CHAPTER - II

A BRIEF REVIEW OF LITERATURE
Though considerable research was conducted to assess the various causative factors leading to delinquency among children, no dramatic revelation has been made. The lacuna lies in the investigation being focussed on a single factor responsible for delinquency rather than a multi-thronged attack of this deviant behavior. This stimulated the examination of the problem simultaneously from different angles. Moreover precise little work was carried out to expose the causative factors of delinquency proneness. In this respect the present investigation is a unique one. Since literature related to delinquency proneness is of a limited nature, research dealing with delinquency itself is reviewed most of the time.

A review of the previous studies made in this field will throw some light on the intricacies of the problem under investigation. An overview of the results obtained by various investigators is of immense help to gain an insight into this vital
problem. So the review of relevant literature is presented underneath dividing it into the following categories.

1. Delinquency proneness
2. Delinquency and schooling
3. Delinquency and Broken Home Conditions
4. Delinquency and Neuroticism
5. Delinquency and Mental Ability
6. Delinquency, size of the Family and Order of Birth

Delinquency Proneness

Assessing Proneness is viewed by Quay (1965) as "an urgently needed first step toward delinquency control. The emphasis on delinquency control comes from the desire at all levels of society to change the behavior patterns of nonconforming individuals". Investigation of delinquency proneness involves the largely utilitarian or functional aim of preventing the individual from drifting away from established social norms.
The first major effort to develop instruments for predicting delinquency was reported by Glueck and Glueck (1950) who matched five hundred delinquents and five hundred non-delinquents in the Boston area on the basis of age, ethnic origin, intelligence and place of residence. Three tables were developed for distinguishing between these two groups. Table one dealt with five social factors.

1. Discipline of Boy by Father
   - Overstrict or erratic
   - Lax
   - Firm but kindly

2. Supervision of Boy by Mother
   - Unsuitable
   - Fair
   - Suitable

3. Affection of Father for Boy
   - Indifferent or hostile
   - Warm (including overprotective)

4. Affection of Mother for Boy
   - Indifference or hostile
   - Warm (including overprotective)
5. Cohesiveness of Family

Unintegrated

Some elements of Cohesion

Cohesive

The second table dealt with personality traits as revealed by the Rorschach Psychodiagnostic test. The factor topics were 1) social aggression, 2) defiance, 3) suspicion, 4) destructiveness and 5) emotional liability.

Table third dealt with personality characteristics as revealed through psychiatric interviewing. From this third table five factors were derived: 1) adventurous, 2) extraverted in action, 3) suggestibility, 4) stubbornness, and (5) emotionally unstable. Of these three tables, only the social factor table has been subjected to follow-up evaluation. The Gluecks recommended that delinquency prediction be made at the time the child enters school, around the age six.
To date, there has been only one major study that tested a group of youngsters at age six and then followed them up, to determine the predictive validity of this instrument. In 1952-53 the New York City Youth Board selected a sample of 224 first grade boys from high delinquency neighbourhoods. Ratings on social factors were obtained through interviews conducted by social workers in the home setting. The investigators in an effort to refine the social factor table, devised a three-factor scale (supervision of the boy by the father, supervision of the boy by the mother, and family cohesiveness) and a two-factor scale (supervision of the boy by the mother, and family cohesiveness). After nine years of comprehensive follow-up, Craig and Glick (1964) concluded that the scale was a good differentiator between serious and persistent delinquents and non-delinquents. The results indicated that the three-factor scale predicted accurately seventy percent of delinquents and eighty-five percent of non-delinquents.

Thompson (1958) applied Glueck's scale to a new sample of 100 boys, differing in age, ethnic background, intelligence, economic status and neighbourhood. At accurately identified ninety-one percent of the cases who later proved to be either delinquents or non-delinquents. High
reliability was maintained for boys as young as six years. The scale was found to possess greater predictive value than clinical study by qualified persons.

These findings seem encouraging but objections raised by critics (Briggs and Wirt, 1955; Kvaraceus, 1966) cannot be lightly dismissed. Michael and Francis (1965) used the Glueck's Social Prediction Scale and concluded that in his study the Glueck's Social Prediction Scale does not accurately discriminate between further delinquents and non-delinquents.

Glueck (1966b) has added two additional traits nonsubmissiveness to authority, and destructiveness, in an effort to produce a more discriminative instrument. Although it is suggested (Glueck 1966a) that these two new predictive instruments will be more accurate than the previously validated scales, the need for additional testing is also pointed out.

Kvaraceus (1953) has devised a K.D.Fromeness Scale consisting of seventy five multiple choice
items designed to differentiate delinquents and non-delinquents. Separate keys are provided for girls and boys (Kvaraceus 1956). Kvaraceus (1956) also developed a K.D. Proneness checklist for use by teachers and other professional workers concerned with prediction of delinquency. This list consists of seventy items concerning family, home, school, and personal factors.

There is also a non-verbal scale (Kvaraceus 1961) which has received the most extensive validation of all the K.D. Prediction Scales (Kvaraceus 1966). Administration of the scale consists in the presentation of sixty two circles, each of which contains four pictures designed to differentiate delinquents from non-delinquents.

Balogh, and Rumage (1956), tested the discrimination value of the Kvaraceus K.D. Proneness Scale (1953) by administering the questionnaire to 132 delinquent white boys, 750 public school boys, and to 453 "high morale" boys. The element
of discrimination in both the high "morale" and public school group appears to be statistically significant. Some degree of discrimination is also apparent even in the delinquent group. Studies of the Balogh (1958) and Balogh and Finn (1961) supported the above findings.

