

**Conceptualizing Police Perceptions
of the Parents of Youth in Conflict with the Law**

By

Brittany A. P. Bennett

A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Sociology

Memorial University of Newfoundland

May, 2022

ABSTRACT

Broadly defined as a member of society given certain rights and tasked with certain obligations from the state, it is clear throughout social sciences literature that the consideration of *citizenship* is tied to the age of majority. Within scholarship exploring what citizenship means for those under the age of majority, there has been little attention paid to the position of police in young people's journeys toward citizenship. Drawing from qualitative data collected through one-on-one interviews and focus groups with rural Atlantic police officers, I build on youth citizenship literature by examining police officers' interpretations of policing youth and their experiences interacting with the parents of youth. In the results, I document police officers' perceptions of their authority and their perceptions of the authority of parents in addressing concerns with young people. A total of 128 police officer participants took part in the study; 76 participants engaged in one-on-one interviews and 52 participants took part in focus groups. Police in this sample discuss how they feel parents use police as a parenting tool, how they believe parents can contribute to youth accountability, and how they suggest parents can influence youth attitudes towards policing legislation. Drawing on theories of governance, I argue that police officers' perceptions of the policing and parental management of youth behaviour reflect a view of young people as less than ideal citizens. Youth are considered unable to work toward the responsibilities required of an *ideal citizen* without the guidance and mentorship from authority figures such as parents and police working simultaneously in both the private and public arenas of young people's lives. This suggests that better policing policy and practice should include engagement and communication between police and parents regarding the expected roles and responsibilities of each authority figure in young people's lives.

Keywords:

Policing Youth; Parenting Youth; Governance; Youth Crime; Youth Citizenship

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Throughout my Master's thesis journey I have been lucky enough to experience unconditional support from family and friends in addition to the phenomenal supervision in the department of Sociology here at Memorial University of Newfoundland. I wish to take some time to highlight the keys individuals that contributed to my success.

I will begin with acknowledgment of my two biggest fans, my wonderful parents Tammy and Barry Bennett. When I would doubt myself, they were able to step in and become the motivation and drive I needed to persevere. I am so grateful for their unconditional love and support in everything that I do. I also wish to acknowledge my brother, Tanner Bennett, who's sense of humour helped brighten the dreary days when I needed it. I am also so appreciative of my grandpa, Howard Martin, one of my biggest supporters who helped me so much in my move to Newfoundland. In addition, I have been privileged with the support and encouragement from countless aunts and uncles that I adore and love so dearly.

My profound gratitude goes out to my partner, Mike O'Reilly, who came into my life at a time that I felt overcome by the imposter syndrome that all too many graduate students have experienced. He held me accountable with the love and compassion that I needed to realize my full potential and capabilities.

Even though my Master's brought me to another province, my friends back home were always rooting me on and words cannot explain how lucky I felt to have that support from afar. To name a few of many, I am so thankful for the support of Lianne Smith, Samantha Irvine, Tara Herteis, Tanisha Longley and the now local, Heather Kennery. I also feel a deep gratitude to the late Tyler Moyer, who kept me fed throughout my course work when I did not have the time or

energy to do so myself. You are missed dearly, Tyler. Thank you to all my friends, near and far.

Finally, I am so grateful for the mentorship and encouragement of the staff in the department of Sociology. I am so grateful for the guidance from Dr. Nicole Power as her feedback helped me challenge myself in significant ways. Above all, I could not have done this without the incredible, compassionate support of Dr. Rose Ricciardelli. I am so proud to say I had the privilege of working under the mentorship of such a talented researcher that I now call a dear friend. Thank you to all of those involved in my education with Memorial University of Newfoundland for this wonderful opportunity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of Study	1
1.2 Research Intent	2
1.3 Significance and Practical Importance	4
1.4 Thesis Structure	8
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE	12
2.1 Youth Crime Legal Terrain in Canada	12
2.2 Defining Young People and Interpreting Youth Citizenship	19
2.3 Perceptions on Parenting Youth Who Transgress the Law	32
2.4 Theoretical Framework	42
CHAPTER 3: CONTEXT & METHODOLOGY	48
3.1 My Role & the Secondary Use of Data	49
3.2 Policing in Rural Atlantic Canada	50
3.3 Data Collection	52
3.4 Sample	53
3.4.1 One-on-one Interview Demographics	53
3.4.2 Focus Group Interview Demographics	55
3.5 Data Analysis	57
3.6 Ethical Concerns and Means of Management	59
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	62

4.1 Policing as Parenting	63
4.2 The Parent in Youth Accountability	72
4.3 Parents' Knowledge of the YCJA	77
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION	82
5.1 Discussion	82
5.1.1 Parental Authority Within Private Spaces	87
5.1.2 Policing Authority Within Public Spaces	94
5.2 Limitations	98
5.3 Future Focus	100
5.4 Conclusion	102
REFERENCES	107

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background of Study

The youth and childhood literature suggests young people are thought of in a very specific way: children and youth are predominantly perceived as requiring protection and mentorship from the adults in their lives (Crossouard & Dunne, 2015; France, 1998; Kennelly, 2011; Smith, 2014). Youth focussed legislation over recent decades, specifically with the enactment of the *Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA)*, in Canada has emphasized protecting youth, understanding exterior causes of youth misbehaviour, and enacting less punitive – the least restrictive possible – policing approaches to youth who are or are becoming criminalized (Donzelot, 1979; Smith, 2014; Trépanier, 1999). For example, the preamble of the YCJA uses the language of “guidance and support” (p. 2) when discussing the encouragement of community involvement towards managing young people (Department of Justice, 2013). Sociological researchers studying youth explain that societal, and resultantly, legislative conceptualizations of youth tend to focus away from acknowledging young peoples’ capacity to make rational decisions for themselves (see, Crossouard & Dunne, 2015; France, 1998; Kennelly, 2011; Williamson, 1997), and more so towards the lack of psychological development that poses limitations to a young person’s full comprehension of their experiences (see, France, 1998; Jenks, 2005; Smith, 2014).

Consistent across much of the literature, is the discussion of youth citizenship in the future tense, as something youth are being encouraged to work towards, are being educated about, and/or are currently incapable of due to certain social, psychological (e.g., brain development) and economic restraints associated with being young (Crossouard & Dunne, 2015; France, 1998; Kennelly, 2011; Williamson, 1997). More recently, a growing amount of literature has focused on the discourse of citizenship with youth; questioning and challenging some of these more

typical ideologies that limit the autonomy associated with youth thereby reducing their capacity for accountability. An existing gap in this growing knowledge are understandings of youth citizenship that account for the perspectives of authority figures who are occupationally responsible to enact governance over youth, such as police officers. Researchers that have narrowed in on ideas of youth citizenship typically have a focus on politics (Crossouard & Dunne, 2015; Frazer & Elmer, 1997) and employment (France, 1998; Kennelly, 2011; Williamson, 1997). Some of these researchers, such as Frazer and Elmer (1997) and Kennelly (2011), work to understand how governance plays a role in youth citizenship. More broadly, researchers have analyzed youth perceptions of police (Amoroso & Ware, 1986; Kennelly, 2011; Leroux & McShane, 2017; Sindall, 2017) with fewer researchers analyzing police perceptions of youth. Outside of one researcher (see, Mason, 2002), to my knowledge, scholars have yet to unpack police perceptions of the parents of youth who have been in conflict with the law. In addition, a very limited amount of youth citizenship research uses theories of governance to understand some of the limitations that young people face when striving to fulfill the role of an *ideal citizen*. Thus, in the current thesis, I aim to contribute to the growing knowledge of youth citizenship by analyzing police interpretations of their experiences with the parents of the youth they encounter on duty to understand how governance is tied to conceptualizations of youth as citizens.

1.2 Research Intent

By analyzing secondary data collected from a rural Atlantic Canadian research project in 2014 through 2018, I will provide greater insight into how police feel about their work addressing youth crime, justice, and accountability drawing on their view of the parents of youth who are,

or, are becoming criminalized. For my thesis, I rely on data from a larger Memorial University of Newfoundland youth policing research project originally conducted for the purposes of deducting best practices of youth policing. The goal in my thesis is to add to criminological literature by understanding how police interpret their experiences with the parents of youth, and how these interpretations feed into a greater discussion of youth citizenship and governance over youth. It is with this focus that I will answer the following questions:

1. How do police feel about their abilities to engage in what they deem best practices regarding youth policing alongside the parents of youth?
2. How are police conceptualizing their experiences of authority in relation to their interpretations of how parental authority is processed over the youth they are encountering?
3. What do these interpretations tell us about how youth are governed and how young people are seen as citizens?

In the current study, I draw on police interpretations of their experiences policing youth and interacting with the parents of youth. I use theories of citizenship, rooted in essays from British sociologist, Marshall to guide my discussion of youth as members of a society that is policed. I use theories of governance, rooted in writings of French philosopher, Foucault to guide discussions of both policing authority as well as parenting authority exercised over youth. The data I analyze consists of one-on-one interviews as well as focus groups with 128 police officers. I will shed light on how police in rural Atlantic Canada believe parents affect their abilities of engaging in what they consider the most effective and meaningful youth policing, and what these results tell us about how youth are governed and interpreted as citizens.

1.3 Significance and Practical Importance

By answering my research questions, my research aims to focus in on the commonly unheard police perspective to work towards the ultimate goal of creating better youth and police relationships. The significance of a study striving to help inform how to create better relationships between youth and police is multi-faceted. I will show why it is important that young people's parents have better relations with police in addition to highlighting the current gaps in our understanding of the power dynamics of police as an authority figure in young people's lives. With a focus on how parents are an invaluable component of this discussion, I will highlight a theme evidenced throughout the literature focussing on blaming parents and rather than feeding into that same stigma, my research will seek to better understand and conceptualize the parents' role alongside police in their governance over young people.

Generally speaking, researchers have suggested that police perspectives toward policing youth are lacking throughout criminology literature (Huey & Ricciardelli, 2015; Macleod & Schneiderman, 1994). In Macleod and Schneiderman's (1994) analysis of policing power in Canada, they note a predominant attitude within the community of being either for or against police officers, the latter being ingrained in a mindset of *us versus them*. Macleod and Schneiderman (1994) suggest that police voices often go unheard of in academia as criminologists are too often seen as a part of an "against" police category. However, the larger majority of youth policing research provides the perspective of young people rather than the perspective of police.

Throughout such youth focused literature, scholars recognize that young people are typically untrustworthy toward police (Flexon, Lurigio & Greenleaf, 2009; Leroux & McShane, 2017; McAra & McVie, 2005; Sindall, Mccarthy & Brunton, 2017). As early as when children

are between age 5 and 8, researchers have shown the focus is largely on the punitive authority of police rather than how police give aid or assistance (Powell, Wilson, Gibbons, & Croft, 2008). As these children begin to have a greater presence in public spaces during the transition away from the home and away from parental oversight, toward a stage of youth, there is a heightened interaction with police (McAra & McVie, 2005; Sindall et al., 2017). Likely then, is that this increased police interaction could be negative, and that young people could be less likely to reach out when they are in need.

While researchers have studied the policing of youth, fewer look at the policing of youth with an emphasis on relationships of power. Researchers of family studies recognize the relationship of power between a parent their child, a relation thought to be ingrained in wider networks of power relations throughout larger social groupings (Donzelot, 1979; Smith, 2014). Theorists of authority, power, and governance within the family have been questioning the concepts for decades. Beginning in the 19th century, theorists have challenged the typical notion of the family as holding a natural authority distinct from that of the state, resulting in the justification of certain legal restrictions on parental authority (Donzelot, 1979; Smith 2014). Resultantly, other members of society – such as police officers – are able to also hold authority over children and youth. Despite the acknowledgment of wider power relations throughout scholarship, little research analyzes the power dynamics between authority figures and youth outside of parents and teachers. While parents and teachers are significant authority figures in young peoples’ lives on a more day-to-day basis, police are the less often encountered authority figures that respond to more of the significant events in young peoples’ lives – police are called for support, help, safety, and intervention. These potential moments that police enact authority

over young people are crucial as these moments can be emergency and/or criminally related events.

The research that does exist to conceptualize police power over youth is, most often, based on interviews with youth (Chan & Lo, 2016; Kennelly, 2011), while minimal researcher findings are from the perspectives of police. Masson (2002) conducted a British study using interviews with police that analyzed police-youth relations with a focus on power. Masson's (2002) study is of the limited accounts of researchers analyzing youth to police relations that asked police about their interactions with the parents of youth. Masson (2002) analyzed police power in regards to the police authority to remove or detain children on the basis of a child's protection (referred to as police protection). Police officers referred to police protection as a power they used at their own discretion. Masson's (2002) results revealed that police officers felt many of the incidents to which they were tasked with responding were non-police matters. They discussed feeling manipulated in their encounters with parents; many believing parents were unloading their, largely parenting, responsibilities on to them. The main sources of police protection referrals actually came from the parents themselves (Masson, 2002).

Similarly, throughout youth criminological literature a bias exists that reveals parents are at the forefront of understanding negative youth behaviour; however, few researchers seek to understand why parents receive blame. There is a preordained responsibility put on the shoulders of parents in regard to youth behaviour, which has more commonly than not led to associations of negative youth behaviour with bad parenting. To name a few examples, researchers such as Hope, Bierman, and Karen (1998), Mazefsky and Farrell (2005) and Zhang (2011) have associated aspects of parenting to increased aggressive youth behaviour and criminal activity. Kaylen and Pridemore (2011), Moore and Sween (2015), Osgood and Chambers (2000), and

Wong (2012) are some of the many researchers that have concluded the family disruption variable of the Social Disorganization Theory significant in foreseeing rural youth crime numbers. Hillian and Reitsma-Street (2003) suggest that a stigma exists that places a narrow-minded blame solely on parents for negative youth behaviour, without taking into consideration other factors that might be at play. Recognizing such findings, I aim to think about some of the more complex factors, such as the influences of legislation, ideologies of youth as citizens, and considerations of roles and responsibilities in governance over youth.

Too often authority figures such as police and parents in youth criminology literature are analyzed separately, and less often researchers in the area work to understand how these authority figures in youth lives feel about one another. Within the preamble and declaration of principle for the YCJA, the Department of Justice (2013) outlines that:

Society has a responsibility to address the developmental challenges and needs of young persons ... Communities and families should work in partnership with others to prevent youth crime by addressing its underlying causes, responding to the needs of young persons and providing guidance and support (p. 1-2).

Canadian youth legislation encourages all adults in society to be working as a community to address the needs and concerns of youth. Trojanowicz, Kappeler and Gaines (2002) explain that police are not experts in the area of youth, thus it is necessary that decision making authority is shared across the community. I seek to better understand police views and interactions with youth and the parents of youth who transgress the law. The hope is that in understanding the “how?” and “why?” behind police interpretations of parents, we can better inform youth policing practices and encourage police and parents to work as allies to meet shared objectives for Canadian youth in the future.

1.4 Thesis Structure

I structure my thesis within six chapters. As can be seen in the current introductory chapter, *Chapter 1* is where I highlight the key background information while also summarizing the goals and objectives of my thesis, alongside the significance and practical importance of my research.

In *Chapter 2*, I review the literature regarding youth as a population that is governed. I begin the literature review with a timeline of the youth crime legal terrain throughout Canada and how youth legislation has moved away from punitive measures and towards modes of rehabilitation with more paternal focussed doctrines. I discuss the criticisms of the different legal acts and how our legal structures have affected the governance that parents and police hold over youth today. In the next section of the review, I define the category of youth as well as the term youth citizenship for the purposes of my analyses. I analyze the more normative perspectives of children and youth and how these perspectives have led to an unachievable status of citizenship for young people as discussed throughout the literature. Following the review of youth as citizens, I review the literature on perceptions of parenting and youth crime. Here, I explore how a constant questioning of parenting abilities has led to a narrowed understanding of parenting youth who have been in contact with the law. I conclude this chapter with the theoretical approach I use within my analyses that is based off the relevant literature reviewed.

In *Chapter 3*, I provide a brief background regarding the context of the current study, which is a smaller piece of a much larger policing research project in a notably rural area of Atlantic Canada. I begin this section by detailing my role as a researcher a part of the larger policing project as well as the specific secondary data used for my thesis. I conclude the chapter

by highlighting the rural contexts of the study's location that could factor into these particular study findings.

I then move into a detailed account of the methodology used for both the original data collection, as well as the analysis of police interviews for the purposes of my thesis, in *Chapter 4*. In this section, I include the original study data collection procedures, the sample of the data that I use within my thesis, the analysis of the secondary data, as well as any ethical concerns I experienced.

Chapter 5 contains the results of my research findings. First beginning with a summary of my findings, I then narrow in on the three major themes regarding the parents of youth that emerged throughout my analysis. I title each section by theme: (1) *Policing as Parenting* (2) *The Parent in Youth Accountability* (3) *Parents' knowledge of the YCJA*. Within the first emergent theme, I share police perspectives on how parents utilize police as parenting tools to seemingly "scare" their children into obeying their rules. Police reveal how they have seen these parenting tactics limit their abilities of reaching young people on a more positive level. In the next theme, I show police perspectives regarding how parents affect youth accountability, more specifically, that the majority of the parents they encounter do not contribute to measures of youth accountability because they do not acknowledge their child's wrong doing. In the last theme, I reveal how police officers feel limited in their youth policing abilities working under the YCJA, and how parents' knowledge of the YCJA has led to a casual interpretation of youth committing minor crimes.

Lastly, in *Chapter 6*, I provide an in-depth discussion about how the police perspectives contained within these three themes reveal mechanisms of governance utilized over youth by both parents and police, that otherwise limit the youth capacity of ideal citizenship without such

management. I finish this section with the strengths and limitations of my approach, my input on where future research in this area is warranted, as well my concluding thoughts.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

2.1 Youth Crime Legal Terrain in Canada

My review of literature on youth crime legislation describes an approach to youth crime and misbehaviour in Canada that is rooted in a child protection mentality that situates the state as a paternal actor. This knowledge will contribute to our understanding of police perspectives on addressing youth crime and working with the parents of young people as the legislation they work under positions both police and parents in very specific ways. In this section, I review literature analyzing how young people have been addressed in Canadian youth justice legislation over the decades. I show the development of youth justice legislation beginning with amendments to the *Criminal Code* in 1857, leading toward the first youth justice statute enacted in 1908. I then reveal a shift in approaching youth crime within legislation enacted in 1984, and end with the youth legislation that Canadian police work under today, first enacted in 2003. I also report some of the criticisms of Canadian youth legislation across the literature, focussing in on the limited amount of research that provides police perspectives. I end with a discussion of how the implementation of the most recent youth crime legislation informs policing responsibilities and authority over young people.

Within an analysis of parenting and family structures using theories of governance, Donzelot (1979) argued that to a certain extent, the regulation of families as a state responsibility was reflected within legislation across most states by the early 1900s. This was notably reflected in the passing of legislation on crimes against children, mandating obligations for children such as school attendance, as well as the posing of obligations or restrictions on parents in regards to the care, safety, and well-being of their children (Donzelot, 1979; Smith, 2014).

