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CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

A conceptual background and framework of the study is very essential for any research work. Analysing similar investigations done previously alone is not sufficient. We should have clear idea about the terms we use and the exact meaning of the concepts. To have a better understanding of the concepts, a conceptual background is given in this chapter.

2.1. SELF- CONCEPT

Meaning, nature and content of self-concept are given below:

2.1.1. Meaning of Self-concept

What is self-concept? Why is it so important to learners? How does it develop? Can it readily be changed once it is formed? If so, how? These and other related questions have guided educational and psychological researchers as well as classroom teachers for years. Unlike most areas of knowledge about human development, that of self-concept is still to be fully explored.

Self-concept can be described as the mental image one has of oneself. This image, of course, may be composed of a host of
attributes. There are many attributes that define our images of ourselves, physical appearance, wit, charm, religiousness, ethnicity, sociability, success, etc.

Self-concept is often defined not so much in terms of what we think of ourselves as in terms of what we think, others think of us. Self-concept works like a mirror; we look at other people to see ourselves. If we think they think we are valuable, we think we are valuable; if we think they think we are deficient, we think we are deficient. Obviously, this definition has direct implications for teachers. Teachers who send clear, positive messages to their students are likely to enhance student’s self-concepts, while teachers who berate their students may diminish their sense of self-worth. Teachers’ criticism can damage students’ self-concepts.

Self-concept refers to the experience of one’s own being. It includes what people come to know about themselves through experience, reflections and feedback from others. The self-concept is an organized cognitive structure comprised of a set of attitudes, beliefs, and values that cut across all the facets of experience and action, organizing and tying together the variety of specific habits, abilities, outlook, ideas and feelings that a person displays.
Self-concept is the fullest description of oneself of which a person is capable of at any time. No one is born with a self-concept. Self-concept is something that is developed through countless learning experiences as the child interacts with others and with the environment, as he discovers himself and becomes aware of what he is capable of doing and what he can not do.

Self-concept has been defined as the most personal meaning, a person attributes to self. Mehrans declares that, how a person perceives himself will be termed as his self-concept. Irving Sarnoff defines it as "the idea one has of himself", and Snygg and Comb consider it as "the individual's view of himself".

From the learning point of view, "self-concept is the apex, the culmination of all the social and personal experiences a child has had". Concept of "self" includes all the perceptions of "self" an individual has had. Self-concept on the other hand includes only those perceptions which are vital, central and important to him.

Lecky (1945) defines self-concept as "the nucleus of personality". Elisabeth Hurlock says that, self-concept is the dominant element in the personality pattern. The most important concept in Roger's theory of personality is the self. The self consists of all the
ideas, perceptions and values that characterize "I" and "me". It includes the awareness of "what I am" and "what I can do".

Medinnus and Johnson (1964) state that self-concept consists of an individual's evaluation of various aspects of self and his ideas about himself.

Most of the researches on self-concept proved that self-concept has its merits and demerits, positive and negative outlooks. It has another dimension called "maturity", i.e., maturity of mind and heart. Self-concept makes a person, social and at the same time independent. The person who has good self-concept has a broader view in every single step he makes.

2.1.2 Why Self-concept, a 'Concept'?

Why do we call self-concept, a concept? To answer this we need to outline what psychologists imply by the term "concept". Psychologists consider concepts as essential for human thinking. When we perceive a familiar stimulus we tend not to pay attention to its idiosyncratic features but immediately classify it as an "X" or a "Y". Concepts enable us to sort and classify stimuli; to recognize that some stimuli are similar yet different from other stimuli. The ability to form concepts facilitates the generalization of learning from others. Self
conception facilitates social interaction so that the individual can anticipate the expected reactions of others. It permits self evaluation to be carried out, on the basis of which, future behaviour can be based.

But in one aspect the self-concept is different from other concepts. It is not merely a naming or classifying technique. Because of its personal nature it has been argued that emotional and evaluative connotations of varying degrees are indissolubly linked to it.

**2.1.3 Related Terms of Self-concept**

The terms "self image" and "self picture" have frequently appeared in the literature with the implication that they are synonymous with the term self-concept. But they give a rather static and neutral appearance to what has been argued as a dynamic, evaluative and considerably emotively charged concept. They fail to convey the attitudinal content of the self-concept.

"Self-esteem" is a personal judgement of worthiness. Rosenberg (1965) defines self-esteem as "a positive or negative attitude towards a particular object, namely, the self". Self-esteem seems to imply simply that the individual feels he is a person of worth respecting himself of what he is, not condemning himself for what he is not. Low self-esteem suggests self-rejection, self derogation and
negative self evaluation. Self-esteem according to Brisset (1972) encompasses two basic psychological processes, a) the process of self evaluation and b) the process of self-worth.

Self-worth is the feeling that the "self" is important and effective, and involves the person being aware of himself. Self-worth is more fundamental involving a view of oneself as being master of one's actions, a sense of competence which is intrinsic rather than depending on extrinsic support. Thus self-worth becomes a rather nebulous concept, falling more within the ambit of the self as 'knower' or 'experincer'.

2.1.4 The Plurality of Self-conception

The term "self-concept" is usually used in the singular when referring to a person's conception of himself. However, when a person is asked to describe himself a large number of different characteristics are generated as we find in our listings, eg. husband, father, christian, lawyer, honest, tall and so on. Because of this, many Psychologists find it more fruitful to speak of multiple self-concepts. Each individual possesses a large array of self-concepts relating to specific perceptions.
But since each description or attribute is evaluated and possesses behavioural implications it would seem far more appropriate and in line with common sense to view the self-concept as a constellation of attitudes towards the self. The self-concept can remain singular as the sum of the self attitudes. However, the existence of multiple conceptions of the person means that some of these conceptions may be incompatible and inconsistent with one another.