Herzog (1960) used the Glueck tables, the Kvarbesus K.D.Proneness scale and MMPI for identifying individual delinquents. He reported that "the greatest problem is ..... they over predict, incorrectly labelling as predelinquent many children who do not merit the stigma."

Curtis et al (1963) examined using 400 tenth grade students, the scores from two modes of administration (paper and pencil and slide Projector) of a delinquency-proneness (D.P) scale and compared them in relation to criterion data concerning past and future school and legal difficulties, withdrawal from school and measures of personal aggression, indolence and rigidity. A statistically non-significant tendency for persons with high aggression
and low rigidity to produce higher D-F scores on the projected mode than on the paper and pencil mode was noted. The discrepancy between the magnitude of the D-F scores for the two modes increased as the item exposure interval for the projected mode decreased.

Bechtold (1964) constructed a scale for delinquency proneness. For statistical comparison the K.D Scale was given to two groups of different socio-economic backgrounds. The test group subjects in the lower socio-economic school were checked to see if they had a record at the Jackson county, Kansas juvenile court. Results of this check list were compared experimentally with the K.D test results. Test group scale scores and test group check list scores were compared experimentally to see if a high score on first instrument would have a correspondingly high score on the other. Bechtold found that the K.D scale and check list were valid predictive measurements for use in the prevention of delinquency. Further
the K.D scale and check list are significantly related to one another.

Roy (1964) constructed a preliminary scale containing twenty seven items relating to defiance, ambivalence to authority, feeling of resentment, and hostility and found it to discriminate between delinquents and non-delinquents.

Ichimura (1966) administered the Rorschach protocols for prediction of delinquency. He concluded the Rorschach protocols which were obtained from the pre school children were able to predict the appearance of delinquent behavior ten years later.

et al

Mizushima (1971) developed an inventory to diagnose delinquency proneness. This scale consisted of ninetyfive items. Elements of delinquency proneness were classified into three categories:

a) emotional disturbances, including psychopathic disorder, b) acculturative - attitudinal disorders caused by identification with delinquent groups,
and o) maladaptive acculturative disorders caused by the first two categories. It was found that family relationships were related to emotional disturbances and delinquent acculturations, and that the common factor in most delinquents was "lack or rejection of interpersonal ties with socialized persons."

Several others like Clements (1960), Feldhusen et al (1972), Follman et al (1972), Matsumoto et al (1973) and Sutton (1976), also constructed various types of scales for the prediction of juvenile delinquency.

Delinquency and Schooling:

There is one point on which really all sociological theories of gang misconduct are in agreement. Negative experience of the schools act as powerful forces projecting youth into delinquency. All of the major theories accord some importance to negative school
Actually the school occupies a key position in the community's programme for the preventing and control of juvenile delinquency. There is no complete agreement as to what this role is, but most child workers do recognize the strategic position of the school. Some tend to minimize the role.

The idea that the school is the agency which can contribute to juvenile delinquency is not new. Over one hundred years ago Pierce (1854) presented an evidently controversial essay in which he stressed the lack of moral training in American schools and its relationship to crime. Sullinger (1929) stated "the determiners of delinquency in the schools are acts of omission rather than of commission".

Mercer (1930) concluded that the school maladjustment is a factor in juvenile delinquency. Powers (1949) stated that the school is responsible agent for the early detection of delinquency.
prone children. Experts' and teachers' predictions of delinquency made ten years earlier, for one hundred boys, nine and ten years old, were substantially similar in accuracy, eighty seven percent and seventy seven percent respectively. Most of those who become delinquent had been predicted to become so. But most of those labelled pre-delinquents did not become delinquent. The delinquents identified were already obvious to any discerning teachers. Delinquency is but a single part of a large categorization of behavior rising from conflict and maladjustment. Therefore, we should not try to isolate the predelinquent and view him as different from other children who are unhappy and inadequate but not delinquent.

Becattini (1949) stated that the most appropriate agent in the fight against juvenile delinquency should be the school. He emphasizes the importance of educational means in the prevention and rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents.
Bloch and Flynn (1950) suggested that, by the time a child has reached school age, his basic personality traits have been formed and many of the incipient and active tendencies toward delinquency and waywardness have been established.

According to Nolan (1951) delinquency is related to certain conditions in the school. Mediros (1958) stressed the fact that hereditary and environmental factors cause juvenile delinquency. Due to the psychological effect of family and school emotional maladjustment is caused which in turn leads to antisocial behavior.

Roman and Harrari (1955) reported that the low socio-economic child is handicapped by a number of factors in his efforts to learn to read. The conflict between his culture and middle class culture and educational experience induces certain Psychodynamic Processes which tend to produce reading retardation, emotional disturbances and
delinquency. According to them the major responsibility for treatment rests with the schools.

Kvaraceus (1968) and Kvaraceus and Miller (1969) reported that the school has the sole or chief responsibility for juvenile delinquency. Delinquent behavior is seldom the product of the school alone. Also it must be appreciated that the school cannot solve the juvenile delinquency problem by itself.

Clinard (1959) made this statement three and half decades ago: "it is a curious commentary on our modern world, which emphasizes education, that the school is a large contributing factor in juvenile delinquency".

Glueck and Glueck (1953 and 1959) believe that the school is the second social institutional circle of influences to which a child is subjected. The rearing of children is the responsibility of the home, and yet in this rapidly changing world the home has recognized that it needs the help of many community agencies.
Stullken (1959) who emphasizes that schools were established to help youth to realize their potentialities and to develop into wholesome personalities and useful citizens, and that education is "a process by which the behavior of people is improved that they may think, feel, and act differently than they ever did before". He adds the fact that the schools must aim to develop young people physically, spiritually, and morally, as well as intellectually. Thus, he concluded that the schools are concerned with all problems of life including juvenile delinquency.