Within a historical analysis of Canadian youth crime legislation predating the late 1900s, Trépanier (1999) suggests the legislation grew away from punitive practices and toward more of a guidance approach of addressing youth crime. Trépanier (1999) reports Canadian legislation first reflected a differentiation between youth and adults in criminal law proceedings within the *Criminal Code* in 1857. According to Trépanier (1999), the former legislation, enacted by the Parliament of the Province of Canada, was the first of its kind to redirect a focus from the punitive treatment of youth who transgressed the law towards modes of rehabilitation. Changes in the *Criminal Code* allowed for quicker trials and court decisions for under age criminalized youth, a reduction of the detention of youth in adult institutions alongside the opening of reformatory youth institutions (Trépanier, 1999). Trépanier (1999) then revealed how the *Juvenile Delinquent Act* (JDA) of 1908 emerged as a less punitive approach to youth crime that resultantly gave more power to the state in matters of parenting young people. Trépanier (1999) highlights the new policies that came from the JDA as grouping under five headings:

- (1) the creation of new offences for the parents;
- (2) the institution of probation;
- (3) separate detention from adult detainees;
- (4) the elimination of the principle of proportionality along with determinate dispositions;
- (5) and the transformation of delinquency cases into child protection cases. (p. 53)

With a focus on the parents of youth, differentiating youth crime from adult crime, and child protection, Trépanier (1999) argues there was a shift of perspective seen within the enactment of the JDA where the state served as more of a “paternal judge” (p. 59). Rather than punishing wrong doing, the focus was on protecting young individuals involved with the law and trying to understand the causes of youth legal transgressions.

Within a historical review of youth judicial processes, Ricciardelli (2018) highlights the major changes seen in the *Criminal Code* in 1857 to have characterized much of the three decades to follow. Continued changes in the 1890s expanded matters of youth justice in regards to the age of culpability (*Criminal Code*, 1892 (s. 9-10)), the privatization of youth trials (*Criminal Code*, 1892 (s.550)), and a reduction in youth sentencing provisions (*Criminal Code*, 1892 (s.956)) (Ricciardelli, 2018), foreshadowing what was seen within the first youth justice statute in Canada, the JDA. This legislation was said to be introduced as a social welfare act, as Ricciardelli (2018) words it within her review, “the intent was to reform society through reforming children” (p. 5). Both Trépanier (1999) and Ricciardelli (2018) discuss the motivation behind this child saving movement to have stemmed from ideologies at the time that suggested inappropriate parenting was one of the highest ranked causes for youth engaging in criminal behaviour. According to Ricciardelli (2018), criminal justice analysts and practitioners at the time criticized the JDA for a lack of clarity in police discretion and sentencing of youth, and following the rising of youth crime rates many stressed that more responsibility and accountability was required for criminalized youth. Despite a major intention of the following legislation to increase measures of youth accountability, similar criticisms continued with the enactment of the *Young Offenders Act* (YOA) in 1984. According to Ricciardelli (2018), the intention of the YOA was to shift toward more formal accountability by means of law enforcement and crime control. For Ricciardelli (2018), the previous objective of rehabilitation was eliminated as the focus was on due process for youth due to “the wake of the popularization of neoliberal political ideologies that stressed individual accountability and denounced social welfare practices and services” (p. 7).

One of the few scholarly writings on police perspectives of the youth crime legislation they were working under was led by Caputo and Kelly (1997) who conducted interviews across 150 Canadian police agencies with police officers working under the YOA. Their police participants shared the opinion that some of the legal discretions set out in the YOA took away the youth voice, resultantly, limiting the possibilities of holding youth responsible for crimes committed. For example, police explained that youth were no longer able to speak for themselves to admit guilt or remorse because statements taken from the youth in question were no longer a valid primary source of evidence in youth criminal cases under the YOA. Thus, police said that they rarely took youth statements anymore even though many of the young people they were in contact with expressed a desire to admit their guilt (Caputo & Kelly, 1997). In addition, youth voices were no longer present in court as lawyers became the sole speakers during youth cases under the YOA. The police participants felt the system was teaching youth they did not have to take responsibility for their actions or account for the crimes they had committed (Caputo & Kelly, 1997). The authors revealed police reporting that their abilities to respond to criminalized youth in meaningful ways under the YOA were actually hindered by legal restraints, resulting in a lack of accountability. Furthermore, the YOA was thought to limit the parental role in aiding with youth accountability. Caputo and Kelly (1997) quoted a police officer saying, “the YOA takes the responsibility away from parents...It puts the parents in the background. The driving factor is the lawyer” (p. 22). The police participants suggested that both youth and their parents are crucial elements of effective youth accountability, but they lacked authority or opportunity under the YOA because of the power, which as put in the hands of the court systems.

At the time of the YOA, Canada held one of the highest rates of incarcerated youth throughout the Western world (Department of Justice, 2013; Endres, 2004). With a purpose of

expanding upon and enhancing the work of the YOA, the *Youth Criminal Justice Act* (YCJA) was implemented in 2003 and is the legislation police work under today. The Department of Justice Canada (2013) states that the YCJA was created to correct issues with “the overuse of the courts and incarceration in less serious cases, disparity and unfairness in sentencing, a lack of effective reintegration of young people released from custody, and the need to better take into account the interests of victims” on the Government of Canada website. According to much of the literature, the two main objectives of the YCJA were to reduce the number of youth in court by encouraging the treatment of less serious offenses with diversionary and extra-judicial options – building from the YOA’s alternative measures, while also toughening the treatment of more violent youth crimes through the imposition of adult sentences (Bala & Anand, 2004; Endres, 2004; Ricciardelli, 2018).

Researchers, Bala and Anand (2004) report critiques of both the YOA as well as the YCJA within a review of relevant media and literature shortly after the implementation of the YCJA. Despite the focus of the YOA to bring in more accountability, Bala and Anand refer to “‘Get tough’ critics” (p. 252) of the YOA. They reveal both public and political criticisms of Canada’s youth justice system around the time of the YOA suggesting criminalized youth were treated with too much lenience (Bala & Anand, 2004). The belief behind these “‘get tough’ critics” (Bala & Anand, 2004, p. 252) is similarly noted in Ricciardelli’s (2018) quote of “neoliberal political ideologies” (p. 7) which is said to encourage more of a punitive approach of holding young people accountable for misbehaviour. Bala and Anand (2004) reported media outlets such as the *National Post* and *Radio Morning News Newfoundland* quoting rates of youth incarceration having declined as much as 20 to 50 per cent in Ontario, Alberta, and Newfoundland and Labrador just months after the implementation of the YCJA. Despite the

pressure to continue incorporating punitive approaches following the YOA, the YCJA focussed more heavily on restorative justice approaches. Within Bala and Anand's (2004) analysis of the YCJA, they outline that the use of extra-judicial options are a matter of discretion for police and prosecutors.

However, within Endres (2004) analysis of the YCJA, the author interprets the language around extra-judicial measures in legislation as the primary first response for police officers. Endres (2004) outlines that section 6 of the YCJA mandates extra-judicial measures as the first consideration for non-violent offenses. Section 6 of the Act, titled "Warnings, cautions and referrals" reads:

6. (1) A police officer shall, before starting judicial proceedings or taking any other measures under this Act against a young person alleged to have committed an offence, consider whether it would be sufficient, having regard to the principles set out in section 4, to take no further action, warn the young person, administer a caution, if a program has been established under section 7, or, with the consent of the young person, refer the young person to a program or agency in the community that may assist the young person not to commit offences." (Youth Criminal Justice Act, S.C. 2002. c. 1, s. 4-10)

Thus, while police officers have discretion in their use of extra-judicial measures, they are mandated to at a minimum to *consider* these measures as a first response. Unlike the alternative measures set out within only one section of the YOA, that Endres' (2004) refers to as underemphasized and inconsistently used, the YCJA dedicates 8 sections to promoting extra-judicial measures. There was a redirection from police response to non-violent youth crimes that involved court processes toward more police-involved responses such as giving warning,

administering caution, and/or referring to community-oriented approaches that involve parents, a community program, or community agency. Endres (2004) suggests,

The police officers, who practically apply the YCJA as part of their daily functions as law enforcement agents, play an important role in the success of this new piece of legislation. Police officers are the frontline portion of the youth criminal justice system; they interact with the youth first and have direct contact with the youth, their parents, schools, and the community. (p. 532)

What Endres' words pinpoint is that police officers were given greater responsibilities over youth under the YCJA, of which entailed more communication and engagement with members of the community such as parents, and less reliance on court systems. Two years following the enactment of the YCJA, Endres (2004) argued that the extra-judicial measures set out in the legislation should result in more effective measures of youth accountability because of police officer and community relations. Thus, there is a community mindset that both parents and police should play active roles in measures of accountability with young people.

Within an examination of the YCJA on police discretion, Carrington and Schulenberg (2008) refer to a redefining of previously considered non-enforcement actions to a new form of law enforcement. Like Endres (2004), Carrington and Schulenberg (2008) argue that taking no further legal action and/or giving warnings can now be considered a means of enforcement.

The history leading up to the enactment of the YCJA is significant in understanding the police perspectives in the current study as the legal framework they work under structures their responses to both young people engaging in criminal behaviour, as well as the parents of said youth. Criticisms across youth crime literature highlight the difficult balance of protecting youth as minors while also still ensuring meaningful accountability for young people as autonomous

“citizens”. As can be seen from the literature noted above, despite such criticisms, current legislation has positioned police in a child protection role and given police related authority. Specifically with the enactment of extra-judicial measures in the YCJA, this approach of policing has created more responsibilities for police in their governance over young people. How police conceptualize young people as citizens of the state, being that they hold greater responsibility and means of governance over youth then they had in the previous, more punitive approaches within the YOA is noteworthy here as changes how governance is utilized over youth under the YCJA.

2.2 Defining Young People and Interpreting Youth Citizenship

How we understand the category of *youth* or *young people* as citizens is historically, economically, and socially specific. There are many factors that influence the concept of youth citizenship. Thus, it is warranted for me to identify the citizen I speak of throughout my thesis. What is clear throughout the literature is that all the components associated to the term citizen cannot be completely understood universally. However, there are some common themes. In this section, I aim to highlight some of the consistencies and similarities across definitions of youth and young citizenship through a review of relevant youth literature addressing topics of citizenship and governance. I review relevant pieces of literature first noting how researchers define the term youth, following with the findings of their analysis and greater conceptualizations of youth as citizens.

In considering the term citizenship, many researchers highlight the dispute between *liberalists* and *communitarians* in theoretical considerations of societal participation as well as social and political relationships. The liberalist point of view is said to be individualistic, and

positions formal equality between citizens and the state. There is a liberal distinction between the public and the private to protect the individual from state and societal pressures and coercion (Frazer & Elmer, 1997). The communitarian approach of citizenship instead, describes the citizen as a member of a community and encompasses more than just the individual. The liberal definition of citizenship is associated with the work of Roche (1987), while the communitarian approach of citizenship analysis is centralized around Marshall's (1950; 1975; 1981) work (Yuval-Davis, 1997).

Within a European analysis, Frazer and Elmer (1997) use political theory and a social psychology of politics perspective in their understanding of youth citizenship. This literary analysis first defines the youth and young people across the literature with the age category of 15-20 years old. In Britain, 15 is the final year of compulsory full-time education, and the final year prior to gaining rights to own property, rights to drive, and rights to join the armed forces. Frazer and Elmer note this timeframe as a significant period as these changes open up a young person's participation in social institutions and also may change their legal status. Frazer and Elmer (1997) explain that youth "is a period which embraces a related set of transitions in economic, interpersonal and political roles" (p. 178). Within their study, Frazer and Elmer (1997) review relevant literature and political theories to discuss how governance over youth is deployed through politics and how young people become participants in these political processes of governance. Transitions such as changes in schooling, entering the workforce, and becoming differentiated by gender were reported as major impacts on youth political attitudes as well as youth political participation (Frazer & Elmer, 1997). Frazer and Elmer (1997) believe the individualist focus of the liberal approach fails to understand embedded social relations and institutions that create communities as it separates the public and the private. For example, this

division between public and private has been deemed a key obstacle in youth research because economic, cultural, and political relations as well as personal/kinship relations are overlooked (Frazer & Elmer, 1997). However, the communitarian approach is also criticized by Frazer and Elmer (1997) as they believe that there are inconsistent constructions in specifying the relation of community (i.e., the connection between the community and the individual). When discussing citizenship, Frazer and Elmer (1997) state:

This is a status defined by participation in certain institutions and processes, notably in the election of government, and in the welfare and taxation systems of modern democracies. Minimally it can be defined by the allegiance with a particular state and people (the right to hold one passport rather than another, the protection of a particular set of laws). If we take independence to be a characteristic of the citizen, then age and economic resources are both inextricably linked with this status, as a number of scholars have pointed out (Coles, 1995; Jones and Wallace, 1992; Pateman, 1989). Rights and duties must be accompanied by resources. (p. 314, 315)

This excerpt denotes how age is tied to participation in citizenship. Being that there is an age of majority associated with political participation such as voting rights, and economic resources such as participation in welfare and taxation systems, young people cannot fully participate in the “rights and duties” nor do they have the “accompanied resources”. The most prominent example within Frazer and Elmer’s (1997) analysis though, is the overwhelming amount of research understanding the right to vote as a key component of active citizenship. Even when young people are found to act politically, such as protesting or voicing political ideologies, Frazer and Elmer (1997) reveal that youth are commonly muted, neutralized, and disabled as political citizens by organizational structures and authority members. While the bulk of youth

citizen literature is limited to political opinions, Frazer and Elmer (1997) argue that there should be more to understanding the choices of political citizens than simple ideological attitudes influencing the name put in a ballot box. Frazer and Elmer suggest researchers broaden the scope of political socialization to help understand society-state relations that are inclusive of young people – such as political processes within the household, the school, or the workplace.

Another youth citizenship study, focused on education and sexual and reproductive health rights conducted in Western Africa by Crossouard and Dunne (2015), bases their age category of young people on the United Nations (1995) grouping of 15-24 years. This age category aligned well with their study, as 15-24 was the age category used by the international non-governmental organization in Senegal that commissioned their research. Similar to Frazer and Elmer (1997), these authors explain the category of youth as in a transitional period. Crossouard and Dunne (2015) explain youth as having an “indeterminable ‘in-between’ status” (p. 45) where they sit ambiguously between the innocents associated with childhood, and the maturity associated with adulthood. Within Crossouard and Dunne’s (2015) study, they conducted a documentary analysis and interviewed managers of the international non-governmental organization, Oxfam Novib, along with partners that organized a youth citizenship focussed project funded by Oxfam Novib. The partners consisted of the directors of and local leaders working on an electronic election monitoring project that intended to engage youth in the Senegal presidential elections. Focus groups were also conducted with young activists that spearheaded electoral protests and were involved in the election monitoring project. Crossouard and Dunne (2015) found that while youth were actively engaging in politics in ways that refuted stereotypical constructions of youth as immature and irresponsible, they kept their political affiliations neutral thus, suppressed the construction of their own political ideologies. The youth participants were working hard to

encourage other young people to participate in the electronic monitoring project, however, they kept their own political opinions and thoughts muted. One youth participant referred to politics and “things which were of real concern to youth” (Crossouard & Dunne, 2015, p. 54) as two different things. Included in the list of real concerns reported was incest, rape, and sexual abuse. Crossouard and Dunne (2015) suggested this was a disassociation of their gender and sexual health rights from their political participation, otherwise, the young people did not recognize gender and sexuality as political or a part of their conceptualization of citizenship. In addition, unemployment, youth indiscipline, and irresponsibility were listed as real concerns. Crossouard and Dunne (2015) take a post-structural feminist theoretical approach to their construction of citizenship, steering away from what they believe to be the more common and problematic construction of the term in which separates the public and private spheres and resultantly ignores the significance of kinship, impacting considerations of youth citizenship. In their analysis of youth citizenship, Crossouard and Dunne (2015) believe active citizenship happens in both public and private spaces, thus, recognizing factors such as ethnic, regional, religious, and sexual identities when conceptualizing citizenship. Within Crossouard and Dunne’s (2015) discussion of citizenship they point to feminist authors, including Yuval-Davis (1997), that have questioned masculinist epistemologies within their defining of citizenship in modern democracies.

Within Yuval-Davis’ (1997) book, *Gender and Nation* she spends her fourth chapter focussing in on citizenship and differences. Yuval-Davis (1997) defines citizenship as... “as an overall concept which sums up the relationship between the individual and the state” (p. 68). Yuval-Davis (1997) completes a review of citizenship literature, explaining that the term has been constructed in many ways across different societies as well as historical shifts throughout the same societies. Within her analysis, Yuval-Davis (1997) discusses citizenship with the

purpose of considering women's citizenship as a multi-tier construct by analyzing notions of nationalism and community as well as social rights and social differences relating to multiculturalism and gender relations. Within Roche's (1987) pursuit of a more liberal definition of citizenship where each individual is presumed to have equal rights and equal duties, she conducts a dialogue with Marshall's "Citizenship and Social Class" (1949). Yuval-Davis (1997) explains that within Roche's (1987) concept of citizenship, factors such as gender, ethnicity, or age are not relevant because all citizens are constructed with the same set of assumptions and expectations of one another. In addition, Yuval-Davis (1997) highlights many criticisms of this liberal notion of citizenship as this individualistic construction does not allow the consideration of active participation toward a common good in the ways a citizen as a member of a community would. By relating the citizen to a community instead of the state, Yuval-Davis (1997) explains, there can be a multi-dimensionality in applications of citizenship across communities (e.g., cities, towns, villages, etc.). Yuval-Davis (1997) refers to Marshall's communitarian definition of citizenship as the most influential in Britain citizenship literature.

Within an analysis of youth citizenship literature, Williamson (1997) discusses the parameters of citizenship with young people considering the limitations as well as the potentials of youth work in Europe. While not identifying a specific age category for the term, Williamson (1997) highlights the category of young people as commonly thought of as being dependent on others, namely the state. Within his analysis, Williamson (1997) reflects briefly on youth definitions and is much more focused on defining citizenship. Across Williamson's (1997) review he notes that certain social groups have revealed a feeling of treatment as a *second class citizen* due to institutional limitations and/or restrictions based on their class, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and ethnicity before also proposing, "and perhaps age" (p. 358).

According to Williamson (1997), essential to the stability of a society is the extension of full citizenship rights to all. However, Williamson (1997) argues that youth are denied full citizenship due to the prolonged dependency consigned to young people. This exclusion can be seen in the reduction of access to rights associated with citizenship as well as the limited opportunities to practice the responsibilities associated with citizenship. Within Williamson's (1997) analysis of youth citizenship literature, he discusses the reality for young people is more that of an education on citizenship. There is a focus from the state on teaching citizenship and fostering ideals of good citizenship in young people. Williamson (1997) finds that youth work is commonly associated with personal development, however, less often tied to the development of citizenship. Furthermore, concerns are revealed regarding what constitutes suitable methodologies to preparing individuals for citizenship. Williamson (1997) argues that citizenship education must not merely define democracy, but enable young people to gauge the quality of their democratic practice as an operational competence around the functions of citizenship.

Despite criticisms, Marshall's (1952) analysis of citizenship is cited as the most consistent source informing debates of citizenship, including that of young people. Williamson (1997) explains that nearly all researchers of citizenship follow Marshall's (1952) concept of rights and obligations. Of Marshall's three areas of rights and obligations (i.e., civil, political, and social) he argues for the significance of social rights in particular. Williamson (1997) explains, "Social rights promote societal development and redress the social problems caused by market economies" (p. 359). Citizenship, according to Williamson (1997), must unite fellow citizens together to form a community. Williamson (1997) believes that factors relating to the economic position as well as the social norms and institutions of the geographies we study impact both research approaches as well as legislative approaches to defining citizenship.

Similarly, these factors will impact how the demographic of youth is defined, whether that be the chronological age or the rights and responsibilities tied to the category.