2.1.5 Development of Self-concept

Each human is unique; each conception evolves into an entirely new creation. Each birth presents a fresh organism devoid of self awareness, but ready to learn about itself. The self-concept is not innate but develops out of the myriad of differentiated and accumulating "I", "me" and "mine" experiences. By a process of interaction with persons and objects in the environment, the self-concept becomes more clearly defined. Piaget (1954) has indicated that initially the infant floats about in an "undifferentiated absolute" in which there are no boundaries between his body and other objects, between reality and fantasy. But gradually he makes distinctions between what is himself and what is not and so comes to separate himself from the external world. It is impossible to assess directly the nature and development of the self-concept in early childhood. At first,
children develop body images. Some infants initially treat bodily parts as though they were not parts of themselves. They often deal with their bodily parts exactly as they do with other aspects of their environments.

Self awareness emerges slowly as the infant uses and acts on his environment. The development of the self-concept does not occur in an all-or-none fashion which permits us to say that upto one point in time the child does not possess a self-concept, but then suddenly he has. The process of self-concept development never really ends. It is actively proceeding from birth to death as the individual continually discovers new potentials in the process of "becoming".

In short, to have a self-concept, the child must come to view himself as a distinct object and be able to see himself as both subject and object; distinguishing himself from other objects.

2.1.6 Sources of Self-concept

Of the various sources of self conception, five appear vitally important though their relative importance differs at different periods in the life-span.
1. The physical self and body image - an evaluation of the physical self as a distinct object. The self-concept is initially a body image, an evaluated picture of the physical self. The body is the most visible and sensed part of a person. The body is a central feature in much of our self perception.

2. Language - the ability to conceptualise and verbalise about the self and others. The development of language aids the development of self-concept.

3. Interpreted feedback from the environment-about how 'significant others' view the person and about how the person stands relative to various societal norms and values. The term "significant others" means those persons who are important or who have significance to the child. 'Significant others' play a confirming role in self-definition. Parents are presumed to be the most 'significant others' in a child's environment. As the infant is being fed, changed, bathed, he receives a message that he is valued and accepted.

4. Identification with the appropriate sex role model and stereotype.
5. Child-rearing practices: Naturally these sources do not function independently. They are closely inter-woven in the fabric of social living. The separation of these sources is artificial and solely for the purpose of discussing their detailed operation.

2.1.7 Content of Self-concept

As a growing child's environment expands, the contents of his self-concept also expand, coming to include such things as possessions, friends, values and most particularly, loved people through identification. Many types of categories and classes have been inferred from the self-report data of children. The most usual are physical, material, in-group role, values, interests, wants, goals etc.

The main categories are the following:

1. Physical characteristics, including general appearance, size and weight, build and shape, and details of head and limbs.
2. Clothing, grooming and make-up.
3. Health and physical condition.
4. Material possessions and ownership.
5. Animals and pets and attitudes towards them.
6. Home and family relationships.

7. Sports, games and hobbies - participation in and ability at.

8. School and school work - ability at and attitude towards.


10. Special talent and abilities or interests.

11. Personality traits.

12. Social attitudes and relationships.

13. Religious ideas, interests, beliefs and practices.


It was found that the younger children stressed mainly external criteria such as physical characteristics and grooming, while the older ones described themselves in terms of inner resources and the quality of relationships with other people. But, generally speaking, categories of self description prominent at one age were prominent at other age levels also. The actual detail of self description displayed some change with age, but the categories tended to remain the same. However, in a more recent British study, categories did change in emphasis with age.
2.1.8 Self-concept and Acceptance of Others

The doctrine that love for oneself is identical with selfishness and is the alternative to love for others, has pervaded theology, philosophy and psychology. The Protestant ethic places much stress on a personal striving for self-achievement.

The basic contradiction between love for oneself and love for others has been questioned by Fromm (1964). Fromm's thesis is that since we ourselves are object of feelings and attitudes in the same way as others attitudes towards others and towards ourselves must run parallel and will be far from contradictory. Love for others and love for ourselves are not alternatives; Neither are hate for others and hate for ourselves. On the contrary, an attitude of love for themselves will be found in those who are capable of loving others. Hatred against others is inseparable from hatred against oneself. Even the Biblical thought, "love thy neighbour as thyself "(St. Mathew, 17,17) implies that respect of one's own integrity, love for and understanding for one's own self, can not be divorced from respect, love and understanding of other individuals.

Fromm hypotheses that selfishness is the basis of the lack of concern and love for others.
2.1.9 History and Theory of the Concept of Self-concept

The concept of "self" has originated even before the origin of personality theory. From the earliest recorded times, there are evidences that man has sought to understand the causes of his behaviour and create a sense of identity. The context of primitive religions provided the earliest attempts of man to understand himself and generally proposed a view of man as a physical body, possessing some internal agent or non-physical counterpart which regulated his destiny. Various conjectures such as "soul", "nature", "breath", "will" and "spirit" were formulated.

Self-concept theorists promote self-concept as the most important and focal object within the experience of each individual because of its primacy, centrality, continuity and ubiquity in all aspects of behaviour.