As Conant (1961) suggests, youth who have dropped out of school and never have had a full-time job are not likely to become constructive citizens. They are more apt to be frustrated individuals who become antisocial and rebellious, and as a result may well become juvenile delinquents. Neumeyer (1961) believes that the school has an excellent opportunity to help prevent juvenile delinquency.
Downes (1966) criticised the middle class domination and said delinquency among lower class was a reaction to this. He further says that the working class boy who has undergone this process, who has been hampered in school by his attachment to working class values reacts to failures not by frustration, reaction formation etc., but by the reaffirmation of the working class system.

Elliot (1966) in his study with seven hundred and forty three school boys found that the delinquency rate was high for lower class boys whether they remained in school or became dropouts. On the other hand the rate of delinquency involvement was lower for middle class boys who were in school and for middle class dropouts.

Hirschi (1969) and Hindelang (1973) both reported greater delinquency with lower academic achievement, negative school related attitudes, and less involvement in school activities. Many others have found similar associations (Slocum and
Stone, 1963; Schafer and Polk, 1967; Polk, 1971; Fresse, 1973; Kelly and Pink, 1973; Elliot and Voss 1974; and Gibbons, 1976). There seems to be no doubt that school success and school attachment deserve a place in any serious delineation of the factors producing delinquency.

Roscoe (1973) conducted a study on school youth. He concluded that those youth who were labelled delinquents were characterized by poor school achievement and a strong dislike for school.

Powell (1975) argues that changing the attitudes and behaviours of delinquents and delinquency prone children requires specific intervention and that this intervention should most often occur in the school setting with the collaboration of various other community agencies. It is suggested that, since schools are much more likely to initiate a programme for preventing than for treatment, it is logical to begin with efforts in the direction. Martin (1967) sees the school as a sort of secondary life of defense in combating juvenile delinquency.
After reviewing the above studies it is concluded that the school must cooperate with other agencies in seeking information that will help all to better understand deviant children.

Delinquency and Broken Home Conditions

Family is the primary socializing agent to the child. Parental separation and deprivation have been found to be closely linked with the delinquency. The families of delinquents have been disrupted by death, desertion, divorce, separation, or prolonged parental absence much more frequently than the families of non-delinquents. The impact of family disruption varies with certain characteristics of the child (Toby, 1957; Monahan, 1957; 1960) notably age (pseudolescents are more strongly affected than older children) and sex (girls are affected more than boys). But the substantial relationship between delinquency and broken homes remains as one of the overriding facts. A number of investigators have pointed to the high incidence of broken homes and multiple parental
figures in the background of delinquent youth. The research literature in this area indicates that children from broken homes, as compared with those from intact homes, do contribute a lot to delinquency activities.

Burt (1929) found no difference between delinquent and nondelinquent groups in regard to death of the father, but the groups differed widely in the incidence of divorce, separation and desertion. Absence of the mother, however, was related to delinquency regardless of the reason of absence, and the effect of maternal absence was especially severe for delinquent girls. Ruggles (1932) stressed that broken and unhappy homes seemed to be closely associated with the criminal behavior. Williams (1932) concluded that bad home conditions appear most frequently as inciting causes, mental abnormalities rank next in order of frequency, and bad companions third.

Sullenger's (1934) study of 1145 juvenile delinquents in Omaha indicates the importance of
broken homes (death, divorce or desertion among parents) as causative factor. The effect is more conspicuous among girls. Glueck and Glueck (1934) found that 66.4 percent of the delinquents and 34.2 percent of the non-delinquents had broken home conditions in their background (out of five hundred sample).

Sen (1937); Buxmann (1939) have pointed out that broken home conditions are important factors in delinquency. Arenaza (1938) concluded that juvenile delinquency is first of all a symptom of disorganized home.

Twenty seven percent of the Navy brig inmates studied by Gardner and Goldman (1948) came from homes broken by divorce, separation or desertion contrasted to only ten percent of the controls. There were no differences in the proportions of homes broken by death. Shanmugam (1948) pointed that frequently the juvenile delinquent came from a broken home.
Glueck and Glueck (1950) found that forty percent of a group of delinquent boys came from fatherless homes compared with about twenty five percent of a group of non-delinquent boys. Nevertheless, not all broken homes produce antisocial behaviour. It is important to consider the cause of the broken home and the kind of conflict that preceded parental separation. The death of a parent seems to contribute less to the development of antisocial behaviour than separation by divorce.

Oltman and Friedman (1952) also concluded a history of family disruption as hardly specific to delinquency, but it does not as an important precondition to crime and it seems to have more to do with the formation of character disorders than with the etiology of some other equally serious forms of disturbance. Smith (1955) points to the strong evidence that the comparatively high rates of delinquents who come from broken homes can be explained largely in terms of differential treatment of children not only by the police but also by the juvenile court.
Monahan (1967) warns against the danger of overgeneralization and states that only a small minority of youngsters growing up in broken homes become delinquents. While no critical age has been established, it appears that older children are less adversely affected by broken homes than the young children. Further it is indicated that delinquents are likely to come from disorganized but structurally non-broken homes as they are from broken homes. He also pointed out (Monahan, 1960) the fact of a break in the home, rather than the nature of the break, may be of more crucial importance to the child insofar as official delinquency is concerned.

