CHAPTER – II

Causes and Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency: A Theoretical Framework

Juvenile delinquency has been a problem faced by all societies. The phenomenon is present in every area, group, class and religion or caste. Its manifestation is closely related to the nature of the social order, pattern of social health, mode of upbringing of juveniles, level of tolerance, response patterns towards growth and development of juveniles, inter-generational gap, machinery to apply societal values and juvenile norm violators. There is a thin line of demarcation between deviance and delinquency because if effective interventions do not take place at appropriate stages, there is every likelihood of a deviant turning into a delinquent. Therefore, the value system of society as reflected in the legal norms continues to serve as the basis for identifying juvenile delinquents (Encyclopaedia of Social Work in India, 1997). Juvenile delinquency refers to behaviour that violates the law by persons who are minors, generally under age eighteen. Behaviour that violates the law can also be a component of conduct disorder, clinical mental health disorder involving a pattern of behaviour in which the basic rights of others or societal norms or rules are violated whereas, delinquency can involve a single act, conduct disorder involves a pattern of antisocial behaviour over time. Societal reactions to delinquency and conduct problems have changed over time, and debate continues about whether antisocial adolescents are responsible for their own behaviour or are subject to circumstances, including mental health disorders, for which they need treatment (Encyclopaedia of Social Work in India, 2002).

Down the ages, mal-behaviour of children has remained a subject for contemplation and such children have been referred to as ‘naughty boys’, ‘child criminals’, ‘juvenile offenders’ and so on by different societies of the world. In the modern era, these children are called ‘juvenile delinquents’. Mainly the term ‘juvenile delinquency’, view the mal-behaviour of children from the legal standpoint. Here, children refer to persons who are minors, generally under the age of eighteen. Thus, juvenile delinquency refers to behaviour that violates the law by persons who are minors generally under age eighteen (Chatterjee, 1995).
The term ‘delinquency’ originates from the Latin word *delinquere* which if dissyllable then ‘*de*’ means “away” and *linquere* means “to abandon”. This term originally referred to parents who neglected and abandoned their children but its latest interpretation is of a child who indulges in wrongful and harmful activities. (Chatterjee, 1995). Different approaches are used in scientific and practical literature on juvenile crime and violence to define and explain delinquent behaviour by young people. To criminologist juvenile delinquency encompasses all public wrongs committed by young people between the ages of 7 and 18. Sociologists view the concept more broadly, believing that it covers a multitude of different violations of social and legal norms, from minor offences to serious crimes, committed by juveniles. Included under the umbrella of juvenile delinquency are status offences so called because they are closely connected with the age status of an offender, a particular action or behaviour is considered a violation of the law only if it is committed by a juvenile; for example running away or truancy. In attempt to explain the theoretical basis of delinquency, sociologists associate the specifics of youth behaviour with the home, family, neighbourhood, peers and many other variables that together or separately influence the formation of young people’s social environment. Antisocial behaviour may be a normal part of growing up or the beginning of a long term pattern of criminal activity. The United Nations Guidelines for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency assert that “youthful behaviour or conduct that does not confirm to overall social norms and values is often part of the maturation and growth process and tends to disappear spontaneously in most individuals with the transition to adulthood”, a great majority of young people commit some kind of petty offence at some point during their adolescence without this turning into a criminal carrier in the long term. While delinquency is a common characteristic of the period and process of becoming an adult, juveniles often create stable groups with a corresponding sub-culture and start to engage in the activities of adult criminal groups, in effect choosing delinquent carrier. The intensity and severity of juvenile offences are generally determined by the social, economic and cultural conditions prevailing in a country. There is evidence of a universal increase in juvenile crime with economic decline, especially in the poor districts of large cities. In many cases street children later become young offenders, having already encountered violence in their immediate social environment as either witnesses or victims of violent acts. The educational attainments of this group are rather low as a rule, basic social experience acquired in
the family is often insufficient and the socio-economic environment is determined by poverty and under or unemployment. The causes of and conditions for juvenile crime are usually found at each level of the social structure, including society as a whole, social institutions, social groups and organisations, and interpersonal relations (World Youth Report, 2003). Juveniles’ choice of delinquent carriers and the consequent perpetuation of delinquency are fostered by wide range of factors the most important of which are described below:

Siegel (1958) in the paper entitled “The Influence of Violence in the Mass Media upon Children’s Role Expectations” is concerned with the possible influence of violence in the mass media upon the cognitive development of children. The hypothesis of the study was that the aggression and violence they include in their role expectations of occupants of certain statuses is influenced by the attribution of aggression and violence to occupants of those statuses in dramatic characterizations in the mass dramas presented to the children, after which their role expectations of the role held by the central character, a taxi driver, were assessed. Subjects of the study were second grades and they were placed in two classrooms E and C. The radio dramas were enacted in two versions. The E children heard those in which the central character resolved the dramatic conflict by personal physical aggression. The C children heard those in which another solution occurred to the same conflict. After the completion of the series each child was tested individually for his role expectations of the status held by the central character. It was found that E children would include more aggression as compared to the C children in their completion of stories featuring taxi drivers. Further, the E children would attribute more aggression to the taxi drivers than would the C children. The study is different from earlier studies as it focuses on cognitive development rather than the emotional development. Cognition and motivation are important in the instigation of behaviour. They contribute to the direction of behaviour and classifying personality variables which encompasses individual’s beliefs, frames of reference, major orientations, role perceptions, ideas and values. Moreover, aggression between children may sometimes be accounted for in terms of cognitive learning. Either the child’s concept of his own role call for aggression, or perhaps his concept of the other child’s role leads him to expect aggression from the other and therefore arouses his own aggressive behaviour in defensive offence.
Sheth (1961) in his book entitled “Juvenile Delinquency in an Indian Setting” emphasized that because of the phenomenal advancement in the field of science and technology, the modern age society has experienced a terrific convulsion of social change and continuation of this process has led to increasing devastations and abnormalities in individual behaviour. Juvenile delinquency is an offshoot of this process. Such a problem is more acute in the lower strata of society. The nuclear family settled down in the city’s slums, economically hard pressed and socially outcast, gradually loses its ideals of community welfare and the sentiments of cohesive family life. Economic insufficiency coupled with dissolute relationship on the part of the parents’ results in neglect and destitution of the children. Once the joint family disintegrates, the neglected or the destitute child is either victimized by adults or takes to law-violating activities as easy means of supporting their families. Economic status affects the parent child relationship. A probe in the family history of the juvenile delinquents reveals that emotional stresses and genesis of the emotional dissatisfaction cannot be ignored for a true understanding of the correlation between delinquency and the circumstances to which the juveniles are exposed.