Within an analysis of research exploring British youth perceptions and experiences of citizenship, France (1998) speaks of young people as those that are under the age of majority and suggests that citizenship is therefore more of an adult experience. After analyzing study findings from interviews with working class young people in Britain, France (1998) concluded that young people undertaking responsibilities associated with citizenship were undermined, excluded, and exploited. The young people were contacted through a local youth centre, and were asked about their experiences of citizenship and how they perceive themselves as present and/or future citizens. France (1998) reported, “to be a 'good citizen' it is necessary to accept the status quo and learn the responsibilities associated with it. The young people of Westhill suggested that such a process is oppressive and leaves little room for questions of 'difference' to be considered” (p. 105). France (1998) refers to *good citizens* as those that follow adult expectations imposed on to young people (i.e., how things ought to be done). Adults impose these *social responsibilities* onto young people, such as the hierarchical view of respect on to elders or how citizens ought to engage in the community. For example, France (1998) reports that youth participants felt a significant sense of community and belonging in rave cultures. However, adults in their lives undermined the social cohesion in such activities and made wider assumptions that such activities threatened community life, ultimately, leading to an increase in youth surveillance. France (1998) explains, “citizenship is generally understood as an adult experience. Being young is seen as a transitional stage between ‘childhood’ and ‘adulthood’ where young people either learn about becoming adults or where they pass through certain ‘rites of passage’” (p. 99). Thus, it is through such transitions such as school to work and family home to independent living that

“citizenship” is experienced for the young people in France’s (1998) analysis. However, France (1998) notes that this point of view is problematic in that it does not recognize lived experiences of being young, such as the cultural contexts and social powers tied to youth citizenship. For example, France (1998) highlights that economic restructuring affecting young people’s access to employment opportunities make it more difficult for young people in their transitions toward adulthood, and otherwise defer their ability to uphold adult citizenship in the future.

The prominent political discussion of youth citizenship France (1998) refers to is that of educating and encouraging young people toward citizenship in the future, otherwise referred to as “encouraging responsibility among youth” (France, 1998, p. 100). Similar to Frazer and Elmer (1997), Williamson (1997), and Yuval-Davis (1997), France (1998) also highlights the importance of Marshall’s (1950) work in both sociological and political discussions of citizenship. Despite criticisms, France (1998) refers to Marshall’s ideas as ensuring a continued commitment to social justice and integration. However, France (1998) refers to one clear failure in Marshall’s definition of citizenship and that was a greater consideration of the responsibilities tied to citizenship. While Marshall outlines compulsory responsibilities such as paying taxes and insurances, and important but non-compulsory responsibilities such as obtaining paid work and undertaking community work, France (1998) refers to these as “passive duties” that “lacked a recognition of other responsibilities” (p. 98). France (1998) believes that Marshall did not clearly define responsibilities outside of respecting the law, and that he failed to consider a relationship between the rights and responsibilities of active social participation. Therefore, in France’s (1998) analysis, she puts more of a focus on the expected responsibilities of young people tied to their citizenship.

Within another theoretical analysis of youth citizenship, Helve (1997) ties governance to conceptualizations of citizenship. This piece of literature does not specifically define the terms youth or young people. Helve (1997) narrows in on the political and social participation of youth citizenship across European and Nordic countries, concluding that youth are excluded from participation as active citizens due their age. Helve (1997) highlights, “A ‘citizen’ is an abstract concept attached to a notional set of norms; it relates to the nature of the state, the role of the market, the idea of common interests and the idea of rights” (p. 413). Helve (1997) believes that directly related to the economic, cultural, and social impacts tied to youth citizenship, is the role of the state: the ways the state governs society and how society is ultimately governed. Helve (1997) highlights that “fundamental to the idea of citizenship is autonomy within the state; yet for large numbers of young people this stage has not been reached” (p. 229). Youth have been argued to exercise citizenship in the very broadest sense because they lack the access to resources and supports availing the autonomy required to obtain the rights and practice the obligations associated with ideal citizenship, most notably in regards to political participation. In defining the concept of citizenship, Helve (1997) refers to those who ‘belong’ and ‘outsiders’; outsiders such as youth being those that are excluded from certain rights and obligations tied to the state (e.g., voting).

Kennelly (2011) analyzes policing and youth citizenship in Canada. Many researchers discuss ideas of youth citizenship in relation to political participation (Crossouard & Dunne, 2015; France 1998; Frazer & Elmer, 1997) or the workforce (France, 1998; Williamson, 1997) with few researchers analyzing youth as citizens in light of governance. Kennelly’s (2011) work is one of few accounts of researchers who work to understand youth as citizens in relation to how they are policed. Though the justification is not identified, Kennelly (2011) uses the age category

of 13-29 in her youth citizenship analysis. According to Kennelly (2011) the categorization of youth, alongside the characteristic of inherent dependence associated with it, is something that first emerged in Canada after the Second World War. Kennelly's (2011) paper describes two different research projects with groups of young people in Canada. The first study consists of interviews with youth engaged in activist work that challenges the state, and the second consists of interviews with street-involved youth before the 2010 Vancouver Winter Olympics. Kennelly (2011) uses Foucault's concept of governmentality to understand how policing functions as governance over youth, and follows writings of Wendy Brown (2005) and Nikolas Rose (1999) to understand how functions of governance are pertinent to what is termed as the *legitimate citizen* of a neo-liberal state. Kennelly (2011) argues that police utilize a form of governance over young people that situates youth as illegitimate citizens. Kennelly (2011) references Nikolas Rose's terminology of an inclusionary and exclusionary mode of control strategy, referring to two types of control strategies that either incorporate the excluded (i.e., inclusionary) or accept those as excluded (i.e., exclusionary). The youth in both of Kennelly's (2011) studies experienced inclusionary and exclusionary modes of governing from police that seemingly tried to guide young people in becoming appropriate contributing citizens through the regulation and containment of the youth. The conclusion of the study was that police enforce governance over youth by teaching them to conform to neo-liberal ideals of what it means to be a good citizen, and if youth are unwilling they are given more severe sanctions. Kennelly (2011) explains that a relationship of *mutuality* exists where the citizen contributes to the state's economy and security, and in return, gains state protection and rights. However, this is especially difficult for young people. Kennelly (2011) explains,

The relationship between youth, citizenship and dependence within the state carries specific implications for young people's treatment by state apparatuses, such as social service agencies, schools and police. Young people, particularly if they are under the age of majority, are presumed to be irrational actors and/or making choices based on their parents' direction. Furthermore, they are perceived to be requiring protection, often extended in a paternalistic form that denies their ability to make reasonable, rational decisions. (p. 341)

Thus, participation in certain institutions and processes of government characterizes the status of citizenship. Similar to the review of youth legislation, Kennelly (2011) is also showing that young people that are not of the legal age to fully participate in society are considered dependant on their parents and/or requiring paternal care from the states as well. Kennelly (2011) goes on to say:

Within a neo-liberal context, young people are culturally positioned as learners who must be carefully guided towards suitable degrees of self-regulation, in order to become legitimate citizens within contemporary (neo-) liberal democracies. This carries specific implications for how they are perceived and treated by gatekeepers and social control agents such as teachers, police and social workers.” (p. 337, 338)

Kennelly (2011) mirrors that of other youth citizenship researchers, insofar as the term citizenship being an educational aspect of young peoples' lives rather than a participatory component of their societal status. What Kennelly also identifies is that “gatekeepers and social control agents” (p. 338) such as police play key roles young peoples' lives for this very reason.

Across the literature the predefined age categories associated to the term youth commonly relate to the methodology of the study at hand (i.e., the age grouping relates to where

the research is commissioned). Being that my study is in Canada, specifically regarding police perceptions working with young people and their parents under the legal direction of the YCJA, I use the age category outlined within the scope of the YCJA, between 12-18. Much of the criteria related the term youth in the literature analyzed also signify a transition in the economic position of young people (i.e., educational status, employment status, and certain legal status) and the political position of young people (i.e., age of majority and political participation) in a certain society. In Canada, young people within this age grouping gain opportunities and rights such as to legally seek employment, watch R-rated films, operate an automobile, complete compulsory education, and nearing the end of that age category one can gamble and vote in political polls. In Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario, Prince Edward Island, Quebec, and Saskatchewan the age of majority is 18 years old (Department of Justice Canada, 2017). In British Columbia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Labrador, Northwest Territories, Nova Scotia, Nunavut, and Yukon the age of majority is 19 years old (Department of Justice Canada, 2017). These transitions in the public and private sphere provide young people with a slow increase of independence and responsibility. Within this age grouping, young Canadians also gain abilities to make certain legal decisions for themselves where prior to the age of 16, a legal guardian would hold such authority. Across much of the literature, how youth are economically or politically positioned is layered with limitations and restraints. As my analyses is from the perspective of police, I consider the position of youth and how that can impact their interactions with authority figures such as police. Some of youth citizenship research outlines a liberalist versus a communitarian theoretical approach of understanding youth citizenship. With a strong focus on the communitarian theoretical approach, I also aim to branch off of the liberalist approach to better understand how young people are perceived as citizens.

How citizenship is conceptualized across the literature is ambiguous, however, definitions are almost always tied to certain rights and obligations (Williamson, 1997) that more commonly than not, fall outside the realm of what young people have the access to fulfill. Many of the researchers discussed in this section refer to the reality of citizenship for young people as more of a citizenship education. I believe the individualistic focus of the liberalist view will help when analyzing the educational aspect of youth citizenship to better understand how societal pressures of police perspectives might influence how police utilize governance over young people. However, similar to the communitarian approach, I do not want to separate the public and private spheres as I seek to understand the embedded social relations of both police and parents as a community around young people. Thus, I will revolve my theoretical approach of citizenship around the most relevant and most cited theorist across the literature analyzed, T.H. Marshall. As there is only a limited amount of research that uses theories of governance in understanding youth citizenship, I seek to work off the only Canadian specific literature, that of Kennelly (2011), who focused on Foucault's theories of governance when analysing police perspectives of theirs and youth's parents' positions of authority.

2.3 Perceptions on Parenting Youth Who Transgress the Law

Recognizing the fact that youth have been constructed as a state of becoming (i.e., requiring the assistance of adults to transition into proper citizens of the state), it is no surprise that parenting has commonly come under scrutiny throughout youth crime literature. Both child and youth behaviours have been linked to specific parenting techniques, practices, and family backgrounds (Hope et al., 1998; Zhang, 2011; Mazefsky & Farrell, 2005), namely under the use of the Social Disorganization Theory (Kaylen & Pridemore, 2013; Moore & Sween, 2015;

Osgood & Chambers, 2000; Wong, 2012). In this section, I will unpack how researchers' findings associate certain types of parenting with negative youth behaviour, alongside ideologies of youth as having developing minds in need of assistance which have, and continue, to influence restrictions to the authority that parents may hold over young people. I will analyze data linking parenting practices to child and youth misbehaviour with a focus on rural contexts, moving into a review of the Social Disorganization Theory and relating research. However, rather than continuing the cycle of parent blaming, I will end this section with two unique pieces of literature that critique parent-blaming approaches and provide the often unheard perspectives of parents.

Even as early on as kindergarten, Hope et al. (1998) reported an impact of certain parenting techniques on negative child behaviours within a study conducted in rural and urban school districts of economically disadvantaged areas of central Pennsylvania. Parents and teachers of 310 kindergarten aged children were interviewed using a Child Behaviour Checklist-Parent Rating Form and Child Behaviour Checklist-Teacher Rating Form created by Achenbach (1991). These scales provided scores on two dimensions of child behaviour problems – “externalizing problems (aggressive, disruptive, and antisocial behaviors), and internalizing problems (anxiety, depression and social withdrawal)” (Hope et al., 1998, p. 49) seen within the home setting (parent ratings) and school setting (teacher ratings). Hope et al.'s, (1998) literature review revealed that one of the most prevalent predictors of young people engaging in crime, substance abuse, and struggling in school is linked to early development disruptive behaviour emerging first in family contexts such as high rates of harsh and punitive parenting techniques. Literature in their study suggested a ripple effect where children will engage in aggressive behaviour learned within the home that is then transferred to the school context, resulting in a

gateway of negative outcomes for other children who interact with aggressive peers at school (Hope et al., 1998). Thus, they aimed to analyze problem behaviours seen within children first entering school, tracking the differences of home to school behaviours across rural to urban settings. Based on the significant amount of research linking punitive discipline practices to disruptive behaviour problems within home settings, Hope et al. (1998) hypothesized that there would be no clear differences in their rural versus urban analysis of externalizing or internalizing child behaviours emerging in home settings—which their results supported.

However, teacher ratings of externalizing behaviour problems were reported as significantly higher in urban areas compared to that of the rural areas. Hope et al. (1998) link this finding to how children in urban areas are at a greater exposure to violence and greater density of high-risk conduct problems. Generally, children in rural areas were reported to have significantly higher patterns of home-only problem behaviours, while children in urban areas were reported to have significantly higher patterns of school-only problem behaviours. Hope et al. (1998) speak to the differential impact of community, given that teachers within rural schools might have more abilities in suppressing negative peer influence and aggressive student behaviour due to the smaller classroom sizes. These authors suggest urban children posing more school-only problems might be at a higher risk of school failure and criminal activity, while rural children posing home-only problems might be at a higher risk of domestic relationship problems and violence. Hope et al. (1998) conclude that collaborative prevention programs are required to link school-based and family-based services, ensuring intervention efforts do not narrowly focus on improving only one or the other, leaving some children to fall through the cracks.

Family background was one of three significant impacts on youth school and criminal outcomes based off the 2001 Canadian National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth

(NLSCY). Researcher, Zhang (2011) analyzed school outcomes and criminal behaviours among both boys and girls between ages 12 to 15 and the potential correlates of neighbourhood contexts, public policies, schooling environments, as well as personal and family factors. While the former two categories did not reveal any significant themes, schooling quality, peer interactions as well family background deemed significant in youth outcomes. Within the results, Zhang (2011) reported that in-class group activities at the school level were positively associated with better school outcomes as well as decreased levels of criminal activities for both boys and girls. In regard to personal and family factors, Zhang (2011) reported parents' educational attainment was positively associated with boys' and girls' school outcomes but did not affect criminal activity and that household income was moderately associated with above-average school performance for both boys and girls but did not affect criminal activity. Most notably, Zhang (2011) reported that parental supervision and peer affect were associated with both better school outcomes as well as fewer criminal activities among boys and girls.

Within another rural focused study, scholars studied the potential influences on aggressive youth behaviour in rural counties of the Southern United States in 2000 (Mazefsky & Farrell, 2005). Researchers, Mazefsky and Farrell (2005) found strong ties between disciplinary parenting practices and negative youth outcomes. The sample included 1,153 ninth grader students across six high schools in public school systems. Students completed surveys – based on the child form of the Alabama Questionnaire (APQ) created by Frick (1991) – within their homeroom classes. Ten questions related to parental monitoring and six questions related to parental disciplinary practices, following a previous study that used the APQ, Mazefsky and Farrell (2005) combined these two subscales to represent parenting practices and define poor parenting. Based off Furman's and Buhrmester's (1985) Network of Relationship Inventory,

Mazefsky and Farrell (2005) created a seven-item scale to assess family support. Mazefsky and Farrell (2005) then used the Problem Behaviour Frequency Scale, citing Farrell, Kung, White, and Valois (2000), to assess aggression with youth. Mazefsky and Farrell (2005) reported that the parenting practices they associated with poor parenting predicted aggressive behaviour with youth. Furthermore, adolescents who witnessed violence as well as peer provocation were even more likely to show aggression if they also had parents that engaged in these types of parenting practices (Mazefsky & Farrell, 2005).

The Social Disorganization Theory is one of few youth crime-related theories slowly finding its way into studies of rural crime despite its original adaptation for urban crime (Moore & Sween, 2015), thus, I found it significant to highlight. Tracing from Thomas and Znaniecki's (1958 [1927]) writings around community solidarity and disorganization, Shaw and McKay (1942) developed Social Disorganization Theory to help understand the relationship between place and youth crime rates in Chicago (Moore & Sween, 2015; Osgood & Chambers, 2000). Over the years the structural characteristics included in the Social Disorganization Theory have changed and extended, such as Kornhauser's (1978) reformulation that rejects the elements of cultural conflict and strain outlined within Shaw and McKay's (1942) version (Osgood & Chambers, 2000). Researchers using the Social Disorganization Theory have largely focussed on urban crime (Kaylen & Pridemore, 2013; Moore & Sween, 2015; Osgood & Chambers, 2000), resulting in an urban-centered focus on two variables a part of the Social Disorganization Theory; high population density and proximity to urban areas (Moore & Sween, 2015). However, researchers have been able to apply other key variables a part of the original Social Disorganization Theory to rural youth crime rates as well, such as family disruption, low

economic status, residential instability, and ethnic diversity (Moore & Sween, 2015, Osgood & Chambers, 2000).

Osgood and Chambers (2000) were one of the first researchers to systemically test the relevance of this urban centric theory to non-metropolitan communities within a study across Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and Nebraska. Within their study, Osgood and Chambers (2000) test the applicability of residential instability (proportion of homes in the community having new occupants within a five year span), ethnic heterogeneity (proportion of white versus non-white homes in the community), poverty (proportion of people within the community living below the poverty level), proximity to metropolitan counties (proportion of counties adjacent to a metropolitan county), and family disruption (proportion of homes within the community that are headed by single mothers) against rates of young people engaging in violent criminalized acts. Osgood's and Chamber's (2000) findings indicated that Social Disorganization Theory could also translate to non-urban communities. More specifically, the findings revealed a significant association between per capita juvenile arrests of violent offenses with residential instability, ethnic heterogeneity, proximity to metropolitan counties, and family disruption. Osgood and Chambers (2000) argued,

From the strength and consistency of the findings, it appears that family disruption is an especially critical element of social disorganization in these nonmetropolitan communities. In terms of social disorganization theory, this result suggests that adults actively engaged in parental roles are especially critical to the systems of relationships that bring formal and informal controls to bear on the behavior of children throughout the community (p. 106).

Kaylen and Pridemore (2011) aimed to extend Osgood and Chambers' (2000) research by applying a similar methodological approach within their study of nonmetropolitan counties of Missouri. Noting that that many researchers that have based their rural analysis from Osgood and Chambers' (2000) and have concluded Social Disorganization Theory generalizes to rural areas (see, Bouffard and Mufti, 2006; Moore & Sween, 2015; Petee and Kowalski, 1993), Kaylen and Pridemore (2011) reveal different results within their study. Of the five elements of the Social Disorganization Theory Kaylen and Pridemore (2011) analyzed, only the family disruption variable (female-headed households) was significant in predicting youth crime in rural areas of Missouri. Kaylen and Pridemore (2011) highlight that there are also a fair amount of inconsistencies across applications of Social Disorganization Theory in rural contexts, even with researchers that claim the theory generalizes well to rural applications. For example, Kaylen and Pridemore (2011) point out that while Osgood and Chambers (2000) as well as Petee and Kowalski (1993) did not find poverty, percent low income, and poverty concentration to influence youth violence in rural areas, Bouffard and Mufti (2006) found a strong negative association within their study between poverty and assault, robbery, and rape.

Another study applying Osgood and Chamber's (2000) application of Social Disorganization Theory to rural areas was conducted by Moore and Sween (2015), but on a much larger scale. Moore and Sween (2015) analyzed the Violent Crime Index of 2010 across 48 states and over 2,000 rural counties in the United States. Their findings suggested that certain factors of the theory could be used to explain rural youth crime, specifically, residential instability, ethnic heterogeneity, and the family disruption variable.

Within a study of both rural and urban communities, the family disruption variable was reported as significant within rural areas, however, much more significant in urban areas (Wong,

2012). Based on municipal-level data of Canadian youth offense rates between 1996 and 2001, results revealed low income, mobility, and ethnic heterogeneity as having stronger effects on youth crime in smaller municipalities rather than urban areas. However, the family disruption variable accounting for single-parent families had stronger effects in larger municipalities over rural regions (Wong, 2012).