Jenkins (1957) and Short and Nye (1958) strongly pleaded that delinquency is a normal reaction to stress, a factor contingent upon parental deprivation. Nye's (1958) study is replete with various kinds of positive attachments to parents that are associated with less reported delinquency. Interestingly, he finds greater delinquency in unhappy intact homes than in simply broken homes (Nye, 1958), indicating the
importance of the quality of parent-child relationships, as opposed to the mere presence of parents in the home.

Bandura and Walters (1969), Ainsworth (1962), and Glueck and Glueck (1970) reported that lack of a father is more likely to produce a delinquent. Of course, a "living divorce" where the parents hate one another and the children, but stay together, is sometimes even worse. These investigators feel that, whether the father is there or not, delinquency results from a chaotic family life. McCord, McCord and Zola (1969) feel that the influence of broken homes per se has been overstressed. They state that a quarrelsome and neglectful home, whether or not it was broken, was found to be much more conducive to criminality.

Miller (1969) argues that the lower-class child engages in gang delinquency in an attempt to establish his masculinity, something he cannot do within the confines of a female-based, father absent household. Andry (1960) observed that the delinquent received less strong and open affection
from their parents, especially from their fathers, and identified less with the fathers. They viewed communication between their fathers and themselves as inadequate. According to this study, the role of the father is of great significance in the causation of delinquency and the supremacy of the role of mothers (as claimed by the theory of 'maternal deprivation') is questionable as a universal feature.

Healy and Bronner (1960) and Grygier (1969) recognized that parental deprivation and complexities of family interrelationship occupy an important place in the etiology of juvenile delinquency. Nash (1965) pointed out the supremacy of maternal deprivation as a significant causative factor in delinquent behavior.

Eaten and Polk (1961) found that more than fifty percent of all delinquents came from broken homes, broken by death or marital discord. Toby (1957); Pati (1961); and Badam (1962) found illegitimacy and broken homes as important factors in delinquency. Hurwitz, Kaplan and Kaiser (1962)
using a sample of 100 male delinquents, reported that boys who had been manhandled, especially by their fathers, tended to get into more difficulty than boys whose parents had more desirable coping patterns.

Sterne (1964) does not believe that the broken home is a major cause of delinquency, but rather disruption and tension within the home.

Siegman (1966) observed that father absent boys were more delinquent than father-present boys. Anderson (1968) studied the role of the father-son relationship in order to compare the maternal and parental deprivation in childhood and the development of delinquency. Effective fathering was considered an important growth factor in the development of child, particularly in the 4-7 age period. Maternal deprivation indicated no significant influence.

Douglas and his co-workers (1968) also reported the delinquency rate of twelve percent in the families broken by parental death. Song (1969)
concluded that love and affection are indispensable in development of positive and accurate self concept variables. Children from broken homes lack these essential ingredients. Delinquent boys from intact homes would show relatively higher self-concept, self acceptance, and ideal self scores.

McDermott's (1970) data consisted of 1467 children up to age 14. Out of them 116 subjects were divorced parents, 1349 from legally intact parents, and 22 from parents who were separated but not divorced. Results suggest that reactions to the divorce experience persisted in subjects for some time. The largest sub-group showed a subclinical depressive period after the divorce. A high correlation was noted between subject's symptoms and his image of the absent parent, suggesting identification with the parent as a method of dealing with the loss. The need for improved facilities for dealing with mental health components surrounding divorce is stressed, emphasizing the vulnerability of children at that time. It is concluded that a frame work of
protection of the rights and needs of children must be developed.

Koller's (1971) study indicated that a larger percentage of the delinquent girls had prolonged parental loss, large family size, and intermediate birth orders. Physical presence of a problem mother and the influence of institutional life may also contribute to the development of subsequent delinquency. Rutter (1971) concludes after reviewing his data as well as others that the rate of antisocial behavior is likely to be higher for children from non-broken homes in which there is great parental discord than for children who live in harmonious but broken homes.

Sylvester (1972) reported that the father plays a more important role in the etiology of delinquency than does the mother. Bhaskar (1975) attempted to study the parental deprivation as a causative factor in juvenile delinquency. His sample consisted of sixty delinquent boys. Results indicated that thirty seven percent of the subjects have experienced parental loss.
Ninety percent of the subjects who had experienced parental loss, was due to death. Absence of father was more common in the sample.

Datesman and Scarpitti (1975) concluded that, in general, there appears to be no unique relationship between broken homes and female delinquency except for family related offenses.

Mishra's (1977) results indicate a significant relationship between parental deprivation and delinquency. The case study revealed unmistakable evidence of the role of the father in the formation of the attitudes of delinquent boys. It was also found that separation, neglect and deprivation of love contribute towards the development of juvenile delinquency.

Shanmugam (1980), in his study with one hundred and fifty delinquents and one hundred and fifty non-delinquents brought out the importance of broken homes. He found a definite association between delinquents and their home conditions. He concluded by saying, "the results on the whole
reflect more pathogenic factors in the delinquents home environment as compared to that of non-delinquents'.

Kodanda Ram (1981) studied the cognitive style of father absent delinquents. The findings indicate that father absent group was more dependent than the father present group.

Delinquency and Neuroticism

Neurotic disorders are mental disorders without any demonstrable organic basis in which the patient may have considerable insight and has unimpaired reality testing in that he actually does not confuse his morbid subjective experiences and fantasies.

A neurotic symptom, as emphasized by Friedlander (1951) "is the outcome of an unconscious mental conflict, and unless the unconscious material is revealed the symptom appears to the person afflicted with it and to the onlooker to be entirely meaningless. In the same way certain
delinquent acts can be understood only if their unconscious motivation is unearthed. It has been found that there is no fundamental difference between unconscious conflicts underlying neurotic symptom formation and unconscious conflicts causing those delinquent actions which we might call "delinquent symptoms".