Gove and Crutchfield (1982) in their paper entitled “The Family and Juvenile Delinquency” examine the effect of various family variables on the etiology of juvenile delinquency. The data are unique as they are from reports by parents of their child’s behaviour, the notions of child’s life at home and parental perceptions of thin relationship with the child. How the family and delinquency literature fit into control theory’s conceptualisation of the importance of the child’s attachment to the family as a determinant of delinquency is evaluated. Variables measuring family structure, poor parental characteristics, household characteristics and parent-child relationships are examined. The attachment variable was found to be the strongest prediction of delinquency and helps to interpret the effects of other variables that are significantly related to delinquency. The way the parent experiences the child emerges as the strongest prediction of juvenile delinquency. Parents who tend not to get with how their children behave probably act in ways which promote misbehaviour. Secondly, children who misbehave tend to promote negative feelings and actions on the part of their parents. It was difficult to determine which effect was stronger and the importance of the effects varied from family to family. However, the findings do suggest that the way the parent feels about the child probably does have an effect on
whether the child is delinquent. The variables relating to delinquency varied between families and were different for boys and girls. Boys in single-parent households are much more likely to be delinquent than boys from intact families. Furthermore, for boys in intact families, delinquency was family strongly related to poor marital interaction. The pattern for girls was different. Marital variables tended to have little impact on delinquency. Parents’ lack of knowledge of friends was much more strongly related to misbehaviour among girls than among boys. Overall, the data provides strong support for the view that family plays a key role in juveniles’ misbehaviour and that control theorist are correct in their emphasis on attachment.

Mitra (1988) in his book entitled “Juvenile Delinquency and Indian Justice System” argued that study of causes of juvenile delinquency are varied and fundamentally based upon the same framework as of crime causation. According to him poverty contributes significantly to delinquency among juveniles, however, no single factor can be held solely responsible for the same. Besides poverty, use of alcohol by family member and criminality in the family were found to be associated to juvenile delinquency. It was observed that most of the children in conflict with the law lived with their parents. Parental supervision extended to children varied according to gender. As compared to boys, girls were less impulsive and were more closely looked after and this eventually led to their lesser participation in delinquency.

Sirohi (1992) in the book entitled “Criminology and Criminal Administration” emphasized on home environment as closely associated with the behaviour of children explained that poverty, criminality in the family, lack of parental affection, jealousy among siblings provide fertile ground for juvenile delinquency. Further, he also mentioned that environmental factors such as unwholesome recreation through mass media also played an important role in the formation of delinquent traits among children drawn from difficult socioeconomic strata.

Felson (1996) in the article entitled “Mass Media Effects on Violent Behaviour” while critically reviewing literature on the effects of exposure to media violence believed that media directs viewers attention to novel forms of violent behaviour they might not otherwise consider. Children who are exposed to violence tend to misbehave. Generally young children may imitate illegitimate violence and their imitative behaviour may have trivial consequences. Out of millions of viewers,
there must be some highly idiosyncratic interpretations of television content that intertwine the fantasy with their own lives and as a result have an increased probability of engaging in violent behaviour.

Wani (1997) in his article “Juvenile Delinquency in India” held rapid industrialisation and unsystematic urbanisation leading to the rise of slums as the prime cause for delinquency among children. According to him, urbanisation poses a challenge for the poor immigrant population which often leads to neglect of children. The lack of parental control and supervision lead to uncontrolled desires among children who often adopt the deviated path for the fulfilment of their desires.

Hahn (1998) in his book entitled “Emerging Criminal Justice: Three Pillars for a Proactive Justice System” emphasised that children raised in subhuman living conditions are likely to be more prone to delinquent behaviour. The sense of being unable to consume in our consumer economy is one of the principle sources of embarrassment, insecurity and hostility among many of the children. In a consumer oriented society that tells us through the media on a regular basis that our worth is measured by what we wear, what we drive, and so on, it is to be expected that many impoverished young people will commit crimes to obtain coveted consumer goods. Children immersed in subhuman living conditions are pushed towards delinquency by the brutalization that they witness or suffer in their respective homes and neighbourhoods. Such children at earlier ages frequently suffer physical abuse and neglect, witness terrible fights and even murder and are subject to peer gang pressure and aware of gang violence. These children grow up fast because they are exposed to a life crisis from which children in other circumstances are protected to a higher degree. They have more than their share of fear and worry because their families are more often struck by disease, the end of marriage, arrests, mental hospitalization and other calamities. When children steal or kill for material things it is generally because of ‘emptiness’ inside them. In the opinion of many, this emptiness is caused by the lack of meaningful relationships, lack of commitment to anything bigger than oneself and the materialistic culture in which so many children are immersed today which teaches us to satisfy only our material needs in our quest for happiness. Many of these children soon turn towards a ‘street-corner society’ of peers because the family has not provided essential functions of bonding, affection, security, education and satisfaction of spiritual and emotional needs. Thus, the lasting group with stability in
the area is one’s ‘buddies’. They, at least, seem to be always there, in comparison to
the family, which may be quite unstable, with frequent starting and stopping of
marriages, jobs and frequent relocations to find affordable housing. In sum, it is not
all surprising that the highest incidence of violence is among the rejected and
disenfranchised members of society. Children who are faultily bonded to parents;
unattached to any other positive adults; underachieving or outside the school system;
struggling to survive in a street culture of violent peers; immersed in a television
world of unattainable glamour and violence; making their pain with soft or hard drug
use; unemployed and probably unemployable; desperately seeking status and respect
in the only way they know in a situation where the very symbol that will earn them
instant respect, the gun, is readily available, is there any reason for surprise that there
is an epidemic of gun violence among them.

