certainly none of the listed charges are legal. A child who is classed as

delinquent, therefore, may fall into one or several of the charges listed on the table. It is not unusual to find one child who has been admitted to the home several times for committing different acts. In these cases, the writer has attempted to take the more serious of the two charges, if there were two, and an "average" of charges if there were more. The "average" of charges was obtained by cancelling out the more serious with the less serious charges, in equal number, and listing the remaining charge or charges.

From the above table, one may observe that charges of delinquency and dependency have claimed about an equal amount of offenders, and along with runaways, constitute the major sources of delinquency. Dependency is an unlimited term, but generally refers to parent-child problems. The parents' failure to support the child or the child's being in a very poor environment, offer examples of dependency problems. These children are often not delinquents, but since their homes may serve as good breeding grounds for later delinquency, since they reside in the same areas as delinquent children, their addresses were plotted as delinquents. Children who are held for medical attention, until foster homes may be found, or for other authorities, are not delinquent problems, but the number of such cases is sufficiently small to be regarded as negligible.

When the various charges are grouped together, there is a tendency for several children in the same neighborhood to commit the offense together. This is explained by the fact that younger adolescents generally choose their friends within a short radius of their own home. This problem may find solution if parents would be more

careful in guiding the selection of their child's friends.

It is interesting to note that all of the shoplifting cases were performed by girls. Since there were only five of such cases, this data should be regarded as a point of interest and not one of statistical significance.

This researcher attempted to learn the correlation of religious adherence to delinquency based upon the records of the home. No positive correlation was found except a significant claim to no religion was noted.

From the Eugene Chamber of Commerce, a map of the metropolitan areas of Eugene and Springfield was obtained. On this map was plotted the address of each delinquent from that area. It was expected that the geographic locations would be scattered widely throughout the two cities because of the limited number of delinquents placed in the home, but certain areas showed definite grouping of juvenile delinquents. The most predominant area, both in concentration and number of delinquents is located between Lincoln and Tyler and between 3rd and 11th Streets west in Eugene. That the area is large is granted, but since it contains 17 juvenile delinquents from a working total of 129, it is the most concentrated area within Eugene and Springfield. Other delinquent areas are from Oak to Lawrence between 14th and 17th Streets West. This small area contains 5 delinquents' addresses. The area just around 29th Place in Eugene contained 8 more delinquents.

Within the small district of Glenwood, 7 delinquents are noted but 4 of these delinquents are from one family listed as dependency

difficulty. The previous study based upon the same purpose as this study found the Glenwood area the geographical center of delinquency, but this study denies that finding. Part of the limitations of the previous study was due to the short period of time upon which the delinquent sampling was based and because over half the delinquents in Glenwood came from one family.

Springfield, itself, showed no grouping of delinquent addresses, but, instead showed an even dispersion throughout the city. Based upon the actual number of delinquents in proportion to its size, Springfield may well be considered a delinquent area alone. This city contains 33 delinquent positions on the map within the city limits alone and 11 more on the immediate outskirts. Springfield, then, being one-third as large in population as Eugene, contains a great majority more than Eugene. The only difficulty is in making a more confined delinquent area. No part of the residential area in Springfield appears to be free from juvenile delinquency.

As a final observation, certain city routes claimed more delinquents than others as noted from the following table.

TABLE III
DISPERSION OF RURAL COMMITMENT

Rt. No.	Eugene Commitment No.	Rt. No.	Springfield Commitment No.
1	1	1	2
2	3	2	2
3	1	3	1
5	6		

Growth of Eugene

Today, Eugene is considered the "second market" in the state of Oregon--second only to Portland. Situated at the southern end of the fertile Willamette valley, it is a leading center for the lumber industry. Its tremendous prosperity is well exemplified by a comparison of the 1940 and the 1950 census. In 1940, Eugene's population was 20,838; in 1950 the population had risen to 35,879--a gain of 71% in the last decade. Springfield's growth is even more astounding for its population increase from 3,805 in 1940 to 10,807--nearly 300%.⁶

TABLE IV
COMPARATIVE ECONOMIC SURVEY FOR EUGENE

	1940	1951
Assessed Valuation and Millage	\$12,786,922	\$32,364,033
Building Permits	1,099,322	6,523,983 ⁷
School Census	5,204	11,813 ⁸
Motor Vehicles	25,992	60,666

This table serves to prove the tremendous growth which Eugene has enjoyed over the past ten years.