While most researchers focus on negative child outcomes related to criminalized activity as an output of parental influences, some believe an unfair stigma directed toward the parents of youth transgressing the law exists in youth crime literature. Hillian and Reitsma-Street (2003) note that little research, beyond their own, speaks to the parental perspective of misbehaving children and handling processes of youth justice at the legal level. Their study, conducted on Vancouver Island, was based on interviews with ten parents of sons that had navigated the youth justice system in the year 2000. The type of crime committed by the youth varied, including both minor, short-term offenses as well as longer, more serious offenses, several were currently on probation. Of the ten participants in this action-oriented study, all of them were Caucasian parents currently in heterosexual relationships. The study consisted of in depth, semi-structured interviews, and follow up interviews. The study also included discussions with four parent collaborators who had initiated parental educational sessions organized by a self-help group for parents in difficult circumstances called *Parents Together*. Finally, the authors also reflected on their own experiences working in their area of youth crime and justice. Hillian and Reitsma-Street (2003) structured the methodological approach to their analysis following, “Colaizzi’s (1978) prescription for phenomenological inquiry and Kvale’s (1996) seven stages of analyzing qualitative research” (p. 26). The parents that participated revealed feelings of emotional turmoil, endless work, lack of support, system constraints, and restrictions to parental involvement in

processes of youth justice. Parents also discussed feelings of blame for their sons' misbehaviour throughout these major themes: "the distress that parents experience when a young person offends is often exacerbated by a common societal belief that the misbehavior of children is the fault of their parents" (Hillian & Reitsma-Street, 2003, p. 20).

Hillian and Reitsma-Street (2003) refer to parent blaming as an expression of *the faulty parenting paradigm*. The faulty parenting paradigm refers to the ideology that youth causing any sort of trouble are simply the product of poor parenting, without consideration of any other broader contexts. Such ideology has informed legislation in both the United States and even some provinces in Canada where parents can be held civilly liable for certain youth crimes – namely, property damages – caused by their children. These authors also highlight that "Probation officers and other professionals in youth justice often complain about the neglecting, difficult parents they encounter. They continue to assume that parents should and can rear law-abiding citizens, but little is known about the specific expectations and experiences of parents themselves, from either a conceptual or parental point of view" (p. 34). Hillian and Reitsma-Street (2003) suggest we must reframe our focus to a "community change approach" (p. 35) in which holds parents, youth, and the community accountable to preventing youth crime and handling youth justice and accountability. The authors believe that proper implementation of the restorative justice practices outlined within the YCJA would promote more of these community-oriented approaches. Hillian and Reitsma-Street (2003) also reported that justice-oriented governmental departments such as police departments were less likely to address concerns of parents in the same ways as other governmental departments would.

Despite the encouragement towards police and parent collaboration, researchers have argued that parents feel a lack of power and involvement in the youth justice system working

under the YCJA. In a Canadian study interviewing a variety of key informants working within the youth justice system, researchers found that parents were, at most, rarely involved in their youth's experience with the justice systems post-court processes (i.e., during police detainment and at the police station; Peterson-Badali & Broeking, 2010). Some researchers suggest that expectations of parents during their children's experiences with the justice system are still broadly stated within the YCJA. Due to inconsistent legislative interpretations and implementations of the YCJA, alongside a failure to provide parents clear direction, parents have reported feeling limitations to their involvement in youth justice (Endres, 2004; Peterson-Badali and Broeking, 2010). Peterson-Badali and Broeking (2010) analyzed the parental involvement of youth justice proceeding under the YCJA by interviewing justice system officials and observing parents during youth court cases. The justice system workers interviewed outlined a wider range of involvement for parents such as advocacy, support, and socialization within court proceedings. Workers suggested that when parents were visibly involved in more positive ways (i.e., for advocacy and support rather than punishment and shame) this enhanced legal advantages for the youth in question as well as the justice system, lending a greater likelihood of gaining more information on the case and positively affecting proceedings regarding the outcomes of cases (Peterson-Badali & Broeking, 2010). In addition, court workers suggested that disagreements between parents and youth during court meetings and cases create additional conflict around who constituted the client and affected court proceedings negatively (Peterson-Badali & Broeking, 2010). Lawyers, judges, probation officers, police, crown attorneys, and youth court judges were identified throughout the literature as advocates for parental involvement in processes of youth justice and accountability in the form of support and guidance

both pre- and post- arrest and during diversional programs by Peterson-Badali and Broeking (2010) as well as Caputo and Kelly (1997).

Within the framework of my analysis, I am not equipped to analyze the parents of the youth discussed but rather, I am analyzing the police perspectives of the parents of the youth they encounter. Therefore, my focus is how parents of criminalized youth are commonly characterized by others throughout the literature. Parents have been at the forefront of blame for child and youth misbehaviour in regard to parenting techniques, a parents' background, and parental involvement within the family dynamics. While much of the youth crime legislation used to have an urban-centred focus, it appears many of the same results have been seen across rural geographies as well. What is not seen throughout the literature is the police perspective of the parents they encounter while addressing youth crime and misbehaviour. While Hillian and Reitsma-Street (2003) and Peterson-Badali and Broeking (2010) are few researchers to highlight the parent perspective, my goal is to try to understand the police perspective of the roles of authority figures in preventing and addressing youth misbehaviour. Rather than simply feeding into a parent blaming focus as identified by Hillian and Reitsma-Street (2003), I aim to understand what police perspectives of parents tell us about how youth are interpreted as citizens that are governed by authority figures in their lives.

2.4 Theoretical Framework

To provide insight into how police perspectives of parents are connected to police conceptualizations of youth as citizens, my analysis adopts theories of governance and citizenship. Theories of governance I use will in large part reflect the writings of and interpretations of governmentally by French philosopher, Michel Foucault. The police

perspectives in my study reflect theories of governance over youth and show how youth are interpreted in regard to conceptualizations of citizenship. My analysis of police perceptions of youth citizenship will draw from writings of and interpretations of British sociologist, Thomas Humphry Marshall on class, citizenship, and social development to show how youth are governed by core adults in their lives such as parents and police. Through the perspectives of police shared, I will reveal the ways policing functions as mechanisms of governance as well as the ideologies of parental governance that together, establish conceptualizations of an *ideal citizen* and the associated barriers to understanding young people in this way.

Governmentality for Foucault is a type of power. Foucault explains that mechanisms of power directly designate relationships, as power is exercised between two or more individuals (Foucault, 1982). Thus, power is not something one can have ownership over, it is something that is actioned or exercised between the relations of one individual to one or more individuals. Power is not simply a signifier of a relationship for Foucault; “it is a way in which certain actions modify others” (Foucault, 1982, p. 788). In the case of a parent or police, these individuals exercise power as authority figures (i.e., governance) over young people in ways that can change how young people behave, and more significantly, are able to practice the aspects of citizenship as defined by Marshall (1965). The exercise of power as a means of governmentality can be reflected within parent-to-youth and police-to-youth power relations. Governing is described as an attempt to shape the individual that is on the receiving end of the power relation (Foucault, Senellart, Ewald & Fontana, 2007), notably not just by commanding or prohibiting as pointed out by Smith (2014). Similarly, in neo-liberal democracies such as Canada, young people are commonly thought of as requiring guidance by other members of the community (namely, parents, police, and educators) to learn how to become successful independent members of

society (i.e., ideal citizens). Rather than simply focussing on the governing of a state, Foucault has noted that many individuals, including himself, that have written on the power of governance have also spoke of the governing of, "... a household, souls, children, a province, a convent, a religious order, and a family" (Foucault et. al, 2007, p. 93). These different modes of governing are considered internal to the government of the state, in which Foucault has argued there exists a plurality in the forms of governance. The plurality of governance is thought of as an upward continuity, beginning with the governance of oneself, then the governance of one's household (family, land, goods) and lastly the governances of one's state (Foucault et. al, 2007). The ways in which governance is actioned from the state to the family for Foucault, is through policing. Within Smith's (2014) adoption of Foucault's governmentality during her analysis of the power dynamics between parents and children, she argues;

... from a governmentality perspective what is of particular interest in the analysis of relations between parents and children is the extent to which they are intertwined with relations of power at the wider, societal level, especially in the manner in which the power parents exercise over their children supports and maintains the political authority exercised by the state over its citizens (p. 10).

Unlike Smith (2014), I am not analyzing the parental governance utilized over youth, but instead, police perspectives of how parental governance could be utilized over youth. I seek to use a theory of governmentality in order to better understand how police feel their authority can intertwine with parental authority and governance over youth. I will use police perspectives of their policing of youth and interactions with parents to discuss how governance over youth supports the ideology of what it takes to be an ideal citizen of the state.

The term citizen is almost always paired with the state, as a type of working or political status. Many researchers such as France (1998), Frazer and Elmer (1997), Williamson (1997) and Yuval-Davis (1997) refer to T. H. Marshall's (1965) theory of citizenship to situate citizenship as an enactment of certain rights and obligations falling under three categories: civil, social, and political. Included in the civil rights of a citizen for Marshall are freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of faith, the right to own property, and conclude contracts, as well as the right to justice. Thus, the institutions that correlate with civil rights are the courts of justice (Marshall, 1965). The political element refers to any rights associated with the political participation of an individual a part of a political body. Thus, the institutions that correlate with political rights are that of the government (Marshall, 1965). The last category covers all social rights required to "live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society" (Marshall, 1965, p. 78). Thus, the economic welfare and security in social rights are associated with institutions such as educational systems and social services (Marshall, 1965). Due to the age of majority, young people cannot directly fulfill a lot of the civil, political, and social rights and obligations Marshall (1965) outlines, therefore the demographic that is capable of ideal citizenship is simply, adults. In regard to Marshall's first category of rights and obligations under civil rights, minors under the age of majority do not have rights to own property or conclude contracts. In addition, the political rights for those considered minors are nearly non-existent; the right to vote is restricted to the age of majority, and participation in welfare and taxation systems are also limited as minors are filed as dependants under their parents/guardians. When considering basic social rights according to Marshall (1965) such as the right to food, shelter, and education, these rights are funnelled through the parents and guardians of minors to ensure rather than directly from the state. Thus, just as concluded by researchers

such as Frazer and Elmer (1997), Helve (1997), Jones and Wallace (1992), and Williamson (1997), youth citizenship as I discuss in my thesis is that of an unattainable status for young people. This will frame how I discuss youth citizenship as something that is either taught or encouraged for young people to work towards rather than utilize in practice. Some researchers have used terms such as *second class citizen* (Williamson, 1997), *quasi-citizenship* (Jones & Wallace, 1992), *deferred citizenship* (Jones & Wallace, 1992), or *illegitimate citizens* (Kennelly, 2011) when discussing perceptions of youth citizenship because *good citizens* (France, 1997) are not achievable for individuals in the youth age category. To understand police mechanisms of governance, and perspectives of parental governance, I will term this ultimate goal of becoming an *ideal citizen*.

Chapter 3: Context & Methodology

My thesis analysis is a secondary use of data from the research project titled, “Creating ‘best practice’ for policing youth: Discovering, re-evaluating, re-shaping, and reviving hope for youth desistance through changing relational dynamics between youth and police, a bottom-up and top-down process” led by Professor of Sociology and my supervisor, Dr. Rosemary Ricciardelli. The greater research project consisted of qualitative (i.e., semi-structured interviews) and quantitative (i.e., demographic data collection & survey questions) research with police, youth, as well as community members that were involved in youth cases of extra-judicial measures (EJM). I will highlight my role in the larger policing study within the next sub-chapter. My thesis analysis focuses strictly on the qualitative data through police officer interviews, alongside the demographic information to give additional context about the participants in my analysis. The police officer interviews were semi-structured around a broad interview guide narrowing in on police attitudes and perspectives of the youth they are engaging with and their experiences working with EJM. I was not involved in the data collection components of the study, I was however, involved in portions of the transcribing, data management as well as all of the data analysis used for the purposes of my thesis research. I began my independent thesis analysis initially for the purposes of the greater study working as a Research Assistant in the department of Sociology. Upon completing the initial analytical coding of police officer interview transcriptions with a semi-grounded theory approach (please see Charmaz, 2006), my interest in the emergent theme of parenting brought me back to the data for the purposes of my thesis. Transcriptions, only some of which I transcribed personally, were coded from interviews with 128 police participants employed in eight rural detachments ranging from ten to under 40 policing staff members at each. The data collection began with semi-structured one-on-one

police officer interviews in the first two years (2014 & 2015) and semi-structured police focus groups in the first year of the study (2014). The following three years of the study (2016-2018) consisted of semi-structured follow up interviews with participants that had already been interviewed the years prior, as well as semi-structured follow up police officer focus groups in the second to last year of the study (2017). A total of 99 one-on-one interviews took place. One-on-one interviews began with 76 initial police interviews between 2014 and 2015, and ended with 23 follow up interviews between 2016-2018. A total of 17 focus groups were conducted, ranging from two participants to seven participants in each group, with the majority consisting of four participant groups. Initial focus groups occurred in 2014 consisting of 14 semi-structured police focus groups and ended with three semi-structured follow up focus groups three years later in 2017.

3.1 My Role and the Secondary Use of Data

Here I will highlight my role throughout the larger study from which the data for my thesis is derived. Data used for my thesis are drawn from a mixed-methodological study conducted in a rural part of Atlantic Canada over the span of 2014 to 2018. The study in its entirety consisted of quantitative survey data and qualitative interviews with both youth and police officers discussing their attitudes and experiences of one another, as well as community members involved in processes of extra-judicial measures (EJM). The long-term objectives of the original larger policing study were to illuminate how police could best serve youth in the study's region, as well as encourage improved youth and police attitudes towards one another. My study works toward the objective of police best serving youth, by providing recommendations for how police can better work alongside parents as meaningful allies in young

peoples' lives. I first began working with this dataset as a transcriber in the months leading up to the start of my Masters under Prof. Ricciardelli's supervision in September of 2017. That summer before I began my Masters I was transcribing some of the audio recordings of interviews Prof. Ricciardelli conducted with police as well interviews conducted with community members. Alongside transcribing, I was tasked with continuing unfinished work of organizing, filing, and inputting all components of the research project. My responsibilities consisted of organizing hard and/or soft copy versions of over 150 audio recordings, consent forms, demographic surveys, and transcriptions as well as EJM referral forms, case files, and notes over the span of four years. A previous research assistant had begun to organize some of the data from the earlier years. Two other research assistants helped with the final transcribing of the audio recordings. Once the data collection concluded in 2018, all audio recordings were transcribed and I had completed the data organization, I began analytically coding the bulk of the data, which consisted of the police interview components of the study for the purposes of the greater study. Two other research assistants coded the youth and community member portions of the study, that are not relevant to my thesis. My contributions in the current research project are highlighted within the creation of an internal report on the implementation of EJM presented to the police organization that gave institutional approval for the original study. As can be seen, I played a role in all aspects of the study post data collection (i.e., I did not conduct any interviews). My thesis is a secondary use of data from the larger research project, drawing from the original analysis I completed of the interviews conducted with police officers.

3.2 Policing in Rural Atlantic Canada

The police interviewed in the study used for my thesis were working under the *Youth*

Criminal Justice Act (YCJA) at the time of their participation. Thus, for my purposes the age category of youth and young people discussed are well suited to reflect the individuals included in the YCJA: between 12 and 18 years of age.

In rural Atlantic Canada much of the land is either uninhabited or sparsely inhabited, the remaining parts consisting of small, rural communities. Police officers interviewed across nearly all communities refer to policing in the region as having its own series of challenges and benefits, different from most other parts of Canada. Many challenges raised throughout the study are spoken of as the result of few police responsible for policing a large geographic area. To give some further context to the rurality of this part of Canada, consider *Statistics Canada's* (2016) reclassified language of Canada's population centres and Canada's rural areas (previously known as urban and rural). Population centres (i.e., urban areas), have been broken up into categories of small (minimum population between 1,000-29,999), medium (minimum population between 30,000-99,999) and large (minimum population 100,000 and over), all still falling under the category of urban. Population centres are defined as having a density of 400 or more people per square kilometer. Of the nine municipalities covered within this Atlantic Canada study, the average population density is 109.4 people per square kilometer, clearly falling far beneath the minimum requirements of the smallest type of population centre.

Definitions of rural policing differ across police scholars, with an overwhelming majority not defining their interpretation of "rural policing" at all. Sims (1988) is one of few criminology researchers that considers "how small is small" while discussing topics of rural and small town policing in his book, *Small Town and Rural Police*. Sims (1988) based their definition of small town and rural policing off the United States National Advisory Commission that categorized police departments by the number of police officers employed. Out of the six categories listed,

Sims (1988) narrowed in on the smallest of them all – less than 15 polices employed – to label small town policing. What Sims (1988) failed to consider in this label was the geographies that are not small in size, but the population in comparison to the geography that is small is size. Sims (1988) notes that some researchers outline up to 75 police officers employed at a detachment as small, and some researchers have considered under 100 police officers employed at a detachment as small. Once again, not clearly identifying the size of the geographies’ these police officers are policing, resultantly fails to consider the greater picture of rural policing outside of the number of police officers employed. The number of police employed per detachment in the current study range from 10 to under 40. While this would bring us into the second category out of the six outlined by Sims (1988) – 16-75 police officers employed – I still argue these detachments should be considered rural because of the large geographies these police are policing. Thus, for the purposes of my thesis, all policing, youth crime, and parenting in the area of study are considered rural.

3.3 Data Collection

As outlined in the original project’s approved ethics application, the research team that conducted the data collection for the larger study visited eight rural detachments across the region of Atlantic Canada for police officer recruitment to solicit participants based on the criteria that: they currently worked as police officers, they had had contact with youth on the job, and could communicate fluently in English. Police officers were first recruited via email, those that responded recruitment emails were scheduled for in-person interviews. Each police officer selected was briefed on the purpose of the study prior to consenting to participation. The research received institutional approval prior to participant recruitment.

All interviews conducted and focus groups were semi-structured; initially adhering to a broad interview guide and progressing with the conversational path of the participants. As the theme analyzed within the current study was emergent and not asked about directly, no specific interview question was analyzed. Rather, all responses to questions were analyzed. The one-on-one interviews conducted were typically between 20 minutes and 60 minutes in length, while the focus groups were typically between 60 minutes and 90 minutes in length. All interviews or focus group discussions began with a short demographic survey and progressed from an interview guide structured around police views on youth crime, police attitudes toward youth policing, potential strengths and limitations of policing youth, as well as the potential of police role strain and/or role conflict. Participants were provided the space to elaborate on each of their responses and asked follow up questions as they became relevant.

3.4 Sample

3.4.1 One-on-one Interview Demographics

Ages ranged between 21 to 56 across the 76 participants that engaged in one-on-one interviews. The large majority ($n=59$, 77.6 per cent) of participants in the one-on-one interviews identified as male, while 14 participants (18.4 per cent) identified as female, and three participants chose not to disclose their gender identity. A majority of participants in the sample ($n=50$, 65.8 per cent) attended some sort of post-secondary education, while 20 participants (26.3 per cent) attended secondary schooling or less. Six participants chose not to disclose their educational background. All participants that disclosed their birth place reported locations in Canada, with a majority ($n=52$, 68.4 per cent) reporting birth places in Atlantic Canada and the remaining reporting birth places from Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan. Sixteen

participants did not report their birth place. The length of occupational tenure across officers was fairly even with 48.7 per cent of participants ($n=37$) reporting 10 or more years (from 10 to 34+ years) and 44.7 per cent of participants ($n=34$) reporting police service as less than 10 years (from 5 months to 9 years). Five participants chose not to disclose their policing service years. The large majority of the sample reported a police ranking of constable ($n=53$, 69.7 per cent), with minorities reporting rankings of corporal ($n=9$, 11.8 per cent) or sergeant ($n=7$, 9.2 per cent), and one reporting as a civilian staff member (1.3 per cent). Six participants did not disclose their rank.