Scenario” is of the view that urbanization has weakened the very fabric of traditional
social environment. He incepted his argument by keeping his focus on various
scientific advances and associated industrialization and urbanization that have led a
new era which is featured by catastrophic changes and mounting problems in all
societies. The traditional social control system which earlier served as a preventive
check against any anti-social activity has gradually been eroded in different social
surroundings. This leads to parental neglect, unchecked exposure of children through
mass media, economic instability and ever prevailing poverty. In the ongoing process
of social change frustration and emotional insecurity play a dominant role giving rise
to the anti-social intensity. There are four basic needs of a child, namely, the need for
security, the need for responsiveness, the need for recognition and the need for
development. In fact, every child is born with the inner desire of being wanted, loved
and cared but when these needs are not fulfilled, dissatisfaction and hostility begin
agitating the impressionable mind. Factors that pave the way to anti-social tendencies
in a child at the initial stage are wrong upbringing, neglect, casual attitude of parents
and families and lack of cordial relations among family members. Further, exposure
to electronic media, migration to urban areas and economic instability of the family
also contributes significantly towards juvenile delinquency. Slum life is a natural
outcome of migration to urban areas. It is often marked with weakening of family and
neighbourhood controls. Very often children are made to earn a living and the insufficiency in this regard prepares a fertile ground for anti-social activities.

Thilagaraj (2000) in his book entitled “Social Deviance and Victimization of Children” discussed delinquency among street children. His work is based on empirical study conducted in the city of Madras. The Study refers to street children as children in difficult circumstances. They have experienced poverty and moved to metropolitan cities in search of livelihood. Most of them have left their families behind. In the absence of informal social control they often fall prey to unhealthy peer group. They are compelled to make a living not merely of themselves but to a certain extent also of their families. Forced by circumstances they often opt for deviant sub culture.

Khan and Dassi (2001) in their paper entitled “Family and the Emergence of Deviant Behaviour among Children and Adolescents” attempt to emphasize on the role of the reaction of family members towards deviant behaviour of children in paving the way to juvenile delinquency. The study was conducted on the residents of the JantaMazdoor Colony, a slum in South East Delhi. It was inhabited by migrants mostly from Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. The respondents’ family were large in size and low in educational level. The predominant occupation of most of the families was daily-wage work. For the purpose of the study juvenile deviance was grouped into three categories as antisocial behaviour, pre-delinquent behaviour and delinquent behaviour. Antisocial behaviour consisted of behaviours such as abusive language, talking back and late return in night which was substantial. Pre-delinquent behaviour included group fights, teasing passersby and using of tobacco which was also substantial. The prevalence of delinquent behaviour was relatively low. It was observed that juvenile deviance had a hierarchy. Antisocial behaviour was more than pre-delinquent which in turn was more than delinquent behaviour. Parents were found to be intolerant towards antisocial behaviour. For example, they beat their children when they talked back to them. Their reaction, however, underwent change in respect of pre-delinquent behaviour for example, nearly two-third of the parents said nothing when their children indulged in group fights outside the family. Their reaction appeared to be still softer in the case of delinquent behaviour. For example, three-fourths of the parents say nothing when they come to learn about the indulgence in gambling or use of alcohol and drugs by their children. Further, they also do not say
anything even when their wards indulged in pick-pocketing or stealing. Taking together the study attempts to highlight the role of parents in the cause and prevention of juvenile delinquency. Parents need to be sensitized on the difference between acceptable and objectionable behaviour of their children. Family has an instrumental role in controlling the deviant behaviour of children. The level of social control depends upon social tolerance expressed in terms of reaction of elders, particularly of parents towards the disturbing behaviour of children.

Loeber and Farrington and their collaborators in the volume entitled “Child Delinquents” (2001) took a hard look at what is known about very young child delinquents, their epidemiology and development, associated risks and protective factors and efficacy of intervention strategies. This is the first volume that summarizes empirical information on child delinquents from several studies across the United States. Child delinquents who commit delinquent acts at age seven to twelve years have a two to three fold increased risk of becoming tomorrow’s serious, violent and chronic offenders. Therefore, child delinquents constitute a disproportionate threat to the safety and property of citizens across the United States. Risk factors for child delinquency, like risk factors applicable to older juvenile offenders are situated in the individual child, the family, the peer group, the school, and probably the neighbourhood in which the child lives. It is likely that early on in a child’s life, the most important risk factors are individual factors (birth complications, difficult temperament, hyperactivity, impulsivity, sensation seeking) and family factors (e.g., parental antisocial or delinquent behaviour, parental substance abuse, parents’ poor child-rearing practices, mother’s smoking during pregnancy, teenage motherhood). Later risk factors are peer influences, school influences, and community factors. No single factor explains child delinquency. Rather, the higher the number of risk factors (e.g., poor parental supervision, poor academic performance) or the higher the number of domains of risk factors (e.g., risk conditions in the family or the school), the higher the likelihood of early-onset offending. Although genetic effects for child delinquency cannot be excluded, there is abundant evidence the factors in the child’s social environment influence long term outcomes. Although there are some risk factors that are common to child delinquents, the pattern and particular combination of risk factors may vary from child to child. Nevertheless, a great deal
has been learned about risk factor for child delinquents in general that is relevant for screening and intervention.