⁶Compiled from information supplied by the Eugene Chamber of Commerce.

⁷1,198 permits which includes University of Oregon construction.

⁸This figure excludes University of Oregon students.

General Breakdown of Offenses for 1950⁹

The following outline indicates the disposal of the total number of delinquents referred to Juvenile Court during 1950.

A. Summary. 1. The following list gives the total number of cases disposed of during the year of 1950:

	<u>Official</u> ¹⁰	<u>Unofficial</u> ¹¹
Total sum of a, b, and c.	271	763
a. Delinquency	129	416
b. Dependency (neglect)	116	295
c. Special Proceedings	26	52

2. Different children involved in children's cases disposed of during the year.

Total sum of a, b, and c.	830
a. In one or more delinquency cases	441
b. In one or more other cases	347
c. In delinquency and other cases	42

⁹Taken from the files of the Lane County Juvenile Court.

¹⁰Official refers to action decided by the court.

¹¹Unofficial refers to action decided outside the court.

B. Cases disposed of officially.¹²

1. Age (total)	Delinquency			Dependency	Special
	Total	Boys	Girls		
	271	107	22	116	26
Under 2	10			10	
2	7			6	1
3	8			7	1
4	6			0	
5	5			3	2
6	3			3	
7	8			4	4
8	4			1	3
9	13	4		9	
10	5	1		4	
11	9			9	
12	14	6		7	1
13	33	17		16	
14	17	13		4	
15	44	16	10	17	1
16	38	25	5	5	3
17	35	20	15	5	5
18 or over	12	5	2		5

2. Place of care pending hearing or disposition¹³

Total	Delinquency			Dependency	Special
	Total	Boys	Girls		
	287	111	26	124	26
a. No detention or care overnight	123	35	11	66	11
b. Jail or police station	41	35	16		
c. Detention home	62	38	4	20	
d. Boarding home	31	1	5	24	1
e. Other place	30	2		14	14

¹²According to the Juvenile Court, children under the age of twelve years old in the category, "delinquency," represent matters of delinquent action referred to the Court, but under the Statutes of Oregon, no child can be alleged or adjudicated a delinquent under the age of twelve.

¹³A change in detention took place in June 18, 1950, with the opening of the Skipworth Detention Home.

3. Disposition of cases.

<u>Mode of disposal</u>	<u>Total</u>
a. Dismissed with or without warning	20
b. Held open without further action	18
c. Probation officer to supervise	115
d. Referred to public institution for delinquents	14
e. Other public institutions	2
f. Referred to other courts	21
g. Public departments	35
h. Private agencies	12
i. Other	34
j. Total	271

C. Cases Disposed of Unofficially.

Delinquency

1. Age	<u>Total</u>	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Dependency</u>	<u>Special</u>
<u>Total</u>	763	323	93	295	52
Under 2	18			16	2
2	12			11	1
3	21	1		18	2
4	12	1		8	3
5	13	4		9	
6	17	5		11	1
7	8	1		7	
8	12	5		7	
9	25	12	1	10	2
10	27	13	1	13	
11	25	8	1	15	1
12	48	26	1	19	2
13	52	27	7	18	
14	73	34	13	26	
15	103	59	23	15	6
16	118	60	24	25	9
17	94	55	15	13	11
18 or over	41	12	7	14	8
not specified	44			40	4

2. Place of care pending hearing or disposition.

Delinquency

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Dependency</u>	<u>Special</u>
Total	769	327	95	294	52
a. No detention or care overnight	601	241	63	249	48
b. Jail or police station	52	37	13	2	
c. Detention home	64	45	10	9	
d. Boarding home	33	3	8	21	1
e. Other place	19	1	1	13	4

3. Disposition of cases.

<u>Mode of disposal</u>	<u>Total</u>
a. Dismissed with or without warning	323
b. Held open without further action	148
c. Probation officer to supervise	117
d. Referred to public institution for delinquents	0
e. Other public institutions	3
f. Referred to other courts	47
g. Public departments	47
h. Private agencies	26
i. Other	52
j. Total	763

The official and unofficial disposition of cases for 1950, while not directly pertinent to the ecological distribution of delinquents in Eugene, does help to reveal the Juvenile Court's procedure with delinquent cases. Since this study is not concerned with types of delinquency or frequency of delinquency, but rather with all forms of delinquents as classified by Juvenile Court, a complete breakdown

of types of delinquents is not listed in the above tables. However, a representative breakdown of juvenile delinquents for 1951 will be given later.