The neurotic delinquent usually hails from a small middle class and disorganized family. They are supposed to possess rigid and irrational super ego.

An estimated three to five percent of delinquent behavior appears to be directly associated with neurotic disorders, and about the same percentage with psychotic disorders. In the case of neurotic delinquent the antisocial behavior may take the form of a compulsion, such as "peeping" or stealing.

Slawson (1925) reported that psychoneuroticism is an important factor in etiology of delinquency.
Grimberg (1928) concluded that most delinquents should be classified as constitutionally inferior individuals, and that constitutional inferiority is the result of the organic deficiency; he places that organic inferiority in the endocrine system. "It will be seen that what we regard as delinquents were primarily biological products of an improper mating with the resulting transmission of a psychic defect". The author is convinced that delinquency and mental retardation go hand in hand though mental defectiveness is not a deciding factor in delinquency. The emotions are ascribed a greater role as a causative agent than the mental status. Emotional defectiveness is stated as a congenital defect.

Karpman (1929) believed that impulsive neurosis is the causative factor in delinquency. Delinquent's impulsive acts are manifestation of the conflict between socially imposed habits and primitive instinctive drives. Courthial (1931) concluded that delinquents are more strongly emotional, lack inhibitory forces and possess a
wide range of interests conducive to unrest and instability. Ackerly's (1933) findings indicate that a greater tendency to extraversion, histories of overactivity and restlessness, greater emotional imbalance and poor school work characterize the delinquent group.

Muller (1936) reported that a direct relationship between neuroses and criminality appears very doubtful, first, because in most delinquent neurotics the basis for the actualization of their criminal behavior is a defective development of the normative functions; and second, because in apparently criminal neurotics, the transition from latent to manifest criminality is determined by accidental, extra neurotic factors.

Armstrong (1937) stated that the psychoneurotic response of running away from home aroused in more boys than girls.

Durea (1937) believed that an insignificant relationship is found to exist between emotional age
and degree of delinquent behaviour. Lippman (1937) concluded that "it is very likely that as more delinquents are analyzed we shall find that there is a stronger component of neurosis in delinquency that has hitherto been suspected."

Marinescu Copelman and Stanescu (1937) stressed that the criminal type can be isolated by psychosomatic study. The psychogalvanic reflex was tested in hundred criminals and most of them showed great emotional defect. Lack of emotional sensitivity seems to be one of the best criteria of criminality. Perry (1937) feels that delinquency may often be based upon mental and emotional dissatisfaction, creditable in themselves, but of such strength as to impel mis-conduct as a means of relief from tension. Bromberg and Keiser (1938) found that swindler exhibited neurotic conflict of a psychosexual nature.

Devereux (1940) offers a sociological analysis of delinquent or criminal behaviour in the neurotic and psychotic. Neurotic and psychotic behaviour is definable only in terms of cultural norms from
which it deviates.

Germain (1940) reported true delinquency as an expression of emotional difficulties. Lorand (1940) believed that the major factor responsible for compulsive stealing is the emotional maladjustment of the patient. The kleptomaniac always lacks critical appreciation of the factors of reality. So that he is unable consciously to resist strong instinctual and unconscious drives from within. Karpman (1940) and Gutheil (1941) also considered neuroticism as one of the important factors in delinquency.

Michaels (1940) reinterprets the data of Healy and Bronner to show that there is probably a certain kind of psychosomatic disposition which permeates the delinquent individuals making him react as differently from the neurotic or the psychotic as they react from each other. "The delinquent is as inextricably rooted to his individual organic structure as he is welded to the cultural milieu in which he develops?"
Goitein (1942) stated that the asocial neurosis is characterized by the combination of delight in antisocial conduct with abhorrence at its expression. Bergler (1945) believed the gambler is considered as a neurotic. Losing seems to be necessary for the gambler’s psychological equilibrium involving a neurotic need for self punishment.

Abrahamsen (1944) concluded that emotional disturbances are important factors in the etiology of delinquency. Gillespie (1944) believes that the stronger the opposing forces are in the conflict, the greater the tendency to develop criminal behavior instead of psychoneurotic symptoms. Michaels (1943) presented his findings that a relationship exists between persistent enuresis and delinquency in the psychopathic personality both being expression of some common fundamental personality disorder. Schneider (1948) opposed to the conception of Muller and Binder which are to the affect that neuroticism never leads to criminality unless non-neurotic factors such as psychosis or psychopathy are involved. Thorpe (1946) pointed out psychopathic personality,
emotional instability, nor gross environment factors, e.g., poverty, congestion, can be involved as adequate explanations for criminal behavior.

Bromberg (1947) feels that emotional immaturity is a cause of antisocial behavior. Donigae (1947) stressed that the antisocial behavior is caused by emotional disturbances resulting from conflicting and frequently unconscious. Jenkins and Glickman (1947) classified the subjects into three groups in his experiment: an unsocialized aggressive group; a socialized delinquent group and an emotionally disturbed delinquent group. The socialized delinquent is characterized by a larger family and better acceptance in a home which is bleak and dirty, parental discipline is lax. The emotionally disturbed delinquent group has experienced a greater degree of rejection that the other groups and the boy is likely to have been the unfavoured child in this family. The unsocialized aggressive group is characterized by parental rejection and placement in fosterhome or institution.
Glueck and Glueck (1950) reported that criminals have a poor home adjustment and they also show emotional disturbances. Sharmugam (1966) concluded that the empirically grouped syndromes of paranoid, neurasthenic tendencies, and sleep disorders were very important in the sex delinquent group. Catell and Eber (1959) found criminals to be above average on emotional maturity factor and spontaneity factor, but below average on worry proneness factor. Eysenck (1957) proposed that neuroticism and anxiety are highly correlated with delinquency.