A study entitled “Impact of Media on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime” (2002) conducted by Organisation for Applied Socio-Economic Systems (OASES), New Delhi found that print media had also brought out the differences in the behaviour of the delinquent and non-delinquents. More persons among delinquents were found focused on crime news (when reading a newspaper), and were interested in crime writings and thought of attempting crime on reading than among the non delinquents. Advertisements had also lead to a feeling of deprivation among the population more so among the delinquents than non-delinquents. The survey also showed that low level of literacy (up to middle school) was more prevalent among the delinquents than non-delinquents. All indicators showed that their socio-economic status was of lower middle class. The study assessed the role of interpersonal communication and found that a higher percentage of delinquents had a limited communication with their parents for various reasons.

Matteo and Marczyk (2005) in their article entitled “Risk Factors, Protective Factors, And The Prevention Of Antisocial Behaviour Among Juveniles” are of the view that over the past several years, researchers and clinicians have identified numerous factors that are correlated with antisocial behaviour among juveniles. The risk factors have been discussed at the individual, family, school, peer and neighbourhood level. They have structured the discussion of risk factors in the multi-dimensional psychological classification approach. Some of the more salient risk factors include history of early aggression, age at first adjudication, and number of prior arrests and number of out of home placements. Another risk factors that has received considerable support as a prediction of juvenile offending is substance abuse which is generally considered the most powerful dynamic individual risk factor for juvenile offending. The majority of juvenile offending has a history of alcohol and drug abuse. A related risk factor is drug dealing, which is predictive of specific forms of anti-social and violent behaviour such as possession of a weapon, automobile theft and frauds. Key family risk factors for antisocial behaviour among juveniles include child abuse/neglect, low levels of parental involvement, and higher levels of hostility, conflict and aggression within the family, parental criminality, family conflict, inadequate parental supervision, early parental loss and emotional deprivation. The
family related risk factors with perhaps the strongest predictive utility for juvenile antisocial behaviour are intra-familial violence, poor parental supervision and antisocial parents. In several studies these risk factors are consistently associated with future antisocial behaviour among juveniles. There are several risk factors related to academic performance/achievement and the school environment that appear to contribute to delinquent and violent behaviour among juveniles. Factors such as low academic achievement, poor academic performance, and low commitment to school, and failing to complete school are associated with delinquent and violent behaviour among juveniles. Even factors such as school overcrowding can be associated with increased aggression among the students. Several researchers have concluded that school-related factors can effectively reduce the level of risk for certain at-risk adolescents. For example, educational achievement is often cited as a protective factor for most high-risk juveniles. It is also likely that participation in school-related extracurricular activities (e.g., sports, academic clubs) reduces the likelihood of antisocial behaviour. Research has consistently demonstrated that adolescents with negative peer relations tend to engage in higher levels of delinquent and antisocial behaviour. Also, juveniles who are socially isolated or withdrawn (e.g., low involvement in traditional social activities) are at an increased risk for engaging in violent behaviour. Environmental influence is a broad category of risk factor that includes living arrangements and cultural, community, and neighbourhood variables. In recent years, researchers have emphasised the effects of environmental factors in causing or facilitating antisocial behaviour among juveniles. One of the most heavily researched of these environmental risk factors is socioeconomic status.

Goldstein and Others (2005) in their article entitled “Mental Health Disorders: The Neglected Risk factor in Juvenile Delinquency” point out that the relationship between mental health and delinquency has recently become a major focus in juvenile justice jurisprudence. Juvenile justice research has repeatedly suggested that inadequate attention to mental health problems may lead to recidivism and further to adult offending. Attention to the mental health of juvenile delinquents is particularly important because rates of mental illness in this population are substantially higher than those found in the general adolescent population. Depression is the most common mood disorder among juvenile delinquents. Depression in adolescents is characterised by depressed mood, changes in sleep and appetite, impaired cognitive
processes and suicidal ideation. Depressed adolescents thought processes are often marked by hopelessness, fatalistic or catastrophic thinking and negative automatic thoughts. Delinquency and childhood depression are associated to engage in delinquent acts, such as physical aggression and stealing than are non-depressed children. Depressed children also exhibit greater rates of conduct problems, impulsivity and hyperactivity with respect to the relationship between depression and antisocial behaviour. It has been suggested that disruptive behaviour is a symptom of childhood depression.

Kumari (2007) in her paper entitled “Juvenile Delinquency: A Socio-Legal Approach” while explaining the cause of juvenile delinquency was of the view that there was no single factor contributing solely to such behaviour but a range of factors which contributed collectively and significantly. Such factors were broadly grouped as those related to home and society. Children who experienced lack of parental control, conflict between parents and children, breakdown of families, violence in the home, single parenthood, parental smoking and drinking, abuse, children living with criminal parents and so on are at greater risk of becoming delinquents. Among these factors breaking down of the joint family system was held to be the major contributor. Children spend more time with their peers in clubs and cinema halls. Illicit and explicit sexuality and violence were the main subjects of choice in the media. The impact of media influence has widened and become more vivid with the introduction of computers and video games. Taking together the role of family and society are important in creating the risk for juvenile delinquency.