Table 1: One-on-one Interview Participant Characteristics

	Participants	Percent
<i>Sample</i>	76	100
<i>Gender</i>		
<i>Male</i>	59	77.6
<i>Female</i>	14	18.4
<i>Not disclosed</i>	3	4
<i>Age Group</i>		
19-29	11	14.5
30-39	32	42.1
40-49	20	26.3
50-59	7	9.2
60+	0	0
<i>Not disclosed</i>	6	7.9
<i>Educational Standard</i>		
<i>Primary or middle school</i>	1	1.3
<i>Secondary school</i>	19	25
<i>Professional institutes</i>	9	11.8
<i>Tertiary institutes (non-degree)</i>	13	17.1
<i>Bachelor's degree</i>	27	35.5
<i>Master's degree or above</i>	1	1.3
<i>Not disclosed</i>	6	7.9
<i>Birth Place</i>		
<i>Atlantic Canada</i>	52	68.4

<i>Central Canada</i>	4	5.3
<i>Western Canada</i>	1	1.3
<i>Quebec</i>	2	2.6
<i>Outside of Canada</i>	1	1.3
<i>Not disclosed</i>	16	21
<i>Occupational Tenure</i>		
<i>Less than ten years</i>	34	44.7
<i>More than ten years</i>	37	48.7
<i>Not disclosed</i>	5	6.6
<i>Police Ranking</i>		
<i>Constable</i>	53	69.7
<i>Corporal</i>	9	11.8
<i>Sergeant</i>	7	9.2
<i>Civilian Staff</i>	1	1.3
<i>Not disclosed</i>	6	7.9

3.4.2 Focus Group Demographics

Of the 52 participants that took part in focus groups, the ages ranged between 24 and 52.

A great majority ($n=44$, 84.6 per cent) of participants in the sample identified as male, while seven participants (13.5 per cent) identified as female, and one participant chose not to disclose their gender identity. A majority of police officers in the sample ($n=38$, 73.1 per cent) attended some sort of post-secondary education, with 12 participants (23.1 per cent) reporting have attended secondary schooling, and two participants chose not to disclose. All participants besides three reported birth places across Canada, with a majority ($n=42$, 80.8 per cent) reporting birth places in Atlantic Canada and the remaining reporting birth places from Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia, and Saskatchewan as well as Germany and the United States. The majority of participants ($n=35$, 67.3 per cent) reported their occupational tenure as 10 or more years (from 10 to 26 years), 16 participants (30.8 per cent) reported less than 10 years of service (from 2.5 months to 9 years), and 1 participant chose not to disclose. The majority of focus group

participants reported a ranking of corporal ($n=23$, 44.2 per cent), 15 participants reported a ranking of constable (28.8 per cent), 11 reported a ranking of sergeant (21.2 per cent), and two reported rankings of civilian staff (3.8 per cent). One participant chose not to disclose their police ranking.

Table 2: Focus Group Interview Participant Characteristics

	Participants	Percent
<i>Sample</i>	52	100
<i>Gender</i>		
<i>Male</i>	44	84.6
<i>Female</i>	7	13.5
<i>Not disclosed</i>	1	1.9
<i>Age Group</i>		
19-29	6	11.5
30-39	16	30.8
40-49	28	53.8
50-59	1	1.9
60+	0	0
<i>Not disclosed</i>	1	1.9
<i>Educational Standard</i>		
<i>Primary or middle school</i>	0	0
<i>Secondary school</i>	12	23.1
<i>Professional institutes</i>	5	9.6
<i>Tertiary institutes (non-degree)</i>	3	5.8
<i>Bachelor's degree</i>	30	57.7
<i>Master's degree or above</i>	0	0
<i>Not disclosed</i>	2	3.8
<i>Birth Place</i>		
<i>Atlantic Canada</i>	42	80.8
<i>Central Canada</i>	4	7.7
<i>Western Canada</i>	0	0
<i>Quebec</i>	2	3.8
<i>Outside of Canada</i>	2	3.8
<i>Not disclosed</i>	2	3.8
<i>Occupational Tenure</i>		
<i>Less than ten years</i>	16	30.8

<i>More than ten years</i>	35	67.3
<i>Not disclosed</i>	1	1.9
<i>Police Ranking</i>		
<i>Constable</i>	15	28.8
<i>Corporal</i>	23	44.2
<i>Sergeant</i>	11	21.2
<i>Civilian Staff</i>	2	3.8
<i>Not disclosed</i>	1	1.9

3.5 Data Analysis

After acquiring informed consent, all interviews conducted were audio recorded. Data were stored on a secure computer and repository. Hard copies of the completed short surveys of demographic related questions as well as youth crime/policing related questions were filed securely within the principal investigator’s campus office, and the data were also inputted into excel spread sheets. A previous research assistant began portions of this work with most of the first three years of data. I went through and double checked that all the surveys inputted from these first three years were inputted accurately, and I also completed inputting tasks for the remaining data. All audio recordings were transcribed, giving complete anonymity to participants by dropping any type of identifiers (e.g., names of people, locations or organizations/institutions). Previous research assistants transcribed most of the data from 2014-2016. I transcribed the remaining 2016 audio recordings that had not been transcribed to date, all of the 2017 audio recordings, and shared transcribing duties over the 2018 audio recordings with two other research assistants helping with the project work.

I imported all police transcriptions to the qualitative data analysis software, NVivo, where I independently coded the data originally for the larger study, going back through the codes for the purposes of my thesis during the process of semi-structured thematic analysis, rooting in approaches of Constructed Grounded Theory (Charmaz, 2006). My semi-structured

approach of constructed grounded theory involved reading, analyzing, and classifying segments of the interview transcripts into thematic codes within the NVivo software initially adhering to a broad preliminary codebook created based on the research questions. Within a semi-constructed grounded theory process of analysis, major themes, along with sub-themes will emerge from the data during the analysis, leading to the addition of new codes to the codebook. For the larger study, a brief preliminary codebook was created in line with the interview guide questions by the principal investigator. I used this codebook during a process of *initial grounded theory coding* (see, Charmaz, 2006) of data segments where the bulk of the codes emerged from within the data itself. Thus, my codebook grew and expanded based off the themes that presented themselves throughout the interview transcriptions. Coding for the data was broad therefore, many different topics and themes emerged from the dataset. After establishing strong analytic directions from within the data, police perceptions and experiences of working with youth's parents was a consistent major theme that emerged. I then realized I wanted to analyze this theme more deeply for the purposes of my thesis research. Thus, I created my research questions based off this emergent theme. Next, I took a more focused grounded theory approach that led me back through the interview transcriptions for a more *direct and selective coding* (see, Charmaz, 2006) of the data that reported on engagement and opinions of young people's parents, tying into more narrowed and focused sub-themes for the purposes of my thesis. At this point, I exported Microsoft Word documents of the codes related to my research (i.e., "Perspectives on parents") from the NVivo software, and organized the pull quotes into the categories in my research findings: *policing as parenting, the parent in youth accountability, and parent's knowledge of the YCJA*.

All data were transferred by an encrypted stick drive from a MUN lab computer and

securely stored on my personal laptop that is password protected and used by only myself. As this is secondary data, I will be following the data retention practices outlined in the approved ethics application of the original data holder. I will retain the data for five years, stored on an encrypted, password protected stick drive safely secured within my personal home. Data will be cleared from the drive in 2024.

3.6 Ethical Concerns and Means of Management

I feel it is crucial to consider the ethical concerns that may arise from who I specifically am as a researcher and how that has aided in my epistemological beliefs, along with how I pursue my research for the current study.

In positioning myself as a researcher, to my knowledge, I do not have any significant points of concern in relation to the current study. I am a white female that spent most of my life residing in a small town in southern Ontario. Currently, I am not a police officer, nor do I have any conflicts of interest with police officers. However, I have ensured to continue to reflect on my experiences with police as a young person, and any potential biases that may reveal throughout my research due to these experiences. Prior to engaging in this data and the relevant literature for the purposes of my thesis, I did not engage in any consideration of youth as citizens or consider the parent-blaming mentality toward youth crime. This work has challenged my ideologies of young people as well as the parents of young people. When I would think of the category of youth prior to this research I would I think of: teenagers smashing pumpkins that innocent children had put time and effort into carving for Halloween; loud and inconsiderate young people talking, laughing, and using their phones during movies at the movie theatres; and groups of youth taking up space in very large ways throughout shopping mall walkways. Much

like the literature reveals, I too considered young people irrational and in need of guidance, unconsciously, to the point of considering ideal citizenship. Unlike much of the research, regarding youth misbehaviour, I had never made the connection to their parents. It is possible that I had a bias there as I grew up with parents that gave me a large amount of autonomy in my decision making and supported me heavily in making my own decisions from a very early age.

The only potential ethical concern in my research project is that the police in my study are discussing parents and youth, while I am not hearing from the parents or youth themselves. To mediate this concern, I have continued to clarify throughout my thesis that these specific study findings are merely the experiences and interpretations of police—the subject of my study—and that future research should also take a similar approach of analysis while giving voice to the parents and even the youth involved in these discussions.

Finally, I must reflect on the interpretation and impact of my research pending the possibility of publication. One of my fears is that my findings will add to the faulty parent paradigm as explained by Hillian and Reitsma-Street (2003), in which continues to place blame on parents for the behaviour of their children. While parent-blaming attitudes such as these do reveal themselves from the perspectives of the police officers in the sample, I am not merely accepting these perspectives as fact but am instead gaining a greater understanding on where these perspectives are rooted and what they tell us about interpretations of governance and youth citizenship. Rather than interpreting police officers blaming parents as the solution to problem youth behaviour, I delve into what this could be revealing in regards to how young people are perceived as citizens. I also seek to understand what other factors are at play that could be contributing to the ways police officers are feeling such as legal pressures and limitations working under the YCJA.

Chapter 4: Results

When discussing root causes of youth misbehaviour, many police officers referred to parents as one of the biggest challenges in managing youth crime, justice, and accountability. Police officers used language such as, “it starts at the home” (P101, male, Unit Commander focus group) and “the minute you meet the parents, it all becomes clear as to why the kid is the way they are” (P35, female, follow up focus group). Such interpretations extended to discussions of potential gaps in police resources, where a police officer suggested a solution was: “someone who’s going to go and knock some sense into the parents would be a good start” (Participant 46, male, one-on-one interview). As can be seen within these excerpts, participants encountering challenges with the parents of youth was a theme that emerged organically during conversations about policing young people. Based on the emergent theme of parenting revealed during police officer discussions of policing youth, my analysis seeks to understand: (1) How do police feel about their abilities to engage in what they deem best practices regarding youth policing alongside the parents of youth? (2) Why are police conceptualizing their experiences of authority in relation to their perceptions of how parental authority is processed over the youth they are encountering? (3) What do these perceptions tell us about how youth are governed and how young people are seen as citizens?

There are specific modes of governance that are required from the police perspective regarding how both police and parents can aid in guiding young people toward the ultimate goal of ideal citizenship. I speak to two modes of governance over young people that I associate with police perspectives of what should either be the parental authority, or police authority, and use these to discuss how police interpret young people as citizens. I structure the results beginning with the most emergent of the themes titled, *policing as parenting*. In this section police officers

discuss a feeling of strain on their policing authority because of the expectations they believe parents hold over how they should be policing youth. Police officers explain that these expectations are more akin to parenting youth rather than policing youth, and that police feel parents use them as a parenting tool, at times to scare their children towards obedience. Next, I turn to the second theme, *the parent in youth accountability*. Here, police officers share concerns that meaningful youth accountability cannot be obtained due to a “not my child” parent mentality against allegations of youth crime. The final theme I present is titled, *parents’ knowledge of the YCJA*. Police officers in this section speak to the limitations and restraints they feel in regards to how parents perceive their legal abilities under the *Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA)*. In addition, police officers argue that these parental attitudes are reflected in their children’s attitudes towards law enforcement. What is revealed throughout these three themes is the notion that youth are a population requiring a certain amount of guidance and management from both police and parents.

4.1 Policing as Parenting

More often than not police officers revealed they were left responding to calls for service from parents bringing forward non-criminally related youth misbehaviour, behaviours they believed parents should be managing within the home. Examples provided by police officers here ranged from being called in response to a youth having beer on their breath, youth taking a small amount of money out of their mother’s purse, youth taking their parent’s cigarettes, to youth refusing to clean their room or put on their seatbelt. Take these two examples:

From [parents] you’ll get very petty things. ‘I told my daughter to go clean her room, she said no and then she pushed me, and walked out the door.’ We’ll get a call on that, and

they'll say 'I want you to come and tell my daughter she has to listen to me.' (P15, male, follow up one-on-one interview).

Same thing, and it's like any small-town Police you know aspect, you're really looking at, you're providing a Cadillac service to these people when they call. I mean like you said, a tipped over garbage box, basically you know who done it, but you know and from a parent perspective and this is what I'm hearing all the time, well [parents] can't do nothing because next thing you know they're going to call Child and Family Services about this child. [Parents] can't do anything, [they're] scared of what he's going to do so [parents are] just going to call the Police and the Police can deal with it criminally basically. (P113, male, Unit Commander focus group)

In the first excerpt, the participant refers to the youth behaviour in question as trivial matters (i.e., “petty things”) such as a young person not listening to their parent telling them to clean their room, suggesting they require parental governance rather than police intervention. Even though most of the youth behaviour discussed was not criminal (or illegal), to which a parent called on police, the behaviour still results in parents requesting the aid of police. Similar to Kennelly's (2011) results, Participant 15 reveals the suggestion that discipline towards more trivial acts of youth misbehaviour is thought of as a mechanism of governance, but rather than by means of police enactment, the participant believes parents ought to action governance over their children to modify youth behaviour to conform to what they deem an ideal citizen. A police perception of ideal citizenship encompasses a person that listens to governing authorities. The second excerpt provides another trivial example of a young person simply tipping over a garbage box, where the parents are reported to think “the police can deal with it criminally”; suggesting the police do not believe it is a criminal matter at all. Here, an ideal citizen would not have

engaged in the behaviour of tipping over the garbage in the first place. Once again the youth would be considered on the track toward ideal citizenship if they were to listen to governing authorities. However, participants believe parents are mistakenly evoking that authority from the police. Within both of these excerpts, consistent with Masson's (2002) findings, participants referred to occurrences where parents have called on police to assist in non-police matters, more specifically, disciplining their children for what these police officers feel are situations requiring parenting. Within the second excerpt, the police officer reveals why he believes parents call on police to govern their children during scenarios that police officers pinpoint as requiring parenting. According to Participant 113, many of the parents he encounters are feeling limitations on their abilities to address their children's misbehaviours due to a fear of reports to child and family services. Thus, parents are feeling like "[they] can't do anything" in regards to governing their children. Noteworthy here is that these are officers policing in a rural jurisdiction. Participant 113 relates the "small town" aspect to providing these forms of duties that are above and beyond the responsibilities required of police officers (i.e., "Cadillac service[s]"). Possibly, parents feel more comfortable reaching out to police for non-police matters with their children when they are more likely to know police officers personally.

Many police officers reported parents requesting mechanisms of governance in the form of scare tactics from police toward youth misbehaving. Two officers shared personal examples during one of the focus group conversations:

P121: And it fits right into our topic about Mounties in this province and the perception of, like it's not uncommon to get a call saying can you come down and talk to little Johnny. Okay so what is it you want me to talk to him about? He's acting up, I need you to come down and talk to him. Okay so you want me to come down and scare him.

P122: They're showing up at our Detachments with their kid by the hand saying, he won't put his seatbelt on, will you take him in the cells? (P121, male; P122, male, Unit Commander focus group)

Once again, we have more trivial examples of young people "acting up" rather than committing criminalized acts. Yet, police report parents requesting police intervention during non-police matters. Specifically, intervention that will scare the youth in question toward behaving like an ideal citizen that follows regulations such as listening to authority members and wearing seatbelts. However, Participants 121 and 122 infer that non-police matters should be a mechanism of governance that is enacted by parents rather than police. Within another focus group of four police officers, participants clearly identified the governance they believe ought to come from the parents but instead, is requested by police in the means of a scare tactic:

P91: I'm sure all of you guys here have probably responded to a call or two, basically parents calling because their kid is out of control.

P94: Yeah.

P93: It's a parenting issue.

P94: I got a complaint laid against me because I said, "I am not going to be the parent that you're supposed to be." I got a complaint against me. Showed up, no I want you to scare the shit out of my kid. First of all, no I won't because I don't go to fucking ball hockey every week to build a rapport to come in here to yell and scream at your kid.

P93: The bogeyman.

P94: Sorry. I'm big and ugly enough. I don't need to build walls.

P92: I was given parental advice, before I was a parent. I mean this is common sense stuff right? So this is what you're getting. You're getting people that can't control their

kids (and some of them could be older too). I know one comes to mind in my previous post. He was 17 or 18 years old. He wanted the car or he wanted his allowance. If he didn't get it he punched a wall.

P94: Sense of entitlement, right?

P92: Yeah, sense of entitlement. Put it up in the house and the father couldn't control him and called the police. We show up. "Yeah, I want you to talk to him. Put the fear into him." It's like, well, you want me to spend ten minutes fixing what took you...

P94: Exactly.

P92: ... fifteen years to f-up.

P94: To make. Because of your lack of action. Ten minutes is not going to straighten out your kid. (P91, male; P92, male; P93, male; P94, female, focus group)

By referring to "out of control" youth, the police discussion reveals that youth ought to be controlled (i.e., governed) to behave appropriately. In this example, the ideal citizenship of the 17 or 18 year old would have been to accept they could not use the car or receive their allowance. Yet again, we come to the idea that youth must obey the authority figures in their lives to be on track toward ideal citizenship. Police in this sample reject the parent's request to "fix" or "straighten out" their children's lack of acceptance (i.e., punching a wall), and suggest "it's a parenting issue"; a means of governance required from parents to ensure the youth behaviour did not get to this point. How parents call on police for non-police matters, participants explained, are to scare youth into complying with the parents' rules or requests. Police report an impact on the youth policing that officers deem important such as building rapport during ball hockey games as explained in the second excerpt, and ensuring they are not creating barriers (i.e., "walls") between police to youth interactions. Noting the "bogeyman"

reference by Participant 93, police governance is crafted into a monstrous “dangerous other” (Drake, 2011). Rather than parents taking on that means of governance as the parental authority, by requesting it from police parents are predisposing police as “not ‘like us’” for parents and their children (Drake, 2011, p. 368).

Nearly all participants that discussed the police scare tactic mechanism from parents voiced a strong opposition as it is reportedly counterproductive to how police officers want to be policing youth. To exemplify the consequence of parents referring to police as solely punitive towards bad behaviour, a police officer described approaching a boy during a community activity who began to cry:

But that just went to show that they’re nervous around you, and probably always will be to a certain extent, but it’s not the goal you want to make. If you go into the stores it’s the same thing. ‘You be good or I’m going to tell him to put you in jail’ that type of thing.

And you see that in small towns – that really irks me. (P18, male, one-on-one interview)

During another focus group a similar example was shared:

P113: Oh yeah my child won’t put his seatbelt on. People pull into the office and say I want you to come out and scare my kid and you hear it all the time, scare my kid. No, no, I don’t want the kids to be scared of me.