General Breakdown of Offenses for 1951

Since the breakdown of offenses for 1950 was representative, only a summary will be given for 1951.

A. Summary.

1. The following table gives the total number of cases disposed of during the year 1951:

	Official	Unofficial
Total sum of a, b, and c.	239	817
a. Delinquency	120	490
b. Dependency (neglect)	83	234
c. Special proceedings	36	93

2. Different children involved in children's cases disposed of during the year.

Total sum of a, b, and c.	841
a. In one or more delinquency cases	472
b. In one or more other cases	341
c. In delinquency and other cases	28

The above figures may reflect somewhat slightly less than the actual number of cases handled, as during the year arrangements were made with some of the lower courts to handle children referred for possession of beer, in much the same manner as traffic offenses are handled. This provided some relief to the staff in directing most

of their attention to more serious types of offenses.

Geographical Distribution of Delinquents for the
Years 1950 and 1951

A large map was made of Eugene and Springfield and on it was plotted the addresses of juvenile delinquents who were referred to the Juvenile Court during the years 1950 and 1951 inclusive. A dot was placed on the map for each delinquent's address and only one dot, irregardless of the number of different offenses the youth may have committed. If there were more than one juvenile offender from one home, a corresponding number of dots were placed at that address. A separate map, prepared by Mayer,¹⁴ showing the geographical distribution of different kinds of delinquency and dependency charges, and distinguished sex and race distribution. This investigator made no such distinction, but rather grouped all the delinquents, male or female, white or Negro, criminal or mild, into one category for the purpose of this study. There are so few Negroes in Eugene, and these tend to cause no trouble, that no distinction was made between them. Girl and boy delinquents and serious and less serious offenders tend to reside in the same area according to Mayer's map and according to the map prepared by this investigator in his work with the Skipworth Detention Home. This work with the Skipworth Home also revealed that

¹⁴Map prepared by George Mayer, School of Architecture, University of Oregon.

dependency cases tended to reside in neighborhoods where the greatest concentration of juvenile delinquents' addresses were plotted.

A distinction must be made between the West side and East side of Eugene. On the East side, a much smaller concentration of delinquents is noted as compared to the West side of Willamette Street. There is a certain concentration between Oak and Hilyard Streets from 6th to 18th Avenue East. This section is near the central business district on the East side. More delinquents are noted just East of the University of Oregon from Emerald to Walnut Street between 13th and 18th Avenues East. A very definite concentration of delinquent addresses is noted just East of Willamette Street between Peal and Ferry Streets from 30th to 33rd Avenue East. On the West side of Willamette Street, another somewhat scattered concentration of delinquents is noted by the central business district. This concentration increases as one moves farther West until a strong concentration is noted between Lincoln and Adams Streets from 5th to 10th Avenue West. This delinquent area widens at Adams Street and includes the area from Adams to Polk Street between 5th and 13th Avenues West. A small concentration of dots is located between Lincoln and Washington Streets from 3rd Avenue West and Clark Street. An examination of the map reveals that the peripheral section of the city is relatively free from delinquency. Except for the areas cited as delinquent areas, there is relatively little delinquency.

Glenwood tends to be a delinquent area and no portion of Springfield seems to be free from delinquency. Delinquents' addresses are noted as far out as 52nd Street, West of Springfield.

Housing Survey for Eugene and Springfield¹⁵

This housing survey included most of the entire Eugene-Springfield area and comprised those areas of the two cities where a high proportion of substandard housing existed. The survey was conducted between May 18 and June 7, 1950. Dwelling units were classified as either standard or substandard, thus:

A. Standard Dwelling Unit: A standard unit has all of the following characteristics:

1. Not dilapidated.
2. Hot and cold running water inside the structure.
3. An inside flush toilet for the unit's exclusive use.
4. An installed bathtub or shower for the unit's exclusive use.

B. Substandard Dwelling Unit: A substandard unit has one or more of the following characteristics:

1. Dilapidated.
2. No hot or cold piped running water inside unit.
3. No inside flush toilet for unit's exclusive use.
4. No installed bathtub or shower for the unit's exclusive use.

A map was prepared for this study and showed "black areas" in Eugene and Springfield. These "black areas" were areas which contained most of the substandard housing. Of course, interspersed with substandard housing were many standard dwellings and this study did not

¹⁵"Eugene-Springfield Housing Survey," conducted by the Housing Authority of Lane County, Eugene, Oregon, June, 1950, passim.

propose to indicate any definite percentage. The blackened areas only show where most of the substandard dwellings are located.