The future of every society or nation as a whole rests on the shoulders of children. Unfortunately, due to various reasons like illiteracy, poverty and other socioeconomic constraints children are deprived of their due rights and they are subjected to varied forms of abuse and exploitation which is commonly placed under the term ‘crime against children’. This problem is acute in developing countries. Bagulia in his work “Child and Crime” (2007), while discussing elaborately on varied forms of crime against children also focuses on individual and social consequences. Victimisation of children can be placed under five broad forms: Physical victimisation includes putting children to hard physical labour under hazardous conditions, causing ill health, and physical injury, permanent or temporary disability or, in worst cases, death. Victimisation of working and street children undoubtedly fit into this category. The
most brutal and inhuman forms of physical victimisation is the crime of maiming (kidnapped) children for purposes of begging, Sexual Victimisation includes exposing or exploiting children for immoral and sexual purposes, forcible child rape, child prostitution, paedophilia, incest involving children. The most reprehensible form of sexual victimisation is the problem of child prostitution. Psychological victimisation includes different types of emotional deprivation, rejection or treating the child in manners that he or she may feel unwanted. Social victimisation includes parental/familial neglect, abandonment or turning the child out of home. Economic victimisation includes cornering the earning of the child, denying the child the payment of adequate or prescribed minimum wages, keeping him as bonded labour and taking the economic advantage of the work done by the child. Most of the victimised children develop the sense of hostility against their victimisers or society in general which in future years, may be channelled into violence. There is a high probability that victimised children may turn out to be tomorrow’s victimisers or perpetrators of crime and violence.

Sharma, Grover and Chaturvedi (2008) conducted a study entitled, “Risk Behaviours related to Interpersonal Violence among School and College Going Adolescents in South Delhi”. It was an empirical study conducted on five hundred fifty adolescents aged fourteen to nineteen years of age. This effort aimed to study risk behaviours related to interpersonal violence amongst school and college going adolescents and its epidemiological correlates. The study concluded that the findings regarding violence related behaviours were consistent and remarkably similar across geographically and culturally dissimilar developed countries. Many of the findings of the present study closely related the prevalence observed in various countries. It could probably imply that adolescents across different nations are basically alike in their nature and in susceptibility and proneness to risk behaviours concerned with interpersonal violence, and the adolescents in India are no exception.

HAQ, a child rights organisation on the basis of interaction with children in conflict with law prepared a report entitled “Blind Alley: The Juvenile Justice System in India” (2009) the report elaborating on juvenile justice in India states that it includes two categories of children i.e., Children in Conflict with law and Children in Need of Care and Protection. Children in conflict with law are simply children who have done something that has violated the law of the land. Children in Need of Care and
Protection, on the other hand, comprise of street children, children who are victims of crime and abuse, homeless children, orphaned or abandoned children, Children whose parents cannot or are unable to take care of them, children voluntarily separated from parents, Migrant and refuge children, Trafficked children, Children in bondage, Children as sexual workers and children of sex workers, Children of prisoners, children affected by conflict and natural disasters and children affected by HIV/ AIDS and terminal diseases, children in institutional care, children with disabilities and other special needs, the girl child and children belonging to ethnic and religious minorities, communities and those belonging to scheduled castes and tribes. However, the boundary between the two categories of children is blurred. Across the world, most of the children in conflict with law are essentially children who are denied their rights and access to education, health, shelter, care and protection for some reason. Worldwide, poor and marginalised children form the major share of children held in police custody, detention institutions and prisons. Most of the children in conflict with law are children in such difficult circumstances that are sometimes indistinguishable from crime. For instance, children trafficked or in prostitution or begging. In the eye of the law, such children may be“committing crime” but in reality, it is they who need care and protection the most. Recent changes in Juvenile Justice law treat children in begging and prostitution as children in need of care and protection, but the corresponding change in attitude has yet to come at all levels.

Lawrence and Hesse (2009) in their work entitled “Juvenile Justice: The Essentials” while supporting the view that juvenile delinquency is a multi-dimensional phenomena explains that family relationships, peers, school gangs, alcohol and drug use and child abuse are significant co-relates of juvenile delinquency. The family is the most important source of socialisation in a child’s life. Parents are role models for children, providing examples for interacting with others, for ethical and legal behaviour, for instilling work habits and being responsible. Nurturing parents who are positive role models and who maintain a positive home environment provide support to help children resist negative peer influence in schools and on the streets. Good parents provide the kind of home environment that helps youth succeed in school and resist antisocial behaviours even when growing up in high crime neighbourhoods. In contrast, children who grow up in families marked by parental conflict and tension, with parents who are absent, neglectful, and/or verbally
or physically abusive, have a greater risk of engaging in delinquency. Family problems are related to negative peer relations, alcohol and drug use, school problems, absenteeism, and failure, and to deviant and delinquent behaviour. There is little question whether family problems, negative peer pressure, school problems, and alcohol and drugs are major contributing factors to juvenile delinquency. The relationship between child abuse and delinquency has been widely accepted. It is rightly remarked that “violence breeds violence”. Abused and neglected children often act out as juveniles and young adults with acts of violence. The process by which child abuse often leads to delinquency has been described as a “cycle of violence”. Studies show a relationship between child abuse and aggressive, delinquent, and violent behaviour. Family violence including physical fighting between parents and among siblings is associated with youth accepting violence as a part of life. Youths relationships with peers and close friends are very important factors in whether they become involved in delinquent behaviour. As youth reach the teenage years, peer group influence often interferes with parental and family ties, encouraging alienation between youth and their parents. The role of parents and peers are thus closely related in the emergence of delinquent behaviour. Youth are more vulnerable to the temptations and pressures of peers, and are more likely to violate laws when they are with their friends, especially if ties with their parents are weaker. Public schools have been cited as a source of delinquency that were causes of academic failures and could lead to delinquency. Irrelevant instruction, inappropriate teaching methods, “tracking” students, inadequate remedial education, inferior teachers and facilities in low income schools, and economic and racial segregation all contribute to school failure and delinquency. Youth who have poor relations with their parents are likely to experience school problems and to associate with delinquent friends. The resulting negative peer influence leads to involvement with delinquency and drugs, even to serious criminal and violent behaviour. The formation of juvenile gangs is an extension of adolescent peer groups, and youth join gangs for a variety of reasons: a need for peer acceptance, belonging, and recognition; for status, safety or security, power, and excitement. Youth who are especially drawn to gangs include those raised under socially deprived conditions; those who are failing in school and not involved in school activities; and those who are unemployed with few if any perceived job goals or opportunities. Research evidence has made it explicit that drug use is associated with delinquency along with the other risk factors. However, it is believed
that drug abuse is a type of delinquent behaviour and not necessarily a cause of it. Delinquency and drug use appear to reflect a development problem that is part of a disturbed socialisation process and lifestyle.