P114: Put your seatbelt on or the Policeman will take you.

I: Really?

P114: All the time.

P115: I’ve seen like, have you ever like gone into the Mall with your uniform on, you walk by and there’s a kid crying or something and all of sudden, if you don’t be good,

that man is going to take you. (P113, male; P114, male; P115, male, Unit Commander focus group)

As seen in both excerpts, experiences with children and youth showing police fear and anxieties, some participants reported, connects directly to parents speaking of police in threatening ways to their children. During another focus groups, two police officers further explained,

P83: A lot of parents use it as a parenting tool. Parents go up, you know what would be good, that man is going to take you away, he, we've become the boogeyman. That man is going to take you away and put you in jail if you don't smarten up and they're talking to like 5 and 6 year olds.

Interviewer: So it starts small?

P83: It starts small. Like we get that all the time like we're going to call the Police and they're going to take you away. When you walk into a classroom you can tell what kids that's been said to because you've never met them before but they're backing up. The other ones are like oh, they come over and give you a hug.

P84: The kid in [identified location] where I work, he cries every time, he runs and hides in the room. And we've never been there for any negative reason to date. But hates to see us come because his parents have obviously instilled some fear in him.

...

(P83, male; P84, male, focus group)

Police officers in this last excerpt show that even during routine settings, such as community events and visiting schools, where the very purpose of the visit is to gain comfort and trust from the children, they are seeing younger individuals fearing police. Thus, their intended approach of governance such as building rapport and community engagement is compromised. Police officers

in the current study report they are being used as a type of scare tactic for youth to take their parents' authority more seriously. Participant 18 explains that this tactic "really irks" him and Participant 113 straight forwardly explains "I don't want the kids to be scared of me." The police officers lamented here, that scaring youth is not an intended approach of governance toward young people. Yet another police officer uses the term "boogeyman" (P83) while describing their interpretation of young people's perceptions of police. Once again, such experiences reveal the push for police governance among parents and the construction of police as the "dangerous other" (Drake, 2011). According to police officers, for their children to behave in a manner that parents deem ideal or appropriate of a citizen, they require fear inducing mechanisms of governance from police to scare them into compliance, separating them as this monstrous other that cannot be trusted. In response, police suggest this type of fear inducing governance limits how officers are able to police young people.

Police believe that their governance, ideally, should focus on encouraging meaningful youth to police relationships, suggesting that youth will learn how to utilize police for protection and security. Participant 85 from the focus group above went on to explain,

...

P85: Oh parents call, he's crying, he's only 4 or 5 years old. Parents call, I don't know, I can't remember how many calls I've gotten where they've actually asked me to take their young child out of their home and put him in a cell for a night to scare him straight. I'm like that doesn't work. 'Oh no it would, it would. They're not listening to me but if you put them in jail for a night it would really give them a reality check.' I'm like, you want us to encourage a generation of police haters, we're not doing it, I'm sorry. We're not

going to scare your kid straight, that's not what we are, we want to be approachable. We want kids to be able to go to us for help, not run away when they see us coming. (

(P85, male, focus group continued)

As can be seen within Participant 85's comment, some police officers believe when younger children are taught to have an initial fear of police, a fear that could grow into anger towards police as they mature and become adults; they could become "a generation of police haters". What the words of the above excerpts reveal is a scare tactic that parents reportedly request of police as a mechanism of governance over young people. Participants here highlighted clear concerns about the repercussions of this means of governance on their abilities to police youth in the ways they deem meaningful, such as building rapport and encouraging youth to consider police as a resource rather than a threat. Participant 85 links approachability as an operation of governance when he explains, "we want to be approachable." Thus, citizenship is tied to active engagement with community members such as police officers. Specifically, police officers expressed concern because of possible negative repercussions for police-youth relationships if police officers are to be viewed with fear rather than as a source of help or support. As Participant 85 explains, "We want kids to be able to go to us for help, not run away when they see us coming." Police officers were concerned that if youth were raised to fear police they would be hesitant to call on police if they required police governance in the ways of intervention or assistance.

Police attitudes here reflect a child protection mentality toward youth, similar to the framework seen across Canadian youth legislation. Young people are thought of as requiring a certain amount of governance toward protecting and assisting youth (i.e., building trust and rapport) for young peoples' safety and security. Thus, police perspectives suggest an ideal citizen

would consider police as a resource, and youth require a certain amount of governance to help influence these appropriate ideals of police within society.

4.2 The Parent in Youth Accountability

Many police officer participants described parents as significantly influencing whether or not their child is held accountable after crimes have been committed. Here, police officers connected parents taking their child's crimes seriously as a strong mechanism of governance over youth by means of accountability. In said cases, parents who impose consequences on their youth, police reported, ensure youth are accountable namely by the simple act of acknowledging the very crime was committed. Regarding effective accountability, one police officer explained, "if you get the parents who are – you can tell they're upset. They race down there as soon as you call them, they're generally concerned as to what's going on, then you know the parents are going to deal with that themselves. And they're going to do more than we could" (P46, male, one-on-one interview). What this excerpt shows is that participants believe police working with parents in holding youth accountable is the most effective in addressing youth crime—the idea of parenting and policing the youth simultaneous, rather than leaving the responsibility for the police. For this police officer, when parents hold their children accountable, the practice removes work from the purview of police and returns the consequences to the home environment. In essence, police officers felt youth involved situations were addressed effectively within the home, however not always. One police officer explained:

Well there is also places where you go, well it's the same everywhere, I mean this is no different than anywhere else, you go there and you will take a kid home and tell them what's going on and you almost want to get out of there as quick as you can because you

know things are going to get taken care of and you're not going to have to deal with those kids again. There's parents who recognize it and want to fix it and will fix it, and then there's ones that don't. And the ones that don't, you're going to deal with them forever. This isn't appropriate for that kind of situation. It's got nothing to do with the kid, as much as the support system. And the problem is, it's too late start parenting at 13-years-old. And we can't fix their problems for them. (P36, male, follow up focus group)

As evidenced in the excerpt above, when parents hold their children accountable, police explained, they could then take comfort the present incident was resolved and also future misbehaviour may be prevented. Both of these excerpts suggest that participants valued governance enacted over youth, that included the governance of parents, towards the ultimate goal of leading youth to engage in the appropriate citizen behaviour of recognizing their wrong doing. Thus, youth are not considered on the track to ideal citizenship without parents that care about the comportment of their children's behaviour or who utilize their governance over young people as a mechanism of righting their wrongs (i.e., accountability). Participant 36 also reveals the idea that the youth they repeatedly encounter are under the guidance of parents who fail to recognize their child's wrong-doing. In such cases, police officers believe that parents fail to hold youth accountable and inadvertently encourage future negative behaviours. This suggests a potential police bias in regards to their perceptions of the parents of young people as the less encountered one-time only "offenders", police reported, have parents that acknowledge and address this misbehaviour within the home in a way that prevents future misbehaviour. Being that these participants also police a rural jurisdiction, it would be likely that the youth they encounter more often are known to them in the community. This could have an impact on how participant's frame the parents they commonly encounter as they would be the same parents

occurring over and over again that are known to police already. Resultantly, this could impact the reliability of the data when considering its application to more urban jurisdictions.

Bearing in mind potential biases, it is not surprising that most police officers in the present study reported the parents they engage with as having an “it’s not my child” (P113, male, Unit Commander focus group continued) attitude that they believe limits effective youth accountability. The “not my child” mentality refers explicitly to police officers encountering parents that claim their child could not and would not ever cause harm, even in cases where the evidence was right in front of them. To exemplify, a police officer explained, “You can catch their kid with a bloody knife standing over the body, and they’d be like, ‘What are you doing with my kid? Why are you arresting my child? Screw you, cop’” (P50, male, one-on-one interview). As evidenced in this police officer’s words, parents of the youth they encounter commonly fail to recognize their children’s poor behaviour, which was attributed to the attitude that their child could not cause harm and an us versus them approach of thinking. As evidenced in the previous paragraph, officers in the current study have concluded that parents whom recognize their child’s wrong doing additionally prevent future misbehaviour. Thus, without this acknowledgment there it is more likely that police will again encounter the youth in question. In consequence of this, police are required to enact more governance over youth due to a perceived lack of governance from the parents of said youth. This suggests youth are not considered ideal citizens capable of recognizing their own wrong doing and rather, it is the obligation of authority figures such as parents and/or police that must hold young people accountable for their actions. During one of the focus group discussions, two police officers described:

P113: Or a Youth is accused of something and you’re 99% sure that it happened and you call the parents and the parents start challenging you that this actually happened. When

you're hoping that you're going to call the parents and the parents are going to take responsibility and say you know what I'm going to deal with this.

P114: There is nothing better than when you hear a parent say it.

P113: But that is very rare, it's very rare that it happens that a parent takes responsibility for the kids and you're like well. Or if you pick up a kid on a Tuesday or Wednesday night and they've been drinking like, well I'm just going to bring them home and Mom and Dad can deal with it. Knock on the door, Mom and Dad is not there. (P113, male; P114, male, Unit Commander focus group continued)

In this excerpt, participants suggest there is hope that parents will be willing to work with police officers in addressing youth concerns. However, Participant 113 goes on to explain that the more common reality is that the parent will either not believe in their child's wrong doing or the parent will not be physically present to aid in their child's accountability. Again, the best youth management practices revealed are at the means of both parental and policing types of governance. Overall, police link the hopeful solution of youth accountability to the imposition of parents, the familiar mechanism of youth governance. Youth as ideal citizens at their own means are disqualified in the sense that they require a certain amount of guidance (i.e., governance from parents) to acknowledge their own wrong-doing. Here, police are limiting a young person's capabilities of reaching that ideal citizen mentality as they are not provided the opportunity to respond to their own wrong-doing. Rather, the "parent [that] takes responsibility for the kids" instead of the youth in question themselves.

Police officers in the current study believe parents ought to be enacting accountability as a mechanism of governance over youth, including acknowledgment of the crime as well as

consequences to follow the misbehaviour. During one focus group two police officers purport about how they believe parents can successfully hold their children accountable.

P94: The basic in communications (and it's stupid here), but I'm just going to say as an example, there's no more Sunday dinners. What are the definitions of what built us, basically our society? Interaction, trust, consequence. I got my ass tanned when I grew up. That's a whole other story, but there was a consequence to any of my actions. Today you fail something and you don't pass in, we're going to give it to you anyway. You're not going to work for anything. You've got kids just being given, given, given, and I think that translates loosely (not loosely), but very much into their development as young adults and adults. It's contagious. It's very much contagious.

...

P92: So parenting is a big one. I know a lot of parents will say, "What do you want me to do? Do you want me to hit him?" No, we're not saying that at all. There's ways that you can punish your child, and it starts at a young age. There's ways that you can discipline your kids. You can take things away. Look at all the things they get. Make them feel what it's like to have to be without it. But you have to be consistent. This is the thing.

Consistent and reasonable. Don't say "you're going to lose your X-box for six months."

Is that really reasonable? Six months? That's not reasonable. Lose it for a week. Let them feel what it's like to be without it for a week. But stick to it. That's the thing. Stick to it.

(P92, male; P94, female, focus group continued)

Participant 94 suggests that young people today are given too much without having to "work for anything"; revealing a mentality of young people as less than ideal citizens. For young people to relate to what this police officer believes built our society, they must have consequences for their

actions. Considered a crucial component of a young person's development toward ideal adulthood, participant 92 goes on to explain that consequences must be both realistic and consistent. The officer suggests a mechanism of governance where parents ought to exert authority over their children to guide them toward ideal citizenship.

4.3 Parents' Knowledge of the YCJA

Some participants described parents as not taking certain minor youth transgressions of the law seriously because of limitations attributed to working under the Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA). It is the very legal discretion that police hold in dealing with these types of youth crimes, police reported, that parents take lightly. One police officer explained,

I think a lot of parents are aware of the Youth Criminal Justice Act and how much kids can get away with unless it's a violent crime and are not worried about their kids out doing stuff because they're not going to have to go to court or they're not going to have to do whatever because their kid will do it and the police will come talk to them, tell them to be good, don't do it again. But unless they're getting into violent crimes, their daily life is not really going to be affected too much. (P79, female, focus group)

As described above, Participant 79 suggests that parents are knowledgeable of the legal framework police have to work under and their knowledge results in a lack of concern from parents when their child engages in, even minor, criminal activity. The apparent challenge police experience rests in parents who understand the law recognizing that police hands are often tied in terms of sanctioning their youth. Here, participants reveal that police responses to non-violent youth crimes are limited because of the legal discretions required under the YCJA. As seen across the literature, the YCJA enables police to enact a new mechanism of authority through the

initial response of extra-judicial measures (Carrington & Schulenberg, 2008; Endres, 2004). While it may appear that police are able to do less, they are in fact responsible for more interaction with young people on the ground to ensure less legal/court interaction. Police in essence, under the YCJA are to divert youth, whenever possible, from the criminalizing sanctions of the legal processes. Police feel parents view this type of governance in a certain way, specifically as less than because of the lack of immediate consequence. This does however, result in a consequence for police officers, as their governing abilities become limited, even reduced when they are not taken seriously in their position or authority. As seen in my study findings regarding youth accountability, police link a parent's acknowledgement of youth misbehavior to a meaningful mechanism of governance over youth. Without this parental authority, police feel they are limited in their abilities of managing young people—they also lack the support of the parents in ensuring directed positive sanctions are imposed that can serve the youth to realign their activities in a prosocial manner. Youth, then, are suggested to require a certain amount of governance from both police and parents in order to guide young people towards the ideal behaviour of taking minor youth crimes seriously.

Moreover, some police officers suggested the casual interpretation of policing abilities under the YCJA from parents is reflected in their children's views as well. One police officer explained,

I can see it when I was going to the parent's house, you talk to their parents. You know the parents that are worried and want to work with their kids and us and you know the parents that don't give a crap about who you are or what you are, you know like the way they talk to you, you're just like nothing to them. So yeah we'll have the same reaction from the kids that we get from the parents. So, we can see that is a system and there's no,

there's nothing anymore like I know it went from the YOA to the you can't jail me act, the YCJA. (P102, male, Unit Commander focus group)

The participant's words here reveal the police desire to govern youth in parallel with parental governance, but what Participant 102 further explains is that a young person's attitude towards police governance is shaped by their parent's attitudes. Similar to the findings of Sindall, McCarthy, and Brunton (2017), police participants believe parental attitudes of law enforcement influence youth attitudes of law enforcement as well. Police relate parents wanting to "work with their kids and [police]" as the parents who collaborate with police to enact effective governance in a way that encourages ideal citizenship from youth, while the parents that "don't give a crap about who you are" negatively impact police abilities to govern youth in ways police are legally obliged by means of extra-judicial measures and diversion. In fact, police officers were commonly relating negative youth attitudes as coming directly from the way parents speak of police to their children. For example, one police officer said,

One thing that I'm noticing a lot is of kids or youth like hating us or having a negative outlook or just ... It comes solely from parenting. And like, there's youth, there's kids I deal with in this community and they hate my guts for no other reason than their parents told them we were no good. (P48, male, one-on-one interview)

As suggested here, police relate the youth attitudes that they are seeing in chronic cases where youth consistently transgress the law as a reflection of their parent's attitudes that both poses limitations to holding youth accountable for the crimes committed, but also poses limitations to preventing youth from committing future crimes. Youth crime is again thought of as something that requires a certain amount of governance in order to combat, specifically, that of parents and police to enact together to mold young people into ideal citizens that respect the legal structures

that are put in place. Again, clear bias remains regarding the parents that police officers more commonly encounter, which can also translate into police officers encountering more parents (and resultant their children) to hold negative police perceptions. Furthermore, policing within a rural jurisdiction means that police officers are likely known by the parents of youth, including those that commonly engage in criminalized behaviour. The reoccurring presence of the same police officer could impact perceptions on police officers entirely, when in fact, the parents may have issues with a certain police officer(s).

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

5.1 Discussion

Participants express that some of the parents they are encountering are comprising their abilities to engage in what they deem best practices regarding youth policing, as well as practices they are legally obliged to enforce. The police officers conceptualize their governance over youth as something that must happen simultaneously alongside parental governance to succeed in encouraging youth to become *ideal citizens*. Researchers tend to highlight or play into the socially constructed view point that children are vulnerable, irresponsible, developing beings in need of guidance to ensure they grow into productive members of society in the future (Jenks, 2005; Smith, 2014). Despite the fact that youth are transitioning away from childhood, conceptualizations of how youth navigate such changes are notably rooted in how children are discussed by researchers as irrational and in need of support (Crossouard & Dunne, 2015; Frazer & Elmer, 1997; France, 1998; Kennelly, 2011; Williamson, 1997). Whether it be the transition from school to work, from living in the family home to living independently, or from care free to having responsibilities; young people are considered dependant and requiring shaping from adults. This mindset is mirrored across the police perspectives on young people in the current study, and results in a greater discussion about how police believe we should be managing young people toward ideal citizenship within society.

When asked general questions about managing youth as police officers, the participants commonly referred to the parents of the youth they encounter as a potential area of concern. This highlights a perspective that youth cannot be held accountable for their own behaviour on their own, rather, the adults in their lives such as parents are more significant in providing accountability mechanisms. The more realistic perception of youth citizenship is a citizenship

education where young people are citizens in training that require governance by authority figures to learn what is required of them. Specifically, police suggest that parents and police should be enacting governance over youth together rather than one relying solely on the other. However, police officers report the parents they commonly encounter are requesting police governance for non-police matters, not acknowledging their child's wrongdoing, and influencing negative viewpoints regarding police legal discretion. Suggesting the youth that police do not commonly encounter, may already have the needed governance structure implemented within the home. How parents are requesting governance from police and/or are lacking perceived governance over their own children is counterproductive to how police wish to be enacting governance over youth. Youth and the parents that police are routinely encountering may be underpinned by bias, a bias related to regular contact that also intertwines with crime and rurality, in the case of the current study. Being that the common youth police encounter may be criminalized, a bias toward parents is also possible—where parents are held accountable or at fault for their children's behaviours. Furthermore, being in a rural jurisdiction, a community where 'everyone knows everyone', police may have pre-existing opinions of, at least select, parents that they know historically.

Police officers critique the position of the parents of the youth they commonly encounter because they believe youth require a significant amount of governance from the adults in their lives. Youth, in essence, live under parental surveillance – a form of governance – which is necessary to ensure pro-social development. When surveillance is lacking, police report that the youth are placed under their surveillance, such that parents place the parenting burden onto police rather than actualize their parenting responsibilities. Thus, similar to authors such as Hope et al. (1998), Zhang (2011) and Mazefsky and Farrell (2005) that suggest a connection between

failing parenting techniques and youth criminal activities or aggressive youth behaviour, police perspectives in the current study also associate certain parenting with less-than-ideal youth behaviour. This results in frustration for police as much as concern for the youth, the former rooted in the downloading of responsibilities for youth on to police and the latter due to their role in public safety and requirement to ensure youth are safe and supported. Police officers, in my sample, shared their interpretations of poor parenting – such as using police as a scare tactic, not holding their children accountable for misbehaviour, and influencing negative attitudes – with the youth that they are commonly responding to after misbehaviour or crime. Recall, youth that police encounter regularly may also be engaged in criminalized behaviour, their parents may be those police feel are not enacting their part of governance as required over youth, thus failing to ensure they are on track toward ideal citizenship behaviour. As a result, police perceive parents as contributors to how police officers feel they are able to effectively police youth in these rural communities, revealing the idea that it is both the responsibility of police and parents to work together in managing the youth population.