Bidney (1953) was prompted to acknowledge that only man has the ability to objectify himself, to stand apart from himself and consider what he is and what he would like to do and become. Fromm (1964) sees man as transcending all other forms of living beings since only he is the being actually aware of itself. Dobzhansky (1967) also claims self awareness as the fundamental characteristics and evolutionary
novelty of Homo sapiens. This self awareness places considerable implications on human experiences since it involves a search for the meaning of life itself. Man's conception of himself influences his choice of behaviours and his expectations from life.

2.1.10 Theory of Self-concept in Pre-Psychological Period

The term "self-concept" is only of 20th century origin. Most pre-20th century discussion of self was embedded in a morass of philosophy and religious dogma. Such views are apparent in Homeric writings. This sort of account restricts the self to unscientific speculation in theological and philosophical terms.

In the 17th century, the philosopher, Rene Descarte's "cogito ergo sum" (I think, therefore I am) emphasized the centrality of the self in consciousness. Locke (1860) conceived of man as a thinking intelligent being, that has reason and reflection and consider self as itself.

Cooley (1902) defined the self as "that which is designated in common speech by the pronouns of the first person singular, "I", "me", "mine" and "myself'. He noted that what is labeled by an individual as self evokes stronger emotions than what is tagged as non-self.
Like Cooley, Mead (1934) saw no other birth place for self than society. For Mead, the self-concept as an object arises in social interaction as an outgrowth of the individual's concern about how others react to him.

The individual comes to respond to himself and develop self attitudes consistent with those expressed by others in his world. He values himself as they value him, he demeanes himself to the extent that they reject, ignore or demean him. Society gives shape and meaning to individual self-conceptualisation.

Kant (1934) developed a distinction between the self as subject and self as object. Schopenhauer (1948) elaborated on this dualism of the subject - object, labeling these aspects as the knower and known respectively.

2.1.11 Freudian, Neo-Freudian Theory and Self-concept

A concept of self is implied in the work of Freud (1923), but with the emphasis being laid on "id" functioning at the expense of the "ego", the self construct never became sufficiently explicit. Freud's "ego" represents all that is sane and rational in mental life in contrast to the impulsive irrational "id". The 'ego' is a set of processes such as
perceiving and thinking. The "ego" determines the content of consciousness.

**Adler's** (1927) self is a highly personalized, subjective system through which a person interprets and gives meanings to his experiences. Adler stressed consciousness as the center of personality.

**Sullivan's** (1953) self dynamisms sometimes appears to mean certain habits utilized to avoid anxiety and sometimes to mean one's view of oneself. Jung (1960) echoed Freud in believing that the "ego" was the conscious part of the personality. The self represents an equilibrium between the conscious and the unconscious levels.

### 2.1.12 Concepts of Ego and Self

During the 1940s and 1950s the indiscriminate use of the somewhat parallel concepts of "ego" and "self" caused considerable controversy. Allport (1943) claimed at one point that ego and self were the same thing. Dissatisfied at this fusing of two terms with different origins, both Chein (1944) and Bertocci (1945) attempted to differentiate between ego and self. Chein restricted self to object as the content of awareness and employed ego as the motivational -
cognitive processes built around the self. It is the ego that enhances, defends and preserves the self.

**Cattell** (1950) accepted the notion of self as a keystone in personality. He distinguished a 'felt self' (which is introspective), 'a contemplated self' and a 'structural self'. The contemplated self comprises of both the real and ideal aspects. The structural self is a descriptive, theoretical concept postulated to explain the data of the self.

**Symonds** (1951) defined ego as a group of processes, such as perceiving, remembering, thinking, etc. He restricted the term "self" to the way in which the individual perceives, values and responds to himself.

2. Points of Difference Between Concepts of Self and Self-concept

1. Concepts of self include all the perceptions of self an individual has. Self-concept on the other hand includes only those perceptions which are vital, central, personal and important to him.
2. Concepts of self are in a state of flux, changing and rearranging themselves on the basis of new experience. Hence there is inconsistency in the structure. Self-concept maintains its structure more strongly and its consistency lasts over a longer period of time than the concept of self.

3. The changes in the concepts of self by their inconsistent and temporary nature need not be accompanied by drastic changes in the behaviour of the individual concerned. It is possible that changes in the self-concept by virtue of its importance and centrality and its longer stability will be accompanied by important changes in the behaviour of the individual.

4. The self-concept is involved in the formation of the hierarchy of concepts of self and in the perceptions of self.

2. 1.14. Components of Self-concept

As regards the components of the self-concept, Hurlock (1974) has mentioned three major components. They are the perceptual, the conceptual and the attitudinal.

The perceptual component is similar to physical self-concept which includes the image of one's appearance, attractiveness and sex
appropriateness of body and the importance of the different parts of his body.

The conceptual component is similar to "psychological self-concept" which relates to the origin of the individual, his abilities and disabilities, his social adjustment and traits of personality.

The attitudinal component refers to attitudes of a person about his present status and future prospect, his feeling about his worthiness and attitude of self esteem. Individual's beliefs, convictions, values, ideals and aspirations are also included in it. Hurlock (1974) emphasizing the importance of self-concept mentions that it is inclusive, significant, central and pervasive in one's behaviour. Each behaviour of an individual, simple or complex, is influenced by how he sees himself.

2.1.15. Factors Affecting the Development of Self-concept

Studies have demonstrated that different factors, such as socialization practices, ecology of the child - his home, school environment, his physique, age and sex, peer group, relations, cultural and social factors have a significant importance in the development of self-concept.
2.1.16 Assessment of Self - concept

Lack of suitable methods for assessment of self-concept has restricted the range of empirical research, especially with young children. Procedures for investigating self-concept necessarily depend upon self report. Behavioral observations or reports made by others refer only to behavioral products of the self, but not to the subjective experience that comprises self-concept itself.