Shoemaker (2009) in his book entitled “Juvenile Delinquency” holds that family plays a crucial role either in promoting, reducing or contextualising delinquency. An important family connection with delinquency is the nature of the relationships in a family between parent and child as well as among all members of the family. Further, where a family lives may have a crime reducing or a crime enhancing effect on children. Children living in neighbourhood characterized by high rates of crime and delinquency may be more at risk of becoming involved in delinquency than those living in low-crime areas. The impacts of neighbourhood condition encourage or discourage involvement in gang activity. However, no one particular family variable may, by itself, provide a significant involvement to delinquency. It is wiser to consider the impact of family factors as having a cumulative impact on delinquency. While family factors can exert a powerful effect on behaviour, studies suggest the influence of the family on the attitudes and behaviour of children begins to give way to the peer group as a child grows into adolescence. The influence of peers on delinquency can be very powerful. However, it is also possible that the strength of the family bond along with a family system that consists of good child-rearing practices can help offset the influence of peers and may help to shape the peers one chooses as an adolescent. However, although the influence of the family in its various dimensions on delinquency is important, other institutional contexts also have an influence on delinquency. Schools serve as an important setting for student interactions with peers. They also serve as the most important source of evaluation of student performance. Thus, schools can be sources of both positive or negative emotion and experiences for youth. Academic performance is a major factor in how students perceive themselves and in their behaviour. Low or poor academic performance can lead to delinquency. Through a series of connections such as lowered self esteem, associations with delinquent peers, increased school problems, dropping out and so on. Research indicates that drug use among youth is primarily a social kind of behaviour. Most often, youth are influenced by their peers in decisions to use drugs and in the kinds of drug used. Other factors such as parental attitude and behaviour patterns also play an important role in juvenile drug use but peer groups
remain the single most important influences on juvenile drug use. The relationship between drug use and delinquency is reciprocal meaning that both influence each other. Drug use is common among members of youth street gangs. Reasons for juveniles joining gangs involve factors ranging from economic decline, social disorganisation, sociological as well as social and economic inequalities that can lead to a sense of frustration and discouragement with mainstream society and its accepted means of achieving success and recognition. Further, most gang members lack strong social bonds with family and school and the gang becomes a substitute for these bonds in society. Some join a gang for protection or because friends and relatives were gang members. The causal models developed by Shoemaker suggest that delinquency among juveniles should be viewed as multi determined phenomena and intervention approach should address multiple risk factors.

On the basis of National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB) data Dwivedi(2010) in Juvenile Justice System in India observed that low income, low educational level and poor economic setup are the main attributes of delinquent behaviour of the juveniles. In the year 2006 out of the total juveniles involved in various crimes majority of them were illiterate or had received education only up to the primary level. These two categories accounted for more than 64 percent of the total juveniles arrested during the year 2006. The share of children living with parents/ guardians accounted for more than (approximately) 77 percent whereas; the share of homeless children was only 7 percent (approximately). A large number of juveniles belonged to the poor family whose annual income was up to rupees 25000. The share of juveniles hailing from middle income group (Rs, 50,000 to 2 lakhs) was 7.5 percent. The share of juveniles from upper middle income (Rs. 2 lakhs to 3 lakhs) and upper income (above Rs. 3 lakhs) was considerably low at 0.16 percent and 0.18 percent respectively. Further, he also emphasised on the impact of media on children, violence in today’s cinema, acceptable aberrations shown in television serials, advertisements, fashion show, reality TV serials. Crime related episodes all of these have a negative impact on the minds of children. On the other hand, some children in conflict with law are actually victims of crimes, particularly when they are trafficked and forced into begging, drug peddling, prostitution etc. The growing consumerism, domestic violence and total lack of protective environment were also held responsible for participation of children in delinquency.
Singh (2010), in his book entitled “An Outline of Juvenile Delinquency” elaborates on the extent and causes of juvenile delinquency. The breakdown of family discipline, racial animosity, change in school pattern and the general increases in crime are the reasons usually given for the increase in juvenile crime. Large percentage of crime comes from the slums and other undesirable living conditions. The roots of delinquency are usually in the home.