According to this map, there is a concentration of substandard housing areas around the central business district in Eugene, particularly on the West side, and tends to diminish toward the periphery of the city. West and South of the city, there are large areas of poor housing, but these are beyond the residential section of Eugene. Delinquent areas tend to be in areas of substandard dwellings, but all areas of substandard dwellings are not delinquent areas.

Glenwood, according to this map, is shown to be almost totally an area of substandard houses and a large portion of Springfield is blackened, particularly the Eastern outskirts of the city.

Of the substandard homes surveyed, 50.9 percent were classified as dilapidated, or 541 of the 1062 substandard units in Eugene. Fourteen and six tenths percent of the substandard units rented for \$50 or more per month while 16.7 percent rented for less than \$25. Over half of the standard dwellings rented for \$50 or more per month.

There were twenty-six units occupied by non-white families; of these, twenty-four were substandard.

The median income for families in substandard housing was \$234 per month; the median income for families in standard housing was \$299 per month. Thirty-seven percent of families living in substandard housing in Eugene had an annual income of less than \$2,500.

Geographical Location of Dwelling Types in Eugene

For a term paper for the Department of Sociology at the University of Oregon in 1950, Kenneth J. Williams proposed to show the relationship of social class to the geographical location of dwellings in Eugene. Accordingly, Williams used the scale for classifying dwellings established by Warner, Meeker, and Eells.¹⁶

1. Excellent This is a large, one family dwelling. It is in good repair, has large lawns and well cared for, landscaped yards. Its appearance imposes an element of ostentation with respect to size, architecture and excellent appearance of yard.
2. Very good Roughly, this type of house is not quite as impressive as a No. 1 house. The primary difference is that a No. 2 is somewhat smaller, although still larger than utility demands for the average family.
3. Good Generally, this type of house is only slightly larger than utility demands and is more conventional style. It is less imposing than either a No. 1 or No. 2.

¹⁶Warner, Lloyd W., Meeker, Marchia, and Eells, Kenneth. . Social Classes in America, Chicago: Chicago Science Research Association, 1949, pp. 149-150.

4. Average This is a one-and-a-half or two story, wood frame or brick house which contains one family. This style is conventional and the lawn is well-cared for, but not landscaped.
5. Fair The houses are not quite as good as those in No. four. This category includes small houses in excellent condition.
6. Poor In this category, the size is less important than the condition. The house is generally badly run-down, but not deteriorated to the extent that they cannot be repaired. The yard is not filled with debris. In general, this type of house suffers from lack of care.
7. Very poor This type of house is so deteriorated that it cannot be repaired. These houses are unhealthy, unsafe and often were not originally intended for dwellings. They are shacks and overcrowded buildings whose halls and yards are littered with junk.

Williams classified all of the houses in Eugene in blocks. If most of the houses in a block were No. four's, for example, the block as a whole was classified as a "four". This method of classification

would be more successful in a city more homogenous than Eugene which has several styles of architecture due to different periods of growth. The upper three and the lower three categories were successfully classified but the middle group, No. four, had to be made more elastic by adding the subdivisions upper, middle and lower four's. This group now included, respectively, new houses with little landscaping, average residential homes in good condition and old houses in good condition and with a good yard.

Houses in one classification tend to be clustered into small sections of the city, around these houses tend to be houses of the next lower classification and where these two groups meet is an intermingling of types producing a transition zone. Houses in the transition zone usually cannot be classified into either of the two groups. The following transition zones were found in Eugene:

1. On the down hill side of the Fairmount Loop, there are houses ranging from three through five, none being predominate. The best houses are found on the upside of the slope.
2. Between Grant and Taylor Streets from 4th to 13th Avenue West, there is an even distribution of four's and five's.
3. Near the top of College Crest, there is a mixture of houses in No. 3 and No. 4 categories.
4. From 6th Avenue to the North city limits and between Fillmore and Lincoln Streets, there is a group of lower four's and five's. This is one of the oldest sections in Eugene.

One heterogenous area was found between 31st and 34th Avenues East from Willamette and Hilyard Streets. Here are houses ranging

from four through seven, so completely unrelated that it was impossible to classify this area into a two-group transitional zone. This writer found this area to be a very concentrated delinquent area.