Projective tests may allow inferences about the quality and nature of self-concept, but these are only indirect. Moreover, people differ in the degree to which they are willing to reveal themselves to others; some are extroverted, displaying themselves readily to anyone; others are introverted, guarded about their revelations and reluctant to communicate their perceptions of themselves to others.

a. Self-report Techniques

Burns (1979) says, "you never really understand a person until you consider things from his point of view - until you climb in to his skin and walk around in it".

Combs, Soper and Courson (1963) have argued that most of the studies purporting to measure the self-concept are not studies of the self-concept at all, they are the studies of the self report. These
terms are not synonymous. The self-concept is how the individual sees himself, while the self report is what the individual is willing to say about himself to an outsider. How closely they will approximate would appear to depend on such factors as;

a. The clarity of the individual's awareness.

b. The availability of adequate symbols for expression.

c. The willingness of the individual to co-operate.

d. Social expectancy.

e. The individual's feelings of personal adequacy.

f. His feelings of freedom from threat.

Similarly, Cattell (1946) indicates the following factors:

1. Lack of self - knowledge.

2. Distortion of such responses by such factors as dishonesty, carelessness or ulterior motivation.

3. Lack of true measurement continuum.

4. Lack of understanding of what the question means.
Freeman (1950) looks at the positive side of self reports and claims that they are of inestimable value. Self report techniques are literally the only method available for measuring the self-concept.

There are many self report methods as rating scale, the checklist, Q-sorts, unstructured and free response methods, projective techniques, interviews, etc. Projective techniques like Rorschach's inkblot test, TAT etc. can be used in the study of self-concept. The Q-technique formulated by Stephenson and Thompson in 1935 appears to be a suitable method for measuring the self-concept. Q-technique served to introduce a new sealing device known as Q-sort.

b. Observation Method

Here the observer is a camera impersonally making a faithful record of human events. But complete objectivity by an observer is impossible. Every observer brings to bear on his observations meanings and inferences derived from his own past experiences, expectations and attitudes.

Observations can be structured by providing the observer with a check list and rating scale covering various attributes and behaviors. But this technique can blind the observer to other characteristics and
behaviors which are important for that subject, but which have not been included in the observer's tasks.

Thus there are two general methods for the assessment of the self-concept of individuals.

1. By enabling the individual to report on himself in responding to test items.

2. The individual self-concept can be inferred from behaviour observed by a single or a set of external observers.

Any way, we are faced with the inherent necessity of basing knowledge about the individual's self-concept on the vagaries of introspection and or of unknown bias in the observation and interpretation of overt behaviour.

2.1.17. Self-concept of Delinquents

Reckless, Dinitz and Murray (1956) introduced the notion of the self-concept, as an insulator against delinquency after finding that pupils with a positive self-concept were unlikely to become delinquent.

Deitz (1969) investigated the possibility that delinquency represents internalized conflict which disturbs the delinquent's relations
with himself and with members of society. But delinquents, in his study were not found to possess lower self-concepts than non-delinquents.

**Thomson** (1974) notes that normal and delinquent adolescents do not vary greatly in self-concept level. However, the older delinquents saw themselves as perceived far less favourably by others than did normals. As a result the delinquents tended to be peer oriented since only their chosen friends tended not to under-value them.

Non-delinquents displayed closer identification with parents than delinquents in **Deitz's** study. This suggests that disturbed parent-child relationships have possible ecological relevance in the development of delinquency.

Delinquents see themselves as inaccurately perceived by parents. This discrepancy between the cognized and other self is a source of maladjustment. Delinquents are less self-accepting, identifying less with parents and feeling less understood by parents, than non-delinquents. The core of their problem appears to be self-rejection. Self-rejection and perceived rejection by others go hand in hand. Changes in self-concept are noted by **Eitzen** (1976) in delinquents who have undergone behaviour modification.
Hurlock (1967) in a review of investigations on delinquency notes that an unrealistic self-concept is likely to be associated with delinquency since it increases the probability that the child will try to compensate for the feelings of inadequacy that come from falling short of an unrealistic self-image by behaviour that deviates from the socially accepted pattern.

Some juvenile delinquents have distorted body images stemming from sex-inappropriate builds. Their anti-social activities are regarded by many investigators as an attempt to compensate for the unfavourable impression they believe they have on others. Dishonest behaviour was shown by Aronson and Mettee (1968) to be a function of self-esteem. High self-esteem acts as a barrier against dishonest behaviour because such behaviour is inconsistent with the self picture. If a person is tempted to cheat it will prove easier for him to yield to this temptation if his self-esteem is low. It may be the desire for consistency rather than a lack of ethics that motivates the low self-esteem person. He may cheat to lose. In this way he maintains his view of himself as a loser and failure.

Roberts (1972) made a study of the self images of delinquent adolescent girls in New Zealand. Using "who am I" technique, Roberts found an indication that the younger the girl when her life was first
disrupted by home break-up, the more adverse the effect on her self-image. Vagrants had poorer self-images than thieves, as had girls whose previous history included earlier custodial treatment. Girls with higher self-images tended not to be reconvicted, whereas girls with low self-images tended to be reconvicted and not outlast their parole year. More intelligent delinquents had higher self-images, while poor self-images were associated with any kind of physical handicap.

Thus the complex actiology of delinquency contains many elements of inadequate self-conception, of self-images at variance with the images others hold, of less clear sexual identification, which result in anti-social attempts to regain esteem. A shift in self-image that leads to perceptions that others view one more positively seems likely to create more socially approved behaviour.