The juvenile Justice Act 2000 was enacted in keeping with the standards for child protection provided by United Nations Conventions on the Rights of Child. It is a central legislation that requires each state in India to set up the infrastructure and protocols to ensure that the Juvenile Justice Act provisions are implemented at the ground level. But the gap between intent and practice is very wide. The factors responsible are many, ranging from ignorance to attitudinal blocks. Childline, an NGO works with children on the ground and often face brunt of the lack of knowledge of the Juvenile Justice Act and its processes among the various stakeholders. It was precisely this need which was addressed by Ms. Adenwalla in the Resource Manual entitled “Childline Protection and Juvenile Justice System for Juvenile in Conflict with Law” (2010). The manual which elaborates on the judicial perspective holds that children in need of care and protection are vulnerable to juvenile delinquency. A child is a part of the society in which he lives. It is his environment and social context that provokes his actions. Poverty, unemployment, inequalities and changing values impact children existing in its midst. Juvenile legislation rests on the fundamental principles that juvenile offenders are the truly neglected children and they require care and protection rather than punishment. Worldwide, a separate adjudicating and treatment mechanism has been established for persons below 18 years who have committed an offence. They are not to be treated in the same manner as are treated adult offenders. The reasons for this being that a young person is believed to be less blameworthy than an adult, as he is prone to act in haste due to lack of judgement, easily influenced by others.

“From their inception, youth justice systems have proceeded from the assumption that children and young people, by dint of their relative immaturity, are less able to control their impulses, less able to understand the seriousness of their offences and less able to foresee the seriousness of their offences and less able to foresee...”
The consequences of their actions. Linked to this is the belief that the culpability of many young offenders may be further mitigated by the poverty, cruelty or neglect they have suffered.” (page no. 10)

The juvenile justice (Care and Protection of Children Act, 2000) as did the juvenile Justice Act 1986 and the Children Acts before it, deal with both children in need of care and protection and juveniles in conflict with law, and as the title of the 2000 legislation, it is both the categories of children that require care and protection. The focus of juvenile legislation is on the juvenile’s reformation and rehabilitation so that he also may have a chance to opportunities enjoyed by other children.

Biagi (2010) in his book “Media Impact: An Introduction to Mass Media” explains the effect of media by citing various media research studies. Media research includes two types of analysis, Media Effect Research and Media Content Analysis. Media Effect Research tries to analyze how people use the information they receive from the media for example whether political advertising changes people’s voting behaviour. Media Content Analysis examines what is presented by the media, for example how many children’s programmes portray violent behaviour. The prestigious Payne Fund sponsored the first major study of media, conducted in 1929. It contained 12 separate reports on media effects. One of these studies concentrated on the effects of movies on children. In his interview, researcher Herbert Blumer simply asked teenagers what they remembered about the movies they had seen as children. Using this unsystematic approach, he reported that the teenagers had been greatly influenced by the movies because they said they had been greatly influenced. Blumer’s conclusion and other conclusions of the Payne Fund Studies about the media’s direct one-to one effect on people were accepted without question, mainly because these were the first major studies of media effects, and the results were widely reported. This became known as the Magic Bullet Theory, the belief that media messages directly and measurably affect people’s behaviour. The next major study of media effects was conducted by Hedley Cantril at Princeton University. The Cantril researchers wanted to find out why certain people believed particular broadcast while others did not. After interviewing 135 people, Cantril concluded that high critical thinking ability was the key. This finding might seem to be self evident today, but the importance of the Cantril study is that it differentiated among listeners. People with
different personality characteristics interpreted the broadcast differently. The 1950s were a time of adjustment because of the addition of the new medium of television, which was seen first as a novelty and then as a necessity. Since 1960, four of the major studies of the effects of television have focused on children. Published in 1961, by Wilbur Schramm, Jack Lyle and Edwin Parker, *Television in the Lives of Our Children* was the first major study of the effects of television on children. Researchers interviewed 6,000 children and 1,500 parents, as well as teachers and school officials. Schramm and his associates reported that children were exposed to television more than to any other mass medium. In a finding that often was subsequent cited, Schramm said that from the ages of three to sixteen years, children spent more time in front of the television set than they spent in school. Children used television for fantasy, diversion and instruction. Children who had troubled relationships with their parents and children who were classified as aggressive were more likely to turn to television for fantasy but Schramm could not find any serious problem related to television viewing. However, he also found that different children showed different effects. *Television and Social Media*, a six volume study of the effects of television sponsored by the United States department of Health, Education and Welfare found that there was a “tentative” indication that television viewing caused aggressive behaviour. According to the study, the connection between television violence and aggressive behaviour affected only some children who were already classified as aggressive children and only in some environment. Several studies since 1971 have suggested that television violence causes aggression among children. In their 1998 book *The Early Window: Effects of Television on Children and Youth*, psychologists M. Liebert and Joyce Sprafkin supported the proposition that television violence can induce aggressive and or antisocial behaviour in children. *Television and Behaviour: Ten Years of Scientific Progress and Implications for the Eighties* published in 1982, by the National Institute Of Mental Health, compiled information from 2500 individuals studies of television submitted that a direct correlation exists between aggressive behaviour and exposure of violent media content although there was no way to protect, heavy television viewers were more fearful, less trusting and more apprehensive than light viewers and lastly children who watched pro social programmes were more likely to act responsibly.
Siegel and Welsh (2010) in the book entitled “Juvenile Delinquency: The Core” aim to provide a groundwork for the study of juvenile delinquency by analysing and describing the nature and extent of delinquency, the suspected causes of delinquent behaviour, and the environmental influences of youthful misbehaviour. Explaining the varied influences on delinquency the authors attempted to familiarise with the link between family relationships and juvenile delinquency. Family stressors such as single parent home or poverty can have a significant impact on children’s behaviour. The family is the primary unit in which children learn the values and attitudes that guide their actions throughout their lives. Family disruption or change can have a long-lasting effect. In contrast, effective parenting can help neutralize the effect of both individuals (e.g., emotional problems) and social (e.g., delinquent peers) forces, which promote delinquent behaviours. Four categories of family dysfunction seem to promote delinquent behaviour: Families disrupted by spousal conflict or break up (family breakup), families involved in interpersonal conflict (family conflict), ineffective parents who lack proper parenting skills (family effectiveness), and families that contain deviant parents who may transmit their behaviour to their children (family deviance). These factors may also interact. Parents involved in crime and deviance may be more likely to experience family conflict, child neglect and marital breakup. Research indicates that parents whose marriage is secure produce children who are confident and independent. In contrast, research conducted in both United States and abroad shows that children raised in broken home with one or both parents absent may be prone to antisocial behaviour. The connection seems self-evident, because a child is first socialised at home. Any disjunction in an orderly family structure could be expected to have a negative impact on the child. Although parents are the primary source of influence and attention in children’s early years, children in later years seek out a stable peer group, and both the number and the variety of friendships increase as children go through adolescence. Friends soon begin to have a greater influence over decision making than parents. As they go through adolescence, children form cliques, small groups of friends, who share activities and confidence. They also belong to crowds, loosely organised groups of children who share interests and activities, such as sports, religion or hobbies. Intimate friends play an important role in social development, but adolescents are also deeply influenced by this wider circle of friends. Adolescents self image is in part formed by proportions of one’s place in this social friend world. Research shows that peer group relationships
are closely tried to delinquent behaviours. Delinquent acts tend to be committed in small groups rather than alone, a process referred to as co-offending. There are four points regarding peer relations and delinquency.