Police are of the communities they police; their kids go to school with the same youth they encounter on the job and the small nature of the area leaves all susceptible to impose on police privacy. While rural and small-town policing has been more commonly poorly understood across research (Fenwick, 2015; Pelfrey, 2007), rural policing is commonly connected to more of a community policing approach (Pelfrey, 2007; Sims, 1988). As Fenwick (2015) explains, police have to balance being *in the community* as an officer of the law, and being *of the community* as a known citizen within the area. While the people of the communities are under surveillance by police – police in rural communities are also under the surveillance of the very people they police – defined as a form of “sousveillance” (see, Inoue, 2020). Resultantly, police perspectives

of parents and youth are impacted, as are parent and youth perspectives of police. For police, they cannot escape the sousveillance, which is coupled with more intimate knowledge of community members. For parents, they may stress that likely the same officer(s) is responding to repeated calls for service, including regarding their youth. Thus, part negative interactions, differences of opinions, and related feeling could be projected onto all police. Although rurality was not a central focus in the current study, I start to unpack the nuance of policing in rural jurisdiction, and this fact shapes my findings by shedding light on diverse factors. The factors include: how police are perceived by parents and resultantly their children (including those in closer social or familial circles), how police navigate their governing duties with youth in line with parental expectations being members of the very communities in which the parents reside, and how police perceive the youth and parents they already know within the communities they police.

By relating certain youth misbehaviour directly to that of the parents, seemingly reflecting a parent blame mentality as described by Hillian and Reitsma-Street (2003), police in the current sample do not consider youth autonomous citizens capable of managing their own behaviour. Police recognize that youth are still learning and developing – socially, physically, and cognitively – thus, they require support, correction, and effective responses to their behaviours. To this regard, police perceptions of youth as citizens seemly reiterate an unattainable status of citizenship similar to Williamson’s (1997) *second class citizen*, Jones’ and Wallace’s (1992) *deferred citizen* and Kennelly’s (2011) *illegitimate citizen*. Policing perceptions of youth pose an institutional limitation on young people’s ability to fully participate as citizens within society, therefore constructing Williamson’s (1997) *second class citizen*. Police defer a young person’s potential to engage in active citizenship by relating certain

responsibilities on governing actors rather than the autonomous individual themselves (e.g., accountability from parents); connecting the transition to adulthood with the transition to citizenship parallels with Jones and Wallace's (1992) deferred citizen. Police also frame youth as illegitimate citizens as they are perceived as lacking the capabilities (e.g., creating perceptions about legal structures) required to attain a legitimate construction of citizenship as explained by Kennelly (2011).

How youth are interpreted, both by researchers and within legislation, suggests that young people are transitioning toward citizenship and citizenship is unattainable without the guidance of authority figures. Young people, if thought of as irrational because they are still developing and are therefore, dependant on authority figures in their lives (France, 1998; Jenks, 2005; Smith, 2014). Therefore, participation in the civil, social, and political citizenship categories as outlined by Marshall (1965) are out of reach due to legal frameworks limiting youth rights while simultaneously obliging governing responsibilities over youth on both parents and police.

Throughout my analysis of police interviews, police revealed perspectives on both policing as well as parenting authorities and responsibilities tied to the management of young people. Police explain how they wish to be enacting governance over youth alongside parental authority to keep young people on track toward ideal citizenship. Youth cannot fully participate in all the rights and obligations tied to citizenship largely due to the age of majority (Kennelly, 2011; Frazer & Elmer, 1997; France, 1998) thus, as suggested by researchers such as Williamson (1997) and France (1998), more realistic is a citizenship education for youth. In adopting a communitarian theoretical approach of analysis on active citizenship – even if just the road to active citizenship – one must involve private and public spaces (Crossouard & Dunne, 2015;

Yuval-Davis, 1997; Marshall, 1965). In this case, governance within the home is considered private and governance within the community is considered public. In my analysis of youth citizenship, I reveal mechanisms that aid in the education of young people – both in the public and private spheres –to encourage youth on the track toward ideal citizenship; something that is only attainable in adulthood.

Furthermore, according to Foucault’s (1982) plurality of governance, this must include one’s family as well as one’s state (Foucault et. al, 2007). There are a number of problems raised by police officers about how parents and police are not currently governing young people in collaborative ways when considering the private versus the public realms of young people’s lives. Yet, police believe they should be utilizing governance over youth alongside the parents of youth, a phenomenon to which I now turn.

5.1.1 Parental Authority Within Private Spaces

Researchers have shown how mechanisms of governance within the home have an impact on educational achievement, criminal involvement, and youth behaviours. Early identified childhood problem behaviours correlating with punitive parental discipline practices have been reported significantly higher in home settings across rural areas when compared to that of urban areas (Hope et al., 1998). Amounts of parental supervision (Zhang, 2011) as well as parental disciplinary practices (Mazefsky & Farrell, 2005) have been tied to school outcomes and aggressive behaviour in young people. Even as simple as homes headed by single mothers noted in the family disruption element of the Social Disorganization Theory has deemed significant in rural youth crime and violence (Osgood & Chambers, 2000; Moore & Sween, 2015; Wong, 2012). Out of the applicable categories explored for in Social Disorganization Theory (i.e.,

residential instability, ethnic heterogeneity, poverty, proximity to metropolitan counties, and family disruption) applied against rates of young offending, the family disruption category accounting for homes headed by single mothers is noteworthy (see chapter 2.3). Here, the presence of having that second parental authority affects youth engagement toward less than ideal behaviour such as criminalized activity. Similar to my research findings, the literature also crafts a perception of young people as requiring adult authority figures in their lives to guide them toward the ultimate goal of ideal citizenship.

In the first theme of my results, police officer participants report requests from parents to intervene in non-criminally related youth misbehaviour, most commonly noted within the home. This suggests the parents these police officers are encountering are asking for police governance over their children within the private sphere where most research places parental authority. While police officers are instead, arguing that this mechanism of governance should be enacted by parents over their children. Said differently – police officers are requesting that parents head the governance within the private sphere (i.e., the home), leaving police the time and effort to put toward governing in more public spaces.

Quite similar to one of the limited accounts of research analyzing police interpretations of parents in Masson's (2002) study, the officers in the present study shared feelings that many ways parents are requesting policing authority over their children were not considered police matters. The large majority of incidents brought to police attention by parents were spoken of as regular occurrences within the home such as having the child clean their room or put their seatbelts on. What these discussions reveal are that youth behaviour is thought of as requiring a certain amount of management (i.e., governance) even if it is not illegal behaviour, and even if it is within a private space such as the home or family vehicle. This suggests that young people

must learn within the home to develop as ideal citizens that can participate in society in public spaces. Here, police connect the actions of youth in private spaces, as a platform of practicing ideal behaviour, as the behaviours a youth would engage in within public spaces. However, the parent's responsibilities and authority is tied to the management, even teaching, of young people.

Police relate non-criminally related youth misbehaviour as requiring parental authority, thus, a mechanism of discipline within the home through parental governance. Police and their interpretations of parents suggest that certain youth behaviour is deemed inappropriate, although not illegal, these behaviours are not accepted in consideration of an ideal citizen. Therefore, youth require the governance of an authority figure to correct such behaviour, and in this case, police deem that the parental responsibility.

Police perceptions, I found, expose key limitations to understanding youth citizenship as highlighted by researchers such as Crossouard and Dunne (2015) and Frazer and Elmer's (1997) in their discussions conceptualizing youth citizenship. For example, police officer participants connect social relations (i.e., child to parent) and institutions (i.e., police) in the public and private spaces. Even though a division between the public and the private has been deemed a key obstacle in youth research (Crossouard & Dunne, 2015; Frazer & Elmer, 1997), police in the presented study reveal how personal/kinship relations are connected to a young person's participation in society—from their perspective. Rather than taking the liberalist point of view as identified by Yuval-Davis (1997) in relating the citizen (i.e., youth) to the state, police officers relate youth citizenship to a community inclusive of parents and police working together to craft ideal, participatory citizens both within the home and within public spaces that are policed. In practice, this could look like parents resolving disputes and misbehaviour happening within the home, while police address concerns with youth outside of the home. Take one of the examples

from the results: a young person stealing money out of their parent's purse. If this example were to happen in a public space with a person unrelated to the youth, the police first response would consist of an extrajudicial measure such as involving the community (e.g., having the youth give the money back and apologize to the victim) or providing a warning. In this case, police are asking that parents take on that governing responsibility and address their own children when misbehaving happens within the private space of the home. Their response could also be similar such as asking their child to provide the money back and apologize or providing a repercussion warning.

Youth accountability has been one of the most debated concerns over the decades of Canadian youth justice legislation, each new act promising different means of accomplishing the goal of meaningful accountability. The Juvenile Delinquents Act of 1908 was criticized for focussing too heavily on child protection so that accountability was lost (Ricciardelli, 2018). The Young Offenders Act of 1984 was criticized for taking youth voices away at the level of court process so they could no longer speak on their behalf in an accountable way (Caputo & Kelly, 1997). Now, as can be seen within the declaration of principle in the *Youth Criminal Justice Act* (YCJA), legal principles are still grounded in ideologies of children and youth as undeveloped citizens rather than autonomous beings that can hold themselves accountable (See, Department of Justice, 2013). The focus remains on understanding the best means of holding youth accountable for their actions throughout discussions of youth misbehaviour, thus, a certain pressure at the level of police to enforce meaningful mechanisms of youth accountability. However, the YCJA also limits the means through which youth can be held accountable. Canadian legislation encourages police to take more diversionary routes for minor youth crimes to stand as learning lessons rather than court sentences, such as giving warnings, speaking with

parents, or seeking extra-judicial and/or community-related measures (Endres, 2004; Peterson-Badali & Broeking, 2010). Police are limited in their actions and must also choose the least restrictive and punitive means possible when deciding how to hold youth accountable – thus, their discretion is dependent on these policies. Problematic or progressively, a point beyond the argument here, the concern remains that police cannot enforce punitive measures unwarrantedly and they must rely on parents to see through courses of action that are intended to support rehabilitation, accountability, and poor-social citizenship. For example, a direct referral to an extra-judicial measure places the youth outside of systems of criminal justice. If they do not or do adhere and complete the required measure is beyond the role of the police to enforce – police cannot retreat or change their mind and elect to lay a charge after the decision for an extra-judicial measure has been selected as the way forward. Thus, the accountability can fall on the youth and under the governance of the parent to ensure compliance. The police, in essence, are removed from the processes (Ricciardelli et al., 2017).

Within the present study, police position accountability as a means of governance best utilized within the home. Not to say the entirety of accountability lies within the responsibilities of parents, but that police report when parents additionally hold their child accountable within the home it is more effective than when police attempt measures of accountability without parental support. Similarly, Peterson-Badali and Broeking (2010) have shown that parental accountability can positively inform court proceedings in favour of lower sentences for youth. Court officials too associate a certain amount of accountability on parents for the children's misbehaviour, and parental governances, as a means of accountability, is a successful mechanism of governance over young people. However, within the second theme of the results, more often than not, police officers described experiences of parents challenging accusations against their

children with a “not my child” attitude rather than working with the police to hold youth accountable for their actions. Police officers very directly acknowledged parents as holding a substantial amount of higher authority than police in relation to holding youth accountable for their actions, as noted, if an extra-judicial measure is elected as the way forward, police have no control over youth compliance – the onus falls entirely on the parent, who may or may not be supportive. According to police officers, the parents that have been seen as holding their child accountable, as simple as acknowledging the behaviour with disappointment, gave police officers a comfort in knowing parents were effectively governing their child within the home. Again, authority in private spaces can be interpreted as a mechanism of governance these police officers request of parents; expecting parents to guide their children towards ideal citizenship in the future.

According to predominant participant perspectives, kinship relations play a crucial role in how a youth decides to participate within society. To keep young people on track toward the idealism of holding oneself accountable and learning from one’s mistakes, police believe youth require parental guidance and encouragement within the home. By putting the responsibility on parents rather than the youth, police are seemingly enacting the limitations highlighted by Williamson (1997) – youth opportunities to practice the responsibilities that are associated with ideal citizenship are limited, when existing. Police do not feel youth are capable of holding themselves accountable and following through on accountability measures such as processes of extra-judicial measures. To remedy this, they put the onus on the youth’s parents/guardians.

However, because of a police bias resulting from namely encountering the parents with a “not my child” mentality towards accusations of wrong-doing, challenges with youth accountability were pinned to the parents of youth. Police officers voiced clear concerns that

means of discipline are not happening due to parents lacking the initial acknowledgment of the crimes in the first place. Due to normative ideologies of youth as developing towards citizenship, policing the youth population has much less of a punitive focus, and more of a community-oriented, rehabilitative approach. As stated above, policing youth under the YCJA emphasizes teachable approaches in hopes that young people will be able to learn and grow from any criminalized experiences in beneficial ways that will prevent future crimes as adults (e.g., warnings, speaking with parents, extra-judicial measures). However, police officers in this study suggested that the parents of the youth they are more commonly encountering do not seem to recognize their children's behaviour in ways that hold youth accountable for their actions, thus, pose limitations to the effectiveness of simply speaking with parents, giving warnings, or pursuing an extra-judicial measure with some of these youth.

The legal limitations to policing youth surfaced throughout the current analysis. In addition, the third theme reveals police perceptions on how legislation is interpreted by parents and, resultingly their children, is an obstacle as well. Other researchers have shown a connection between youth attitudes and parent attitudes towards law enforcement. Sindall et al. (2017) compared youth police attitudes to that of their parents in the UK and an attitude alignment was found with youth, specifically showing positive police perspectives among parents as typically reflected in their children's viewpoints as well. Within the current study, police relate modeling and influencing positive law enforcement attitudes as a means of a parental governance that should be enacted to modify youth behaviour to what is deemed appropriate of an ideal citizen. Here, youth are not considered legitimate citizens capable of their civil right of freedom of thought as their attitudes towards legislation are correlated to their parents influence. Much like France's (1998) findings, young people undertaking responsibilities associated with citizenship,

even just having perceptions on legal systems that are put in place, are undermined. In this case, the responsibility of youth is to have a positive interpretation of police and the legal structures they are working under, thus allowing a road toward ideal citizenship. However, because the youth in question do not have the ideal perception of the topic at hand, their opinions are undermined and blame is attached to the governing actor within the home, simply said, the parent.

The rural contexts in which data was collected also come into play when understanding how police perceive governance within private spaces. Some police officers in the current study equated the small-town mentality toward the strong presence of parents requesting policing governance during situations as avoidable if the parent enacted governance within the home. Considering parents in rural areas are more likely to know the officers policing their jurisdiction, familiarity could inform reliance on police for non-police matters. Moreover, parent biases, when they exist, can further have negative effects on youth interpretations of police. A concern, however, arises in situations where a parent, with preconceived notions about the officer in the jurisdiction – which are arguably more likely to develop positively or negative in rural communities where people are known to each other – confuses the personal versus professional role of an individual. Such an array requires future investigation through directed interviews (see limitations in Chapter 6.2) to be unpacked as it is beyond the scope of the current thesis.

5.1.2 Policing Authority Within Public Spaces

Throughout the literature, the approach to youth crime under the Canadian justice system has been and continues to be rooted in philosophies of the state serving as a parental figure. The positioning of the state paternally impacts policing governance over youth as police are working

under legal expectations lending more of a parental approach. Due to the strong encouragement of extra-judicial measures as the police first response to non-violent offenses (Bala & Aband, 2005; Carrington & Schulenberg, 2008; Endres, 2004), police working under the YCJA have a heavier responsibility to action governance as a means of child protection for young people. Therefore, policing youth is a unique area of dealing with crime in Canada as both societal norms and legislation reflect more of a paternal-guidance approach to addressing concerns with individuals under the age of 18 (Crossouard & Dunne, 2015; Jenks, 2005; Smith, 2014; Trépanier, 1999). Police in rural Atlantic Canada, are further hampered by the lack of full implementation of the YCJA, specifically the access to extra-judicial measures, which limits the courses of action they can take. They must use discretion that results in either less punitive actions (e.g., warning) or more punitive actions (e.g., caution, referral to extra-judicial sanction through the courts; Ricciardelli et al., 2017). Thus, despite the state serving as a “parent” in terms of supporting youth, police officers remain limited in their actions and thus their discretion is redefined by a lack of options. They play their governing role, under surveillance and sousveillance, without the full range of policing options which legally should be available to police and youth in Canada. This creates a further reliance on parents to govern their youth, particularly when the police only issue a warning – the youth must be managed by the parent as the authority is no longer with the police. A greater sanction may criminalize the youth and place the court to serve as the ‘parent’ in governing the youth – which still requires the support of parents to be an effective path forward.

Within the first theme identified in the results police officers argued that how parents are seeking police governance in the forms of disciplinary action and inducing fear is counterproductive to the meaningful police engagement they want to be having with youth in

public spaces. Literature has revealed consistently critical and less favourable youth attitudes towards police in the Western world (Chow, 2011; Flexon, Lurigio & Greenleaf, 2009; McAra & McVie, 2005; Sindall, McCarthy & Brunton, 2017). Here, researchers have found that children predominantly focus on the punitive power of police over how police exercise power to give aid or assistance (Powell, Wilson, Gibbons, & Croft, 2008), and other studies have shown that meaningful youth engagement can improve youth attitudes towards policing (Leroux & McShane, 2017). How police felt parents were using police to enforce governance over their children as a means of scaring their children into compliance was a tactic police officers believed to modify youth attitudes towards police in a negative way. Police officers explained when police are being asked to govern young people by means of threat, it limits their abilities to reach children on a positive level in public spaces such as routine visits to schools. The ultimate worry shared by most police officers was that this could prevent children and youth from trusting police to confide when they require assistance. The notion of police governance as a mechanism of protection is then violated and undermined as it damages the potential for a meaningful relationship between police and youth. Here, police reveal a child protection mentality situating youth as dependant on adults for protection, thus, not capable of self-protection in comparison to the opportunities for an adult or ideal citizen.

Given police in rural jurisdictions are likely to visit schools more frequently than in police in urban services, officers have more opportunities to create strong bonds with young people and for building rapport. If rapport is built, rapport can be quickly compromised if youth do not engage with police meaningfully because they are fearful. Inducing fear of police could encourage an engrained culture of silence regarding the voicing of concerns and disputes within

the community that has been found within rural communities by other rural policing researchers such as Smith (2010).

The third theme that arose was a more specific look at the attitudes police believe parents, and resultantly their children hold toward the policing of youth under the YCJA. Police officers believe that most parents see police as having little power to police youth who transgress the law under the YCJA, and that in many cases, this attitude has been passed on to their children. Police officers deemed the consequences of parents demonstrating their positioning to their youth as affecting youth trust in police, particularly hampering youth perceptions of police. For a young person to be perceived as on the road to ideal citizenship, in this case, they must have governing authority within the home to help frame appropriate ideologies of police and the legal framework under which they work. Participants shared concerns that if youth were taught to fear police, such positioning could grow into hatred towards policing and the law in general. A dominant theme across all police participants was officers believing their policing governance over youth requires meaningful police to youth engagement to be effective. Similar to much of children's and youth literature, police revealed a child protection mentality that re-inscribes young people as incapable of enacting the rights and obligations of a citizen such as the social and civil rights related to accessing justice and security.

The rurality of the community shapes how police enact governance in public spaces. How police are perceived by young people shapes how police are able to enact governance with young people, this includes when managing the identification and documentation of an incident, and how such experiences impact any developed youth-police rapport. The literature (Sindall et al., 2017), and my findings support parents' perspectives of police can be passed down to their children—although verifying interviews are necessary with youth and parents about perspectives

of police. Being that rural police officers are under surveillance by the very communities they are policing, the community likely have opinions on the service and stationed police officers. When negative, youth engagement with police is likely to be affected. This means that the ultimate goal of building trust and rapport as a means of governance is impacted, but also impacted is the projected ideology that ideal citizens should be engaged with community members such as police.