Williams concludes that most of Eugene's houses are No. 4's. Wherever there is a knoll in the terrain, the better houses will be at the top of the knoll. All the one's and two's are located either on Judkins Point or Fairmount Loop; a single two being located on Crest Drive. The "upper class" tend to reside in one's and two's, the "middle class" in three's and four's and the "lower class" in the lower three categories, according to Williams.

In 1945, the Department of Sociology conducted a survey of residences and valuations of the city of Eugene. Various symbols which represented valuations were placed on a map of Eugene and these symbolic evaluations were placed on the map so as to represent the general area where they were placed. Although the study was not complete enough for this research, it did definitely indicate that below average residences are found in the delinquent areas and that the best homes are not associated with delinquent areas.

In 1948, Ruth Carson plotted a map of Eugene for the Department of Sociology at the University of Oregon. This map showed by small areas within the city the mean monthly rent for dwellings based on the 1940 census data for small areas. From the map, the following may be noted:

1. The present delinquency areas were in the areas of low rent in 1950.

2. The lowest rent areas were near the river and on the West side of Willamette, in the old section of town.

3. The East side of Willamette Street, near the central business district, was, as a whole, higher renting than the West side and contained the highest renting district in the whole city.

4. The area around the University was a high rent area, with little exception.

Demolition of Buildings

From the Eugene Building Inspector's Office, a list of addresses of buildings which were wrecked was obtained. So few buildings are wrecked each year in Eugene that no attempt was made to plot the addresses on a map. From March 18, 1951 to March 8, 1952 only twenty buildings were demolished. Of these twenty buildings, fifteen were within five blocks of the central business district. There were an equal number on the West Side as on the East side of Willamette. Even from this small, representative figure, the indication is that buildings dilapidated enough to be demolished are located around the central business district. Some of these buildings may have to be removed to construct a business establishment, but there was no indication of type of building which was to replace a wrecked building. It did not seem to be expedient to plot the addresses over a long period of time when such a clear indication could be obtained from a shorter period of time.

Transient Areas

From the Eugene Water and Electric Board, addresses were secured of water turn-off's in Eugene for the months January, February, July and September of 1951. Only one Summer month was selected as there is a tendency for more people to move during the Summer months. Winter months tend to be the most stable of the year, that is, fewer people move during the Winter. Each person who changes his address must contact the Water Board to have the water turned off. Since water turn-off's represent movement of people, the addresses listed at the Water Board would represent areas where there was the most moving. There were 3,162 turn-off's for the four months represented and each address was plotted so as to form a spot map. These transient areas were found to correspond strikingly with delinquency areas. Exclusive of University Housing, the following areas were classed as transient areas.

1. The area located between Lincoln and Monroe Streets from 5th to 9th Avenue West.
2. The area located between Monroe and Grant Streets from 5th to 13th Avenue West.
3. The area located between Willamette and Ferry Streets from 31st to 34th Avenue East.
4. The area located between Pearl and Patterson Streets from 10th to 18th Avenue East.
5. The area located between Willamette and Washington Streets from 12th to 18th Avenue West.

6 6. The area located between Mill and Alder Streets within one block on either side of West Broadway.

Recreational Facilities in Delinquent Areas

While no attempt was made to determine all of the recreational facilities in Eugene, a map was plotted which showed the location of parks, schools, playgrounds, and churches. On the same map was plotted the delinquency areas. From observation of this map, it was noted that all the delinquency areas were lacking in adequate recreational facilities.

Ecological Distribution of School Age Children

To this point, areas of the most concentrated delinquent activities has been determined. Without knowing the number of juveniles which reside in the area, no conclusions could be made other than there may be more juveniles living in these areas. If it could be shown that most juveniles live outside of delinquency areas, then one would conclude that delinquency is quite independent of population concentration in Eugene. From the Administration Building of the Eugene Public Schools, Lobaugh supplied a map showing the divisions of Eugene according to the attendance of school age children.¹⁷ There are seventeen of these attendance districts in and around Eugene, but this investigator used only ten of these which were in the city limits of Eugene. Since there are no delinquency areas outside of Eugene

¹⁷Lobaugh, Dean, Assistant Superintendant of Instruction of Eugene Public Schools.

with which this study is concerned, only the attendance districts within the city were considered. The following list gives the attendance districts and their approximate boundaries:

1. Adams: This district includes the area from Lawrence to Tyler Street between 18th and 25th Avenues West. This area contains relatively little juvenile delinquency.