Lykken (1957), Mills (1971) and Singh (1972) supported that the neurotic extraverts will tend to engage more frequently in anti-social behavior than non-neurotics. Schmideberg (1956) stated delinquency is a perversion and can be approached analytically. Both neurotic and perverse symptoms spring to a strong extent from similar etiology. They differ mainly in the nature of their symptoms, the neurotic reaction being autoplastic and the perverse alloplastic.

Kvaraceus (1958) pointed out that, a delinquent's attitude towards school is commonly "charged with hate and hostility".
Many youngsters who are emotionally disturbed are not delinquents and according to some writers, a youngster may be a delinquent without being emotionally disturbed. Miller (1959) states that the middle class offender is more likely to be an emotionally disturbed person than the lower class offender. Kvaraceus and Miller (1959) reported that the exploiters may be respectable members of society who use delinquents to satisfy "psychic needs".

Panton (1960) investigated the coded MMPI profiles of 1078 prisoners which were sorted into IQ classification groups in accordance with their scores on the revised Beta examination. Six of the diagnostic scales shifted significantly in coded rank with increased IQ. The profiles of the two most intelligent groups were indicative of behavioral characteristics associated with the character disorders, whereas the profiles of the average and below average IQ groups were found to be dominated by configurations usually associated with indices of neuroticism and anxiety. This supports the conception that low IQ is associated with neuroticism.
According to Schepis and Cattell (1961), there is almost nothing good to be said about high anxiety scorers. High anxiety is associated not only with neurosis, but also with almost all the other disorders and maladjustments so far measured. This applies to delinquent behavior also. Regarding the overall neurotic trend, the delinquents are significantly more neurotic than the non-delinquent groups.

Gynther (1962) found individuals who commit sexual crimes appear to be emotionally most seriously disturbed. A survey of Diploma cadets (1964) indicated that rural prisoners showed more personal attachment, anxiety and emotion, while urban prisoners showed more frustration, sex deviation, habituation, personal idiosyncrasy, and family disharmony. Lack of discipline characterized the homes of all criminals.

Kissel (1967) concluded that anxiety leads to the arousal of affiliative tendencies in juvenile delinquency. Wardrop (1967) stated that delinquency stems from neurosis or psychosis. Guze Samuel,
Goodwin and Crane (1969) emphasized that the schizophrenia, manic depressive disease, organic brain syndromes, the neuroses, and homosexuality are apparently seen less frequently in criminals than in the general population. Burgess (1972) feels that the dimension of neuroticism is perhaps more important and relevant to the theoretical model of criminality as offered by Eysenck.

It is evident from several research reports that extraversion and neuroticism are the two main causal components of delinquent personality (Eysenck, 1974; Cattell et al., 1970; and others). These investigators have suggested the view that delinquent behavior is a joint function of extraversion and neuroticism.

A number of studies shown that delinquents and criminals are more extravert than the non-delinquents (Lester, 1977; Eaves and Eysenck 1975; Syed, 1964; and Cluesck 1963). There is strong opinion that delinquent extraverts are characterized by poor conditionability and emotional impulsivity which results in their poor socialization.
A delinquent child is deprived of parental love and affection from his early childhood due to parental negligence and overprotection. As a result he fails to make a good adjustment within the family and acquires avoidance conditioning. At that time, he seeks social acceptance from the external world and tries to satisfy his needs and demands in the outer environment at any cost disregarding whether that behavior is socially or legally desirable or not. Obviously, he shows extraverted trend. Eysenck (1964) in this connection said that "a failure on the part of the person to become conditioned is likely to be a prominent cause in this running foul of the law and of the social mores generally."

Geeta Rao and Animasen (1979) reported that the aggressiveness and emotional immaturity have been found to be characteristic of the delinquents, but most of them were found to be introverts who had a high need for achievement and suffered from acute anxiety and insecurity and were constrictive rather than impulsive in their behavior because of the excess use of repression as a defence.
Singh (1979) stressed that the major crime offenders were significantly more psychic and neurotic than the minor crime offenders.

Chatterji et al. (1980) carried out a very interesting investigation on the impact of certain environmental factors on neuroticism among delinquents and non-delinquents. Two hundred boys in the range of 13 - 18 years constituted the sample for each group. The delinquent and non-delinquent boys did not differ significantly on neuroticism. Two factors viz., parental affection and presence of mother in the family contributed to delinquency. Chatterji and Mukerjee (1981) compared the neuroticism, environmental and certain biographical factors of the inmates of detention home and slum children, and arrived at the same conclusion.

Shanmugam (1980) found that the delinquent boys were more neurotic than non-delinquents. Singh (1980); and Sowaid and Singh (1978) found that delinquent boys are more extraverted and neurotic in comparison to that of non-delinquent boys.
McCurk and McDougall (1981) examined Eysenck's (1964) theory of criminality by contrasting delinquent and non-delinquent groups. Four personality types were found in each group. Two personality types that were present in the delinquent sample were not found in the comparison group. The first type consisted of subjects scoring high on neuroticism and extraversion while the second type consisted of subjects scoring high on psychoticism, neuroticism, and extraversion. It is proved that the personality types were consistent with Eysenck's theory of criminality.

Rushton and Chrisojohn (1981) found no relationship between delinquency scores and neuroticism. Singh (1981) believed that high extraversion and high neuroticism score is more likely to commit antisocial and criminal acts.