5.2 Limitations

Researchers have shown that the question of subjectivism and biases can be applied to all methods of data analyses to some extent (Flyvbjerg, 2006). While all studies are structured within some sort of preliminary assumptions, one could argue there is a strength to using a constructed grounded theory approach of analysis. To support my decision, the major theme of parenting emerged from within the data itself, without explicit questioning or probing—it was voluntary and of pertinence for officers. The topic of young people’s parents was not included in the semi-structured interview guide, therefore, this theme emerged quite organically.

Although supportive of the importance of the theme, there are also limitations to not asking directly about interactions with the parents of youth. A limitation to utilizing secondary data is that some of the topics I engage with in my analysis were not asked about in more direct ways within the interviews, as the interviews were not conducted with my specific research questions in mind (e.g., ideas of governance and citizenship). Thus, there are questions I would have liked to have had the opportunity to ask participants to give more context to my findings, for example: Could you describe how an ideal citizen thinks and behaves within society? Do you believe youth are capable of holding themselves accountable after engaging in misbehaviour or

crime? How does the rurality of your community impact your perceptions on the parents of the youth you more commonly encounter? These three questions reveal specific limitations to the current study: the lack of police interpretation of citizenship, the lack of police interpretation of young people as citizens, and the lack of the rural police interpretation, specifically of the parents police engage with. However, I cannot say for certain I would know to ask these questions without the knowledge gained from the current study. Thus, constructed grounded theory allowed for the exploration of a topic in full as emergent from data—the entire purpose of the current study. Future research warrants examining each of the proposed questions directly.

Furthermore, in using secondary data I did not have the opportunity to probe or ask follow up questions when police officer participants were engaged with a topic relevant to the study at hand. The major gaps here would be questions such as “why do you feel that way?” and “could you provide an example?” after police discussed their perceptions on the parents of the youth.

My study is limited in that I am working with only the interpretations of police and not also the interpretations of the parents with whom these police speak. An even fuller picture would also have the voices of the youth as well. To address said concern I make it very clear throughout my thesis writing that these findings are the experiences and interpretations of police, not parents or youth. I also encourage interviewing parents and youth within the proposed future research component of my conclusion.

Within my discussion, I could have also analyzed the idea of formal versus informal social controls within the context of governance and citizenship. Instead, I focussed on the private versus public spaces as clearly identified spatial locations where mechanisms of governance can be practiced in order to guide a young person toward ideal citizenship. My study

is also limited in that it does not include an analysis of the demographics of participants, specifically the racial/ethnic makeup of police participants. To address this, I do suggest future research focus in on the restorative justice paradigm, and demographical impacts.

Finally, as cautioned with all qualitative data, research generalizability is limited. Humans are unpredictable and their lives shaped by social context, thus caution is necessary when applying findings to other jurisdictions.

5.3 Future Focus

There are still gaps in youth crime literature relating to police governance and youth citizenship awaiting significant research to fill voids of knowledge. What my literature review revealed was a lack of research in the following areas: police perspectives on policing youth and engaging with the parents of youth, parental perspectives on policing youth and, theoretical approaches linking mechanisms of power with youth citizenship.

According to researchers such as Huey and Ricciardelli (2015) and Macleod and Schneiderman (1994), current criminology literature lacks research conducted through interviews with police officers. To this regard, future research with police officers could engage more directly with ideas of power and citizenship by incorporating these terminologies into the questions asked. In addition, the present study revealed a notable police bias due to the more common parents that the police in this sample encounter. Thus, a future focus could look at the one-time-only parents police encounter rather than focussing on the parents of re-occurring youth offenders.

While Hillian and Reitsma-Street (2003) are two of a limited account of researchers that interviewed parents in regards to managing youth crime, to my knowledge, none have focussed

in on the parent perspective of how police officers police youth. Likely, the most significant area of future focus to follow the present analysis, would be to take a similar approach of interviewing but with the parents of youth and asking what their interpretations are of police and police responsibilities over young people as well as their own role as governing authorities within a young person's development toward citizenship. Furthermore, similar research could incorporate demographical information into the approach of analysis, such as the gender or ethnic/racial makeup of participants.

Outside of Kennelly (2011), few researchers have connected mechanisms of power to interpretations of youth as citizens. While much more research exists regarding the power dynamics between young people and parents or teachers rather than police, I have yet to come across one in which speaks to how their relations affect how young people are able to practice citizenship. Future focusses with any type of authority figure (e.g., parents, teachers, babysitters) in young people's lives could take a similar approach to analyzing the ways in which modes of power, such as governance, contribute to or affect youth citizenship.

My literature review narrows in on the Social Disorganization Theory in light of parent blaming; however, other theories exist that clearly identify "poor parenting" as a reason for youth crime. Being that the Social Disorganization Theory has more recently found its way into rural literature, I felt it was a significant area of focus within the contexts of a rural policing study. Future research could take a similar approach of analysis comparing to other parent-blaming theories such as the General Theory of Crime. In addition, while I allude to the restorative justice paradigm with my review of the literature; further research could explore how this paradigm fits within the context of governance and citizenship as it brings together a balance of formal and informal mechanisms of social control.

Lastly, the limitations to viewing youth in this impressionable way are similar to that argued by Williamson (1997); it denies young people opportunities to fully participate in society in meaningful ways. There is little opportunity for young people to “practice” becoming an ideal citizen without the governance of adults. The very beginning of Foucault’s (1982) upward continuity in the plurality of governance is the governance of oneself (Foucault et. al, 2007). Yet, by perceiving young people as developing being requiring guidance, they are not given the chance to show their capabilities of governing oneself. Future research could hone in on the perspective of youth as autonomous beings requiring more support rather than guidance from authority figures in their lives.

5.4 Conclusion

Rather than simply relating youth to citizens of the state, I attach the potential of youth citizenship to that of a community in both private and public spaces. Based on police perspectives of the parents of youth they commonly encounter, police feel there must be a simultaneous governing of young people by parents within the home, and police within the public. However, how police perceive how parents and police officers ought to be enacting governance over youth is quite different than what police describe experiencing. Police officer participants share expectations from parents toward police scaring their children into obedience as a mechanism of governance, while they believe police governance should focus more on child protection. While the parents these police have encountered may feel this punitive approach of governance is required from police, the police officers in this study suggest building rapport and being available for reporting as more important from police as authority members in young people’s lives—such practices would then ensure that youth find police accessible and trust in

police if they require intervention, help, or support. My findings show that police officers relate a certain amount of governance required in private spaces (i.e., parents) and public spaces (i.e., police) in the management of rural Canadian youth's journey toward what they consider ideal citizenship. To address this issue, I suggest that police practice and policy should involve more engagement with the parents of youth. One way toward implementation is if police were trained on communication models that include empathy, inclusivity, and collaboration to clearly identify expected roles of parents and police when addressing concerns with their children in a way that is approachable and received positively. Another option that would also give voice to parents is if police departments were able to hold town hall events for parents at local schools to have the opportunity to effectively engage in communication with parents and receive feedback on the gaps that parents are feeling.

While my research centres around systems infantilizing youth, my research also indirectly speaks to the imperative care of authority figures in young peoples' lives for the possibility of youth citizenship. There needs to be a healthy balance between providing youth autonomy and providing youth support and guidance. In revealing the ways that police perceive young people as irrational and requiring assistance, it is also easier to understand why parents are thought of as responsible for youth misbehaviour. Perhaps, communicating the hope for more parental involvement due to the lack of confidence in youth without parents could open dialogue about expectations over one another's governing roles in young people's lives. When we understand the "why" behind intentions and expectations we can better problem solve for more core solutions.

Through my literature review, parents are commonly blamed for the misbehaviour of youth, and that young people face numerous barriers to fulfilling ideal citizenship. What the

present study does is connect the two: so much blame is placed on parents as young people are thought of as requiring a certain amount of parental governance within the home to develop into what it means to be an ideal citizen a part of society. Police officer participants could have a police bias in relation to parents as the police officers connected these negative aspects of parenting to youth recidivism, therefore suggesting the parents of the youth they do not commonly encounter would not be reflected in the experiences shared. Here, suggested is that the youth that police are not encountering could be receiving the governance from parents that police in the current study are wanting from the parents they more commonly encounter. Once again, open communication between parents and police could show both what is working, and what is not working when managing youth misbehaviour.

The misbehaviour as well as negative attitudes towards police discussed are commonly spoken of as either a product of insufficient parenting techniques or a reflection of parent attitudes, otherwise reflecting a parenting blame mentality in discussions of youth criminalization. Police revealed mechanisms of parental governance that ought to be enacted but, police officers reported, more commonly are not (i.e., managing non-crime related youth misbehaviour within the home, holding youth accountable for crimes committed by acknowledging bad behaviour, and influencing positive attitudes towards legal structures). Police officers also revealed mechanisms of governance that police believe parents want them to enact but pose limitations to their governing abilities (i.e., using police as a mechanism of fear to induce obedience and affecting meaningful police-youth relations).

Just as researchers have shown how youth face barriers to fulfilling the rights and obligations of citizenship in other ways, youth are also revealed as disqualified from ideal citizenship but because they require mechanisms of governance from authority figures in their

lives to be deemed as on the path towards ideal citizenship. Similar to findings of Kennelly (2011) in her analysis of police governance and youth citizenship with youth activists and street-involved youth, police participants too demonstrate how mechanisms of youth governance, adding in the parental authority, re-inscribe what it takes to be a legitimate citizen in society which is otherwise unattainable for young people without governance.

Youth governance by authority figures is revealed as a key concept in society's approach to managing youth crime, justice, and accountability by police officers in this sample. Police suggest that that parents of youth also hold responsibilities in regulating youth crime within private arenas, thus, police and parents must work together towards ensuring the safety and security of Canada's young population and greater society.

According to Marshall's (1965) definition of citizenship, young people cannot directly fulfill all of the civil, political, and social rights and obligations required of an ideal citizen as they are not the age of majority (Kennelly, 2011; Frazer & Elmer, 1997; France, 1998). Similarly, my results reveal the status of ideal citizenship, according to police, as unattainable for young people. More relevant across some of the literature is a citizenship education (Williamson, 1997; France, 1998). My study adds to such literature by providing the police perspective on how adults must be managing young people to guide them toward ideal citizenship behaviour. Police believe youth require the guidance of parental authority within private spaces, and police authority within public spaces as core components of their citizenship education. However, police officer participants suggest they are not currently enacting governance alongside parents in effective and collective ways. Therefore, some youth are engaging in less than ideal behaviour (i.e., unsafe, inappropriate, or illegal), that police relate to a lack of both parental and policing governance. To aid in young people's citizenship education, police believe parents and police

officers need to be enacting simultaneous governance over youth in the appropriate spaces (i.e., parents in the private realm and police in the public realm). The lack of governing authority by parents in the private realm is said to impact police abilities within their governing authority in the public realm. My findings suggest that police want to be sharing the responsibility of managing young people with parents, and police believe young people deserve the proper guidance and mentorship from the governing bodies within their lives in order to achieve ideal citizenship within society.

References

- Amoroso, D., & Ware, E. (1986). Adolescents' perception of aspects of the home environment and their attitudes toward parents, self, and external authority. *Adolescence*, 21(81), 191-204.
- Bala, N., & Anand, S. (2004). The first months under the youth criminal justice act: A survey and analysis of case law. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 46(3), 251-271.
- Bouffard, L. A., & Muftić. (2006). The rural mystic': Social disorganization and violence beyond urban communities. *Western Criminology Review*, 7, 56-66.
- Caputo, T., & Kelly, K. (1997). *Police perceptions of current responses to youth crime*. Ottawa: Solicitor General Canada, Ministry Secretariat.
- Carrington, P., & Schulenberg, J. (2008). Structuring police discretion: The effect on referrals to youth court. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 19(3), 349-367.
- Chan, G., & Lo, T. (2016). Family relationships and the self-esteem of hidden youth: A power dynamics perspective. *Journal of Family Issues*, 37(9), 1244-1266.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: a practical guide of qualitative analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Crossouard, B., & Dunne, M. (2015). Politics, gender and youth citizenship in Senegal: Youth policing of dissent and diversity. *International Review of Education*, 61(1), 43-60.
- Department of Justice Canada. (2013). The Youth Criminal Justice Act: Summary and background. Ottawa. Retrieved from <http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/cj-jp/yj-jj/tools-outils/pdf/back-hist.pdf>

- Department of Justice Canada. (2017). Putting children's interest first - Federal-provincial-territorial consultations on custody and access and child support. Retrieved from <https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/fl-lf/famil/cons/consdoc/cscam-paem.html>
- Donzelot, J. (1979). *The policing of families* (1st American ed.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Drake. (2011). The “dangerous other” in maximum-security prisons. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 11(4), 367–382. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895811408836>
- Endres, K. (2004). The Youth Criminal Justice Act: The new face of Canada's youth criminal justice system. *Family Court Review*, 42(3), 526-539.
- Flexon, J. L., Lurigio, A. J., and Greenleaf, R. G. (2009). Exploring the dimensions of trust in the police among Chicago juveniles. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 37(2): 180–189.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), 777-795.
- Foucault, M., Senellart, M., Ewald, F., & Fontana, A. (2007). *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-78*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan: République Française.
- France, A. (1998). 'Why should we care?': Young people, citizenship and questions of social responsibility. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 1(1), 97-111.
- Frazer, E. and Emler, N. (1997). ‘Participation and citizenship: a new agenda for youth politics research?’, in J. Bynner, L. Chisholm and A. Furlong (eds) *Youth, Citizenship and Social Change in a European Context*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Helve, H. (1997). ‘Perspectives on social exclusion, citizenship and youth’ in J. Bynner, L. Chisholm and A. Furlong (eds) *Youth, Citizenship and Social Change in a European Context*. Aldershot: Avebury.

- Hillian, D., & Reitsma-Street, M. (2003). Parents and youth justice. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice/Revue Canadienne De Criminologie Et De Justice Penale*, 45(1), 19-41.
- Hope, T. L., & Bierman, K. L. (1998). Patterns of home and school behavior problems in rural and urban settings. *Journal of School Psychology*, 36(1), 45-58.
- Huey, L., & Ricciardelli, R. (2015). 'This isn't what I signed up for': When police officer role expectations conflict with the realities of general duty police work in remote communities. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 17(3), 194.
- Inoue. (2020). Between Surveillance and Sousveillance: Or, Why Campus Police Feel Vulnerable Precisely Because They Gain Power. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 49(2), 229–256. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241619880323>
- Jenks, C. (2005). *Childhood* (2nd ed., Key ideas). London; New York: Routledge.
- Jones, J., & Wallace, C. D. (1992). *Youth, family and citizenship: An exploration of young people, independence and domestic life*. Maidenhead, United Kingdom: Open University Press.
- Kaylen, M., & Pridemore, W. (2011). A reassessment of the association between social disorganization and youth violence in rural areas. *Social Science Quarterly*, 92(4), 978-1001.
- Kennelly, J. (2011). Policing young people as citizens-in-waiting. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 51(2), 336-354.
- Leroux, E., & McShane, K. (2017). Changing youth attitudes toward the police through community policing programming. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 45(6), 810-822.

- Lyons, P. (2015). The role of the police in building community identity among young people. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 85(6, Suppl), S100-S102.
- Macleod, R., Schneiderman, D. (1994). *Police powers in Canada: The evolution and practice of authority* (DesLibris. Books collection). Toronto: Published in association with the Centre for Constitutional Studies, University of Alberta, by University of Toronto Press.
- Masson, J. (2002). Police protection - protecting whom? *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 24(2), 157-173.
- Marshall, T. H., & Lipset, S. M. (1965). *Class, citizenship, and social development*. Chicago, Ill: University of Chicago Press.
- Mazefsky, C., & Farrell, A. (2005). The role of witnessing violence, peer provocation, family support, and parenting practices in the aggressive behavior of rural adolescents. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 14(1), 71-85.
- McAra, L., and McVie, S. (2005) The usual suspects? Street-life, young people and the police. *Criminal Justice*, 5(1): 5–36.
- Moore, M., & Sween, M. (2015). Rural youth crime: A reexamination of social disorganization theory's applicability to rural areas. *Journal of Juvenile Justice*, 4(1), 47-63.
- O'Connor, C. D. (2008). Citizen attitudes toward the police in Canada. *Policing*, 31(4), 578-595.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org.qe2a-proxy.mun.ca/10.1108/13639510810910571>
- Osgood, D., & Chambers, J. (2000). Social disorganization outside the metropolis: An analysis of rural youth violence. *Criminology*, 38(1), 81-116.
- Petee, T. A., & Kowalski, G. S. (1993). Modeling rural violent crime rates: A test of social disorganization theory. *Sociological Focus*, 26, 237-289.

- Peterson-Badali, M., & Broeking, J. (2010). Parents' involvement in the youth justice system: Rhetoric and reality. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 52(1), 1-27.
- Roche, M. (1987). Citizenship, social theory, and social change. *Theory and Society*, 16(3), 363-399.
- Peled, Y. (1992). Ethnic Democracy and the Legal Construction of Citizenship: Arab Citizens of the Jewish State. *The American Political Science Review*, 86(2), 432-443.
- Powell, M., Wilson, J., Gibbons, C., & Croft, C. (2008). Children's conception of police authority when responding to requests for assistance. *Police Practice and Research*, 9(1), 5-16.
- Ricciardelli, Crichton, H., Swiss, L., Spencer, D. C., & Adorjan, M. (2017). From knowledge to action? The Youth Criminal Justice Act and use of extrajudicial measures in youth policing. *Police Practice & Research*, 18(6), 599-611.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2017.1363971>
- Ricciardelli, R. (2018). *Constructing and implementing an extra-judicial measure police directed referrals to community groups in Newfoundland and Labrador*. Unpublished report.
- Sindall, K., McCarthy, D., & Brunton-Smith, I. (2017). Young people and the formation of attitudes towards the police. *European Journal of Criminology*, 14(3), 344-364.
- Sims, V. (1988). *Small town and rural police*. Springfield, Ill., U.S.A.: C.C. Thomas.
- Smith, K. (2014). *The government of childhood: Discourse, power and subjectivity* (Studies in childhood and youth). Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smith, R. (2010). Policing the Changing Landscape of Rural Crime: A Case Study from Scotland. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 12(3), 373-387.

- Trépanier. (1999). Juvenile delinquency and youth protection: The historical foundations of the Canadian Juvenile Delinquents Act of 1908. *European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice*, 7(1), 41-62.
- Trojanowicz, R., Kappeler, V., & Gaines, L. (2002). *Community policing : A contemporary perspective* (3rd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Pub.
- Williamson, H. (1997). 'Youth work and citizenship', in J. Bynner, L. Chisholm and A. Furlong (eds) *Youth, Citizenship and Social Change in a European Context*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Wong, S. (2012). Youth crime and family disruption in Canadian municipalities: An adaptation of Shaw and McKay's social disorganization theory. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 40(2), 100-114.
- Youth Criminal Justice Act, S.C. 2002. c. 1, s. 4-10. <https://www.laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/PDF/Y-1.5.pdf>
- Yuval-Davis, N. (1997). Citizenship and Difference. In *Gender and Nation* (pp. 68-92). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Zhang, L. (2011). Family, school and friends: correlates of Canadian youth outcomes. *Child Indicators Research*, 4(3), 467-498.