2. Lincoln: This district includes the area from Lawrence to City View Street on the city limits between 6th and 13th Avenues West and also includes the County Fair Grounds and the Eugene Air Park. This area coincides very closely with a delinquent area.

3. Westmoreland: This district includes the area from Chambers Street beyond the West city limits between 11th and 24th Avenues West. This area is quite free from delinquency.

4. Willard: This district is around the central business district and includes the area from Hilyard to Lawrence Street between 10th and 24th Avenues. This area has some juvenile delinquency, but not as much as the Lincoln district. The Willard district, then, may be considered as including the highly transient apartment area on the East side of Willamette Street which is comparatively free from delinquency.

5. Edison and Harris: These two districts include the area from Hilyard to Floral Hill on the East city limits between 18th and 30th Avenues East. Harris occupies the small area from Baker to Hilyard Street between 25th and 30th Avenues East. These districts were not considered as delinquency areas.

6. Condon: This district includes the area from Hilyard Street to the East city limits between 18th Avenue East and the Willamette River. This district does not include a delinquency area.

7. Washington: This district includes the area from Lincoln to University Street between 3rd and 10th Avenues West and extends Northward on Oak Street to include much of the rural district in that area. There is some delinquency in the East Broadway area, but it was not considered as delinquency area. The East Broadway area is, however, a transient area.

8. Whiteaker: This district includes the rest of North Eugene from 6th Avenue and includes much of the Northern rural district which is an extension of the area between Grant and Oak Streets. Although there is some delinquency in this district, it was not considered a delinquency area.

9. Dunn: This district includes the area from Washington to Hilyard and extends Southward from 24th Avenue. This district includes the highly concentrated delinquency area from 31st and 34th Avenues just East of Willamette Street.

The following table lists the number of children living in these districts from grades one to six.

TABLE V
DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN IN EUGENE¹⁸

District	Grades in School						Total
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	
Adams	48	33	53	38	37	35	244
Lincoln	51	59	43	61	31	54	299
Westmoreland	53	45	54	43	35	31	261
Willard	74	75	82	77	70	67	445
Edison	79	57	87	74	78	56	431
Harris	47	53	53	41		19	194
Condon	79	51	71	56	70	74	401
Washington	32	29	27	29	34	28	179
Whiteaker	53	59	56	63	32	70	333
Dunn	56	48	51	40	38	42	275

Total for all 17 districts in elementary school: 4505

Total for all Junior High students, grades 7, 8, and 9: 1767

Total for all Senior High students, grades 10, 11, and 12: 1312

Total for all students in the Eugene system, grades 1 through 12: 7584

According to Lobaugh, these figures for the first six grades are quite representative of the total youth population through high school. In other words, there is a proportionate amount of eleventh graders living in a district as there are sixth graders. Some districts, of course, will have a higher percentage of young children than older adolescents, but these variations are small.

¹⁸Compiled from Consolidated Classification Report for month ending November 16, 1951. There has been very little variation from these figures during the years 1950 and 1951.

¹⁹Fifth and sixth graders in the Harris district attend school in the Condon and Edison districts.

In the Administration Building of the Eugene Public Schools, there is a map showing the geographical location of first grade children's addresses for the school year 1951-1952. This map clearly indicates that most of the first graders live around the central business district. This is representative of all school age children.²⁰

As noted from Table V, most children live in the Willard district, but this district does not contain the most concentrated delinquency areas. The two most concentrated delinquency areas are in Lincoln and Dunn districts. Lincoln and Willard districts are about the same size, Lincoln being the larger, and the delinquency area includes most of Lincoln, yet there are only about 67% as many children in the first six grades in Lincoln as there are in Willard. The delinquency area in the Dunn district is less than 5% of the total area of the district and its juvenile population is even lower than for the Lincoln district. Yet this small area within the Dunn district is very concentrated with juvenile delinquents.

Thus, based on this evidence, juvenile delinquency is independent of population concentration. This writer did not attempt to form a ratio between the number of delinquents and the total delinquent population for each of the districts within Eugene since the difference between delinquency areas and population is so apparent.

²⁰Information from interview with Dean Lobaugh, Op. Cit.