2.2 DELINQUENCY

Meaning and types of delinquency, characteristics of delinquents, etc. are given below.

2.2.1 Meaning of Delinquency

There is no consensus in the international community as to what constitutes a delinquent act. Delinquency has been defined from
statistical, moral, normative and legal perspectives. Although a number of similarities in delinquent behaviour exist throughout the world there are important differences between countries in both frequency and type of juvenile offenses as well as in public perceptions of deviancy. Thus, for example, even the age at which a youth is considered to be juvenile or adult offender varies widely among nations.

Since the early 1980s there has been a trend, especially in Western societies, as exemplified by the Canadian Young Offenders Act of 1982, to decriminalize many behaviours, such as school truancy, sexual immorality, incorrigibility, swearing, smoking, and so forth, when such behaviours are legal for adults.

The answer for what is juvenile delinquency and who is a juvenile delinquent is too controversial. There is no precise concept of juvenile delinquency. A juvenile delinquent is a child who is under the age specified by law in force, at the place concerned. The legal definition of juvenile delinquency varies from country to country and state to state. In many European countries, a minor is legally considered a delinquent only if his breach of penal code is an offence for the whole population. On the other hand in U.S.A., the charges on which a minor appears before a court cover a wide range of behaviour, such as truancy from school, consistent disobedience towards parents,
consumption of alcohol, smoking in public etc. On the whole, juvenile delinquency is a legal term which denotes acts of varying degrees of social consequences from mere naughtiness to major assault punishable by law.

International Encyclopaedia of Education defines delinquency as law-breaking behavior on the part of those who, by virtue of their youth, are not yet seen as being fully responsible for their actions.

A child is defined as a delinquent when he displays antisocial behaviour which threatens the social norms and disturbs the social peace and harmony which essentially demands legal protection and consequent legal action against him by the juvenile courts.

Burt remarked that a child is to be regarded as technically delinquent when his antisocial tendencies appear so grave that he becomes or ought to become the subject of official action. As such, a delinquent is a deviant child who has departed from the normal behavior of the society. Healy has defined that a child who deviates from the prescribed norms of normal behaviour is called a "deviant child". William C. Kvaraceus and Walter B. Miller have reported that behaviour by teenagers which violates norms of a particular social institution with sufficient frequency or seriousness so as to provide a
firm basis for legal action against the behaviouring individual or group is known as "delinquent behaviour".

Uday Shankar (1976) says, delinquents are the children who are guilty of offences such as stealing, burglary, violence, vagrancy, gambling, sexual offences and other antisocial behaviour calling for official action and legal procedure. The delinquents of all shades and types are essentially maladjusted personalities who create difficulties for others and who are themselves blocked in their own wholesome growth.

Robinson (1961) says that the concept of delinquency should embrace any behaviour which a given community at a given time considers as coming in conflict with its best interests, whether or not the offender has been brought to court. Woodmansey (1971) defines it as "a mental state specifically characterized by a tendency to behave without regard for, or in active opposition to, the welfare of others". Delinquency, as defined by Friedlander (1957) is a "juvenile misconduct that might be dealt with under the law".

According to Mishra (1991), the basic difference between delinquency and crime is that, whereas delinquency is an act
committed by a juvenile in violation of law, the crime is an act committed by an adult in violation of law.

Delinquency is a legal rather than a psychological term. What is considered delinquent at one time and place may be lawful at another time or in another place. Coming to the legal point of view, Sethna (1964) writes juvenile delinquency involves wrong doing by a child or by a young person who is under a certain age specified by the law of the place concerned.

In India, the meaning of the term is something different. Here the legal tendency is to consider young offenders ranging from the age of seven to eighteen years as juveniles and the Indian Penal Code uses the expression, "juvenile offence" rather than the term "delinquency". According to Reformatory School Act (first passed in India in 1876 and later codified in 1897), a "youthful offender" means any boy who has been convicted of any offence punishable with transportation or imprisonment and who, at the time of such conviction, was under the age of fifteen years.

Very often, delinquency has something to do with misbehaviour. But the quality of the behaviour and the degree of social deviation are
factors in judging an act to be delinquent, or trivial. In short, we can say that juvenile delinquency is a bio- socio- psycho-legal misconduct.

### 2.2.2 Age of Delinquents

Although the purpose of the Children Acts of various States in India is more or less the same, the definition of the child varies from state to state.

In most of the states the age is 16 years for boys and 18 years for girls. In Gujarat, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal the age limit of boys is upto 18 years. In Maharashtra, the age limit of girls is 18 years. In Punjab and Uttar Pradesh, age limit of girls is upto 16 years.

Such differences in age limit create problems in case of transfer of the child from one state to another. Hence it is essential that all the states in India follow the same age limits.

### 2.2.3. Personality Characteristics of Delinquents

According to **Farrington** (1982), delinquents are more likely than non-delinquents to be socially assertive, defiant, lacking in achievement motivation, hostile, suspicious, destructive and lacking in self-control. They also lack sympathy, socio-moral reasoning, and interpersonal problem solving ability. Many of these traits appear to be
defensive in nature, reflecting feelings of inadequacy, emotional rejection and frustration of the need for self-expression.

Some investigators maintain that delinquency can serve to improve self-esteem, while others contend that delinquents continue to have a negative self-concept and view themselves as undesirable people.

Delinquents' relationships with their parents often lack intimate communication, mutual understanding and affection. Instead, there is mutual hostility and parental rejection, indifference, dissention or abuse and family violence.