Kaliappan, et al. (1982) and Senthilathiban (1984) found that prisoners or delinquents have significantly more anxiety than the normals. Kundu and Bhaumik (1982) concluded that the combination of high neuroticism and extraversion
has led the delinquents to a state of secondary psychopathy. According to Shariff and Sekhar (1982) consanguinity among parents does not play a vital role in delinquency formation. Early childhood neuroticism plays a vital part in the formation of delinquency. Sharma; Gunthey and Mansingh (1982) reported that the delinquents significantly differ from non-delinquents on anxiety factor. Sources of anxiety may be many e.g., the non-satisfaction of their needs, the behavior of the parents or some other factors.

Delinquency and Mental ability:

The relationship between intelligence and delinquency is still a subject of controversy, but the issue is not as much confusing as it was in the past. This is due to an improved understanding of juvenile delinquency, availability of better instruments to test intelligence and advances in the research methodology of social sciences. However; the role attributed to various traits of mental ability in the causation of delinquency has
been the focus of serious concern among psychologists and students of social deviance.

Lombroso (1912) devoted his attention to the identification of physical correlates of the inborn and unalterable criminal traits. Even though he did not go into great detail in describing genotypic characteristic, it appears rather certain that he considered low mental ability as of fundamental importance in the atavistic syndrome. Goring (1913) attributed the delinquent tendencies to defective intelligence. Further, Goddard (1921) was led to assert dogmatically that mental deficiency was the chief cause of antisocial behaviour.

Rees Gostwyck (1925) identified three types of mental defectives among delinquents: 1. simple mental defectives, 2. mental defectives with abnormal mental stability and 3. mental defectives with psychosis or psychoneurosis. In all these groups antisocial conduct has been of such a degree that detention is required for the protection of society. Bridges and Bridges (1926) reported that the mental and physical characteristics of delinquents do not correlate very
highly with each other, although there is a general tendency for them to occur together.

Healy and Bronner (1926) stated that intellectual level does not, in general, distinguish the delinquent from his non-delinquent siblings. The intellectual ability of the subjects ranged from dull to very superior, indicating that delinquents cannot be categorically described as intellectually subnormal or superior. Bridges (1927) reported that delinquents stood low on intelligence tests.

Slawson (1926), Tappen (1949), Reckless (1950), Shulman (1951), Elliott (1962) and Rao (1960) observed that intelligence was merely one among many other factors and the relationship was not marked. Sutherland (1931), Zelensky (1933), Carr (1950) and others supported the same view.

Murchison (1926), Rouke (1950), Eilienberg (1961) and Rutter et al (1970) gave less importance to the influence of low intelligence on delinquency. Baker, Decker and Hill (1929) held that intelligence scores revealed only a small difference between delinquent and non-delinquent groups. Burt (1929)
reported a higher incidence of mental deficiency among the delinquents.

Ackerly (1933) found no appreciable difference between the delinquent and non-delinquent groups in mental ability. Vervaeck (1933) described the psychiatric classification of abnormal delinquents interned under the Belgian law of social defence. This law recognized three types of abnormal individuals namely those with frankly mental disorders, the mental deficient persons and the psychopaths, and certain psychoneurotics. Of the 451 institutionalized individuals 103 (23 percent) belong to the group of insane patients, 145 (32 percent) to the mentally deficient, and 203 (45 percent) to the unbalanced group.

Lane and Witty (1935), using group rather than individually administered tests of intelligence, found somewhat higher IQs for the delinquents. These authors reported that 700 male delinquents examined with the Otis test of mental abilities achieved a mean IQ of 88 with only ten percent of the cases falling in the range of mental deficiency.
Healy and Bronner (1936), in a well planned and controlled study reported the 1916 Stanford-Binet intelligence results of 105 pairs of delinquent and non-delinquent siblings as follows: 110 IQ and above, 15% and 17%; 90 - 110 IQ, 52% and 57%; 72 - 90 IQ, 31% and 23%; 71 IQ and below, 3% for both groups. These children were matched for age and sex, but known mental deficiencies were excluded from the delinquent group. Thus the 3% of delinquents reported in the 71 IQ and below category may be an underestimation of mentally deficient children who were apprehended for juvenile offenses.

Maller (1937) examined the intelligence test results from New York City School and compared these data for each school with the delinquency rate for the area in which the school was situated. The findings indicated that intelligence test results and delinquency rates were negatively related throughout the various areas of the city. On the basis of these findings, Maller concluded that cultural and social conditions that characterized the high delinquency areas had an adverse effect.
upon the intellectual development of not only the delinquents, but also of all children residing in such areas.

Lichtenstein and Brown (1938) warned against the danger of drawing conclusions that delinquents are excessively low in intelligence. Actually they found that a high percentage of lower IQ children is typical in the area from which delinquents come. So it is necessary to take into consideration the socio-economic backgrounds of the children. Watts (1941) concluded that the delinquent negro boys are not intellectually and educationally retarded when compared with the non-delinquent boys. It is indicated that both the delinquent negro boys as well as non-delinquent boys are retarded. Sir Rast (1942) stressed that low intelligence was the most important single factor in delinquency.

Foulds (1945) examined a group of 45 mentally defective juvenile delinquents. They were classified as extrapunitive (35½ %), intropunitive (22 %) and impunitive (42½ %). The mean IQ's of extrapunitive, intropunitive and impunitive were 75, 73 and 57 respectively. The impunitive showed
extrapunitive paranoid, intropunitive obsessional, and impunitive hysteretic associations were substantially conferred. The different psychoneurotic groups showed no significant differences between their mean IQs, but it seemed that on the whole the hysterics were the least intelligent.