CHAPTER IV
INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Conclusions

As previously indicated, the purpose of this study was to find the geographic location of delinquency areas in Eugene. This was determined from referrals to the Lane County Juvenile Court during the years 1950 and 1951. Definite delinquency areas were found in Eugene. Although there were many delinquents located around the central business district, they were somewhat scattered. The two main concentrations were located just East of Willamette between Pearl and Ferry Streets from 30th to 33rd Avenue and in the Northwest portion of town between Lincoln and Adams Streets from 5th to 10th Avenue and widens Eastward to include the area between Adams and Polk Streets from 5th to 13th Avenue West. This study is based upon the 2,090 cases disposed of by the Juvenile Court for the years 1950 and 1951. Based upon Mill's canons, the following conclusions may be made:²¹

1. Delinquency cases and dependency cases tend to arise from the same areas.

2. The homes of juvenile delinquents are concentrated into definite areas in Eugene; the largest area being near the central business district, but not immediately surrounding it. If Eugene

²¹Westaway, Op. Cit.

continues its peripheral growth, this larger delinquency area will be considered as the area surrounding the business district in a decade or so.

3. Delinquency areas contain a mixture of good and poor housing. The concentrated delinquency areas contain substandard housing, but not all substandard housing districts are delinquency areas.

4. The demolition of buildings tends to take place around the central business district.

5. Delinquency areas are those in which people do not tend to permanently reside.

6. There tends to be an absence of adequate play facilities in delinquency areas.

7. Delinquency areas are not dependent upon an increased population count of juveniles residing in the area.

These findings do not mean to imply that when the above factors exist in an area that that area is or will become a delinquency center for a city. They do imply that delinquency is influenced by environment whether inside or outside the home and that delinquent behavior is a result of opportunity. If a child is not tempted by crime, he is not likely to become delinquent since no child is inherently bad or criminal. A child's environment should be desirable and inducive to proper conduct. To produce proper surroundings, certain factors within delinquency areas should be changed. This study has hinted some factors that probably affect delinquency in some way.

Suggestions for Future Study

Since Eugene is growing so rapidly, a similar study as this one is warranted after a few years of growth. Studies should be made regarding the relative importance of each of the environmental factors discussed in this study. Some of the factors discussed as possible causes of juvenile delinquency may disappear as the contour of the city changes. In this manner, an investigator may be able to eliminate certain factors and then see if there has been any change in delinquency rate and location.

This type of study deserves attention in several other cities in Lane County, namely Springfield, Glenwood and Cottage Grove. Although these cities are small, much more work is needed in these areas because each of them tend to be delinquency centers.

There are strong implications for schools, churches, community leaders and law enforcement bodies to provide proper and adequate facilities for tomorrow's citizens. Just what these agencies can do or will do requires more study. The whole problem of social influence on delinquency and the complete reorganization of the communities from which delinquency arises, needs careful deliberation in order to prevent the chain reaction of environmental temptations which may lead to adult crime.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aschaffenburg, Gustav. Crime and Its Repression. New York: Little, Brown and Co., 1913. p. 43.
- Breckinridge, Sophonisba P. and Abbott, Edith. The Delinquent Child and the Home. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1912. p. 150-53.
- Burt, Cyril. The Young Delinquent, London. London: 1891. Vol. II.
- Eugene-Springfield Housing Survey. Conducted by the Housing Authority of Lane County, Eugene, Oregon, June 1950. 75 p.
- Gleuck, Sheldon and Gleuck, Eleanor. Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1950. p. 1-215.
- Johnson, Williard F. "A Study of Urban-Rural Delinquency." The Delinquent Child and the Institution. No. 2. p. 27-37.
- Maller, J. B. Maladjusted Youth. Legislative Document No. 75, 1939. 201 p.
- Reckless, Walter C. The Etiology of Delinquent and Criminal Behavior. New York: Social Science Research Council, Bulletin 50, 1943. p. 1-29.
- Shaw, Clifford R. and McKay, Henry D. Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942. 446 p.
- Shaw, Clifford R. Delinquency Areas. 1929. p. 1-30.
- Tannenbaum, Frank. Crime and the Community. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1938. p. 20.
- Thrasher, Frederick M. The Gang. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927. p. 22-23.
- Warner, Lloyd W., Meeker, Marchia and Eells, Kenneth. Social Class in America. Chicago: Chicago Science Research Association, 1949. p. 149-50.
- Westaway, F. W. Scientific Method: Its Philosophic Basis and Its Modes of Application. London: Blackie and Son, Ltd., 1924. p. 203-207.

APPENDIX

Typed by Margaret Ann Adams