Generally delinquent acts are done in company with other people. In these smaller groups the delinquent act may earn praise while they may be disapproved by society. The approval of the smaller group may be valued more than the approval of the larger group.

According to Kuppuswamy, the delinquent may be perfectly normal and behave normally in most of the circumstances. It is only when he is confronted by some extra-ordinary situation that he may manifest delinquent behaviour. Thus, delinquent behaviour is not the characteristic behaviour of any individual.
Delinquents are not a specific type of human beings. They are quite normal individuals with normal desires, but with some maladjustment. They have an eagerness to respond decently to decent treatment. In the delinquent character, the ego or the self is weak. It is mostly governed by the pleasure principle.

2.2.4. Symptoms of Delinquency

According to Mahesh (1994), delinquent children are deviates and they display deviant behaviour. Obviously, the behaviours of children depart from the normal children. As they are involved in anti-social behaviour, they display destructive temperament and aggressive tendency. Kvaraceus (1959) has described as many as 18 peculiar features of the juvenile delinquents.

Some of them are given below:

1. They have anti-social thinking and perception and are largely involved in destructive activities.

2. They display violence frequently and are aggressive.

3. They are bodily strong persons with firm determination, courageous attitude and action.
4. They are non-cooperative with the heads of the family and administration. They challenge authority and question new undertakings.

5. They display depressive equivalents and unstable emotional personality traits.

6. They display godlessness in their thinking and non-risk taking behaviour.

7. They seriously lack foresightedness in their personality. Emotional instability is the very core of their personality.

**2.2.5. Types of Delinquency**

To speak of juvenile delinquency as a single entity is misleading. The range of behaviour covers from murder to defying one's parents, from armed robbery to petty pilfering. In Western Europe theft accounts for 60-70 percent of officially recognized juvenile crime and in Japan 77 percent. Stealing from shops is widespread among children. Girls are equally involved in it. Most juvenile delinquency appears to occur in public places - on the street, in shops, dance halls, etc.
A study conducted in the mid-western United States identified four psychological categories of troubled youths and youthful law offenders.

1. Impulsive delinquents
2. Narcissistic delinquents
3. Depressive borderline delinquents
4. Empty borderline delinquents

James C. Coleman (1970) classifies the delinquents in different way.

1. Organic delinquents
2. Mentally retarded delinquents
3. Psychotic delinquents
4. Neurotic delinquents
5. Socio-pathic delinquents
6. Sub-cultural delinquents

Madras Children Act of 1920 classifies delinquents as follows:

a. Legal delinquents
b. Non-legal delinquents
1. Neglected children

2. Uncontrollable children

3. Exploited or victimized children

2.2.6. Causes of Delinquency

Delinquency is a phenomenon of multiple causation. Some are hereditary and others are environmental or psychological. According to Uday Shankar (1984), delinquency is a product of social environment. For Mussen (1990) both social conditions and individual experiences contribute to delinquency. Poverty and associated living conditions are one set of factors, together with major changes that disrupt the structure and functioning of societies. Family and peer relationships, together with other psychological and social influences, appear to play a far more critical role.

We can classify the major causes of delinquency as under:

A. Primary Factors

1. Biological
   a. Inheritance
   b. Constitution defects
2. Psychological

   a. Intellectual weakness
   
   b. Lack of security and affection
   
   c. Mental disease
   
   d. Emotional instability
   
   e. Weak super-ego
   
   f. Personality trait

B. Secondary or Social and Environmental Factors

   1. Family
   
   2. School and other educational institutions
   
   3. Society and environment

2.2.7 History and Theory of the Concept of Delinquency

   The term delinquency is many centuries old. The Romans used it to refer to failures, neglect of duty and abandonment of an agreement. But this is far removed from the prevalent, contemporary usage of the term. When "delinquency" is preceded by "juvenile" it refers to a major social problem involving a distinctive age group defined by law. The
term "juvenile delinquency" as such has been recognized only since 1899. One of the earliest roots of the concept of juvenile delinquency is to be found in the idea that immaturity exempts the individual from being a free agent, morally responsible for his choice of behaviour.

Hebraic Law exempted the male child from sinning until his "rite de passage" at the age of thirteen. Roman Law divided minors into three categories with regard to responsibility; a) children under seven who were not responsible under any circumstances; b) those from seven up to the age of puberty were not responsible if the preactor was of the opinion that they lacked understanding of the nature of their acts; c) those from puberty up to 25 years of age were to have their youthfulness taken into consideration in deciding punishment.

According to the English Law a child between the age of 8 to 14 years has been presumed to be incapable of guilt and therefore irresponsible. In the Far-East and Asian countries there seems to be a common agreement that this term embraces non-adult offenders.

In the beginning the concept of delinquency emerged and developed along legalistic lines and within a judicial frame of reference. At the judicial level, the law differentiated juvenile delinquency as something quite different from crime.
Apart from this legal conception, there are the psychological and other Social sciences' conception of the term. According to the social definition, the juvenile is delinquent because he conceives of himself as delinquent, whether it be through official action or being pointed to as such in the neighbourhood. Once remanded as a delinquent by the legal authorities, people take up special attitudes towards them, because he has been labeled as a delinquent.

Sociologists disregarded the old view of the born criminal and began to investigate the differences of the delinquents and non-delinquents. The most valuable contributions of sociological researches are linked with the names of Healy (1931) and Burt (1925), who were pioneers in the field of delinquency. They emphasized the multitude of environmental factors which work together in causing delinquency.