Merill (1947) investigated the mean IQ of 500 court cases tested with the 1937 Revised Binet as 92.5 IQ. Glueck (1950) using a Wechsler - Bellevue Intelligence scale, found a mean IQ of 92.4 for 500 institutionalized males.

Bovet (1951) has pointed out that it would be incorrect to base any conclusion on data collected from a sample of delinquent boys drawn from an institution. It has been proved that intellectually inferior delinquents are proportionally more numerous in such institutions as the more intelligent offenders are usually discharged on probation or not caught at all.
Webster (1954) found that the population of prisoners was emotionally unstable, low average (mean) in intelligence, among other relationships ascertained. Woodward (1955) believed that low intelligence plays little or no part in delinquency. Bloch and Flynn (1956) stated that "delinquents, by and large, do not differ radically in intellectual capacity from non-delinquent children coming from the same social and economic environments".

Wheway (1958) concluded that sheer lack of intelligence is rarely if ever a major factor in causing delinquency. The poor scoring of delinquents on intelligence tests is explained by the inapplicability of the tests and by the delinquent's lower social order, poor health and emotional instability. Siebert (1962) reported the Otis IQ of court cases at 91.4 IQ. It appears that the recent evidence, based on a variety of intelligence tests, consistently revealed a difference of about eight points between the mean IQ's of delinquent and general population samples.
Pati (1966) and Shanmugam (1980) supported the view that delinquents and normals compared well on intelligence. West (1969) found that low IQ, on the Raven's Matrices Test was significant of the liability of appearance in a juvenile court. Vandecreek, Leon and Bath John (1970) reported that delinquent youth have a slightly lower intelligence level than the population average and are educationally retarded. Geeta Rao and Animasan (1979), basing their study on a sample of ten delinquent boys selected randomly from a remand home in Delhi, reported that the IQ level of this sample ranged from 80 to 140. However, the majority of subjects (70%) fall into the 80-110 IQ range. Only two subjects have a superior IQ while one fell into the very superior category. The interesting feature of the study is that these subjects have the highest educational status in the group. Insecurity and aggression are indicated as the underlying causes of delinquency.

Rebindranath (1982) found that delinquents and normals will not differ significantly on intelligence.
Sharma, Gunthey and Mansingh (1982) observed delinquents to be less intelligent. Their contention is that the lack of intelligence makes the behavior of the delinquent less adaptive and less efficient.

Delinquency, Size of the family and Order of Birth:

Family size is another factor in the causation of juvenile delinquency. Many studies have proved that large family size leads to delinquency.

Shulman (1949) found the size of the family, occupational and economic status, crowding and ethnic membership to be related to the incidence of delinquency.

Nye (1958) and Cowie et al. (1968) reported that large family size is often causative factor in delinquency. Biles (1971) concluded a high proportion of large families (seven or more children) to be represented in the sample. It is concluded that middle born children in large families appear
to be at greater risk than older or younger family members.

Koller's (1971) study indicated that children from large family size and intermediate birth orders were more often exposed to delinquency. Geete Rao and Animasan (1979) observed that 80 percent of the delinquents belong to large families, (more than three siblings). The average size of the sibship for the whole sample was found to be five to six, ranging from one to nine children per family. A combination of a large family with low economic resources was found to be a characteristic in most of the cases.

Sletto (1934) reported that in general, delinquent boys in the only child position did not differ greatly from other delinquent boys in the types of offense committed. Parental control over the only boy breaks down more often than is true for boys in other positions.

Hart and Axelrad (1941) concluded the only child showed significantly more often instability, over
aggressiveness, seclusiveness, lying and running away. The children from families with sibling showed more nostalgia, revenge feelings, suspiciousness, temper outbursts, leadership and association with undesirable companions.

Miller (1944) suggested that first children are more prone to deviate from the average than others in traits involved in aberrant social behaviour.

Watteberg's (1949) study appears that only children are only half as likely as non-only children to become offenders. Yet they are just as likely to belong to gangs, contrary to popular impression.

The investigation of Lees and Newson (1954) revealed the following findings: 1) only children more often came from disturbed homes and were inclined to participate, like the eldest subjects in the samples, in individual offenses; 2) eldest children tended to commit individual rather than group offences; 3) Intermediates, as a group, tended to commit group offenses.
In Berg's (1967) study 799 young delinquents were compared to 37,587 controls. While family size was not related to presence in a school for problem boys, Slator's birth order index indicated an over representation of early born boys. Meld (1976) concluded that the psychological first born was over represented on the honor roll, and the psychological middle born was over represented among the delinquent subjects of the study.

Luthra (1957) studied the cognitive ability and personality characteristics of prisoners, convicts, and probationers. They exhibited neurotic trends and occupied the extreme ordinal position among the siblings.

Schachter (1959), Hilton (1967); and Rothbart (1971) had found in their studies that first born and last born children get a special kind of attention from their parents and middle born was ignored. This may lead to jealousy and may be one of the causes of delinquent behavior. Sharma et al (1982) reported that
delinquents come from poor, less educated families and most of them were middle born.

An appraisal:

A resume of the previous studies discussed so far threw some light on the practical problems faced in the investigation of the delinquent behavior. Most of the studies dealt with the actual delinquents. The information gathered on delinquency proneness is very little. The present investigation dealing with delinquency proneness is meaningful and relevant in the sense that if proper understanding of the nature of this phenomenon is made, it will be possible to set right this malady in the initial stages. As it was pointed out earlier, the speciality of the present investigation lies in the assessment of the impact of several factors acting together in the situation.

With this aim in view investigation of certain psycho-social factors related to delinquency proneness among school going and non-school going children is taken up.