According to the psychological conception, the delinquent is a child who seeks emotional satisfaction that he cannot find in his environment. According to this conception of delinquency virtually everyone has probably been delinquent at some time or other.

According to psychologists no sharp differentiation can be made between delinquents and non-delinquents. Suppose an eleven year old
boy steals some food from a shop because he is hungry; to avoid starvation, he has committed a mistake. From the legal point of view, he is a juvenile delinquent, but psychologists cannot take the boy's behaviour as anti-social.

Only he can be called a delinquent, if he develops a habit of stealing in all situations and is predisposed to harm the society.

Psychologists say that a delinquent is one whose attitude towards society is such that, it will eventually lead to a violation of the law. According to Bandura and Walters (1959), delinquency is aggression. They have tried to relate delinquency to the frustration of dependency needs which cause aggression.

According to Chintamanikar (1992), delinquency may mean to the offender an attempt to:

1. escape or take flight from a tense, unpleasant situation,
2. obtain social recognition,
3. provide excitement and thrill,
4. take revenge against parents and others,
5. deny dependence to others,
6. seek punishment in order to shake off the sense of conscious to unconscious feeling of guilt.
In short, a juvenile delinquent is one who falls within a particular age group and indulges in any act that is prohibited by law.

2.2.8 Disability and Delinquency

It has been demonstrated that mildly handicapped youth are at a much greater risk for delinquency, adjudication, and incarceration than non-handicapped peers. Limited record-keeping and differences in how a handicapping condition is defined, make it impossible to report reliably the incidence of handicapping conditions in general prison populations around the world. However, many nations (eg. Australia, Hongkong and Sri Lanka) report that their prison populations are comprised of a significantly larger proportion of severely illiterate inmates with primary reading and writing difficulties. In the United States, data clearly show that mentally and emotionally handicapped youth are at significantly greater risk for delinquency than non-handicapped peers when factors of age, race, and social status are held constant.

According to Nelson (1987), thirty to forty percent of all juvenile offenders in the United States are considered to be handicapped. American learning disabled (L.D.) youth are adjudicated at about twice
the rate of non-LD youth and make up the largest group of handicapped offenders.

2.3. LOCUS OF CONTROL

The concept of locus of control is explained in this section.

2.3.1 Meaning of Locus of Control

Locus of control is a personality construct, an expectancy variable, referring to an individual's perception of the place, events and the degree of personal control that one has over the reinforcements (eg. events, stimulus or state of affairs) that change subsequent behaviour when it temporarily follows an instance of that behaviour.

The effect of rewards on reinforcements preceding behaviour depends, in part on whether the person perceives it as contingent upon his behaviour or independent of it. When the reinforcement is perceived by the subject as following some action of his own, but not being entirely contingent upon his action, then it is typically perceived as the result of luck, chance, fate, systems, powerful others or as unpredictable because of great complexity of forces surrounding him. This belief is labeled as external control. On the other side when the person perceives that the event is entirely contingent upon his
behaviour and his own relatively permanent characteristics, it is rated as internal control. These internal Vs external dimensions of behaviour is known as locus of control orientation.

A sense of personal control (internality) has been cor relational linked to numerous indices of positive mental health, against externality with emotional instability. According to Seeman (1959), externals are the "psychologically powerless" and viceversa. Rotter (1966) explained locus of control as a key dimension to self-efficacy, self-concept and individual differences variable which is stable over time and across situations.

After 1966 there has been a proliferation of studies concerning the dimensional structure of locus of control and multi-dimensionality and domain specificity which are given a great deal of attention. Lavenson (1975) divided external dimension into two -'chance control' represents unordered forces such as fate and luck whereas 'powerful others' represents ordered forces in control, associated with powerful people.

The primary determinants of expectancies regarding locus of control is individual's social learning history which may be either of "behaviour influencing outcomes" type when he learns that "my
behaviour makes a difference" and holds internalized locus of control belief of life events. On the other side when it is "behaviour being largely irrelevant of outcomes" type, he learns that "my behaviour makes little difference, what will be, will be (Seligman 1975). This is externalized locus of control belief which results in helplessness and hopelessness ie. "it is not worth trying because it makes no difference".

The essence of the 'locus of control' concept is that each of us locates the controlling elements in our lives either inside or outside ourselves. The person who believes that he can decide for himself what he wants to do and will do, is the "captain of the soul", locates his control internally. And the person who believes what happens to him is largely due to fate or believes that his fate depends on the decisions of others is locating his control externally.

The locus of control concept originated from Rotter's (1966) social learning theory. So, the concept of locus of control is of rather a recent origin. Now a number of psychologists are interested in this idea and a number of studies are going on in this area.

Locus of control can be considered on the basis of one's perceptions, and it can be either internal or external.
Internal Locus of Control

If one person perceives that an event or achievement is contingent on his own behaviour or on his own relatively permanent characteristics, he is termed to have internal control.

Here he assumes that he is the master of his fate and the captain of his soul. He thinks he can do what he wants to do and achieve results by his own efforts. Such people have internal locus of control.

Characteristics of Internals

1. Internals are more likely to seek information.
2. They are more sensitive and alert.
3. Internals pay more attention to relevant cues when there are uncertainties in a situation.
4. They show more incidental learning.
5. They are more responsive to informational requirements.
6. Internals pursue goals by paying careful attention to demands of the taste.
7. They set realistic goals and take responsibility for their actions.
External Locus of Control

When a reinforcement is perceived by the subject as following some action of his own but not being entirely contingent on his action, then it is typically perceived as the result of luck, chance, fate, etc. When the events are interpreted or attributed in this way by an individual, then that is the belief in external control.

If one believes that his ability and his skill would not make much difference because luck and other people will govern the outcome of his efforts, he is said to have external locus of control.

Characteristics of Externals

1. Externals are more suspicious of social influences and social demands.
2. They pursue goals by relying more on behaviour oriented towards the social agent in the situation.
3. They are not ready to take responsibility for their actions.

2.3.2 Types of Locus of Control

A number of researches have been conducted to find out whether locus of control is too broad a term. They have suggested that
it might be better to break down the concepts internal and external into component parts. Levenson (1973) for instance, maintains that externals may be of two different sorts, ie. people who believe the world as disordered (where things happen by chance) and people who believe the world as ordered (where luck decides the fate or result.)

Researches have developed a test that distinguishes between the internals who take responsibility primarily for his success (1+) and the internals who blame himself for his failures (1-). These two types have been shown to follow different developmental courses and to have differences in the class room.

2.3.3 Locus of Control and Self-concept

An interesting variable that would appear on armchair analysis to have some bearing on how a person perceives himself, on how he reacts to others and on how he feels others affect him, is the concept of locus of control.

Some people perceive their behaviour and environment as under external control, eg. by luck, chance, unknown but powerful others, authority, etc.
Other people believe that they have more control over their own destinies, so that internal control via, skill, ability, experience and inherent potential is used to control behaviour and influence events.

Theoretically, the attitudes a person holds about himself should bear some relation to this locus of control dichotomy. A person who feels insecure, lacking in self worth and low in feelings of personal adequacy should be oriented towards external control rather than internal control. The high self-esteem person, with his positive sense of adequacy should feel more in control of what he does and what happens to him rather than under control from outside forces. Externals may not only perceive a lack of own control but actively seek external control, because of their feelings of personal inadequacy.

In a verbal memory task during which subjects were required to self evaluate their performance on the first test and then self evaluate and self reinforce on the second, Bellak (1975) found that externals produced lower self evaluation. Such externals seemed to believe that their behaviour was not effective in securing results and was depended on external reinforcement for evaluation of behaviour.
Externals are also depicted as having difficulty with interpersonal relations (Mc Donald, 1971) with low self evaluation (Hersch and Schiebe, 1969) and with poor personal adjustment.

According to Burns (1979), externals also manifest large discrepancies between self and ideal and perceive internal control as their ideal. Externals manifest less self acceptance than internals. Chandler (1976) noted significant relationship between feeling controlled by external events and low self-concepts.

### 2.3.4 History and Theory of the Concept of Locus of Control

The locus of control construct originated from Rotter's (1966) social learning theory, though the ground work for his theory was laid by Fritz Heider (1958). According to social learning theory, the potential for any given behaviour to occur is a function of the individuals expectancy that the behaviour will be effective in securing a desired end or re-inforcement.

Social learning theory attempts to explain the person's selection of specific responses from a larger repertoire in predicting behaviour in social settings. Although social learning theory evolved from associationistic and instrumental conditioning theories, it encompasses a wide range of behaviour determinants including personality.
motivation and situational context. Within this framework, Rotter developed the concept of 'locus of control'.

Heider's speculations were refined and formalized also by Weiner, Frieze, Reed, Rest and Rosenbaum (1971). Weiner described the elements in the kinds of explanations individuals use to account for their performance.

The internal versus external dimension of behaviour is known as locus of control orientation.

Internals believe that the reinforcements they receive are primarily a result of their own behaviour, ability, effort or characteristics. Individuals at the external end of the locus of control continuum attribute the control of their reinforcements to forces outside themselves, such as luck, chance, fate or powerful others.

Individuals may learn to attribute to themselves greater control over their own behaviour and view themselves as agents who can affect the world, rather than as passive objects being victimized by environmental commands.

This fact is one of the focal issues of the Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy theory. Self-efficacy is one's perceived capacity to meet some challenge or perform a particular response.
According to Rose (1981), teachers with a generalized expectancy of internal control perceive classroom events as being a consequence of their own actions and under their personal control. Teachers with an expectancy of external control perceive little contingency between their actions in the classroom and student behavioural outcomes. The degree of contingency expected by individuals between their behaviour and its effect has been conceptualized by Rotter as the personality dimension internal-external (I-E) locus of control.

According to Brown Autry and Langenback (1985), the locus of control construct is an element of attribution theory. Attribution theory is associated with the investigation of the perception of causality, the judgement of why a particular incident occurred.

2.3.5 Assessment of Locus of Control

The Rotter I - E Scale was designed to measure generalized expectancies regarding the locus of control of life events, that is, to measure the degree to which an individual believes that important life events are self-controlled (internal locus of control) or are controlled by external forces (external locus of control). The premise underlying the scale development was that individual social learning histories are the primary determinants of expectancies regarding locus of control. An
individual whose learning history is one of "behavior influencing outcomes" learns to expect that "my behavior makes a difference". On the other hand one whose social learning history is that of behavior being largely irrelevant to outcomes, learns to expect that "my behavior makes little difference; what will be, will be".

The numerous studies in which the Rotter I - E scale has been utilized have emphasized the effect of the generalized expectancies for locus of control upon a wide range of cognitive, affective and overt behaviours in a wide variety of settings.

CONCLUSION

The concepts like self-concept, locus of control, delinquency, etc. were analysed and explained in this chapter. A conceptual understanding is very essential before we exactly enter into the investigation. Since we have better understanding of the terms and concepts like self-concept, locus of control, delinquency etc. it was easy to design the study, prepare the tool and form a methodology for the study.