i. Although delinquent appears to have close friends, they actually lack the social skill to make their peers relations rewarding or fulfilling.

ii. Delinquent friends cause law-abiding youths to get in trouble. Children who fall in with a bad crowd are at risk for delinquency.

iii. Delinquent youths form close knit groups that sustain their behaviour.

iv. Deviant children are forced to choose deviant peers. The Social Baggage they carry around presents them developing associations with conventional peers.

Regardless of which view is correct, empirical evidence indicates that delinquent peers have a significant influence on behaviour. Numerous studies have confirmed that delinquency is related to academic achievement, and experts have concluded that many of the underlying problems of delinquency, as well as their prevention and control, are intimately connected with the nature and quality of the school experience. Although there are differences of opinion, most experts agree that problems associated with the educational system bear some responsibility for the relatively high rate of juvenile crime. An association between drug use and delinquency has been established, and this connection can take a number of forms. Crime may be an instrument of the drug trade: violence erupts when rival gangs use weapons to settle differences and establish territorial monopolies. Drug users may also commit crimes to pay for their habits. One study conducted in Miami, U.S. found that 573 narcotic users annually committed more than 200,000 crimes to obtain cash. Drug users may be more willing to take risks because their inhibitions are lowered by substance abuse. The relationship between alcohol and drug abuse and delinquency has been substantiated by a number of studies. Some have found that youths who abuse alcohol are most likely to engage in violence.

Pal (2011) in his book entitled “Psychological Dimensions of Juvenile Delinquency”, states that inherent intricacies caused by social change of urbanisation and industrialisation has shattered the very foundation of a well-knit family life. The dynamic developments are agitating the elementary basis of psychosocial order. The established standards of social norms and values are undergoing perplexed
transformations. This process in the long run leads to deviations in individual’s psychological behaviour. The adequate psychosocial development and socialisation of a child is essentially the primary function of the family but the members of the modern families have either little time or zeal to perform this function emotionally, effectively and efficiently. Thus, the growing intensity of superficial, non caring and impersonal relations among the members of the family ultimately lead to the lack of smooth family relationships. Any defective family relationship generates stress and strain on the part of the individuals and begets tendencies toward maladaptive character formation. Thus, juvenile delinquency is one of the major psychosocial problems of behaviour deviation resulting from emotionless, non-caring and sentiment less upbringing of the children due to the rapid pace of industrialisation and urbanisation, which has shaken the very foundation of the traditional mode of living.

Cox, Allen, Hanser, and Conrad (2011) in the text entitled “Juvenile Justice; A Guide to theory, Policy, and Practice” focused on integrated juvenile law, theories of causation and procedural requirement while examining their interrelationships. According to them it might not be the broken home itself that leads to delinquency; instead, it may be the quality of life within the family in terms of consistency of discipline, level of tension, and ease of communication. Therefore, in some instance, it may be better to remove children from intact families that do not provide a suitable environment than to maintain the integrity of the families. In addition, it might not be necessary to automatically place juveniles from broken homes into institutions, foster homes, and so forth provided that the quality of life within the broken homes is acceptable. Because education is an important determinant of occupational success in our society and occupational success is an important determinant of life satisfaction, it is imperative that attempt is made to minimize the number of juveniles who are “pushed out” of the educational system. Both juvenile justice practitioners and school officials need to pursue programs that minimize the number of juveniles who drop-out. Educators are required to provide academic and vocational information but also to promote psychological and social well-being, moral development, and a sense of direction for juveniles (formerly provided basically by the family). However, if educators fail to provide for these concerns, the juvenile often has nowhere else to turn except his or her peers, who may be experiencing similar problems. One result of this alienation from both the family and the educational system is the development of
delinquent behaviour patterns. Another may be direct attacks on school personnel or fellow students.

Malik (2012) in his work entitled “Administration of Juvenile Justice in India: Juvenile in Conflict with law”, while discussing varied dimensions of juvenile delinquency also attempts to explain its etiology. For the purpose, the author has relied on authenticated data of the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB), an official authority in India. Emphasising the role of education in moulding the character of children, the study analyses the data regarding the educational level of children in conflict with law. Analysis of data from 2001-2010 revealed that trend in educational status of the juveniles is shifting from less educated to educated ones. In 2001, 70 percent of the juveniles were illiterate or studying in any of the primary classes or passed only primary. On the other hand, 30 percent were studying in junior or metric and had passed metric. Whereas, in 2010, educational status of the juveniles reduced in primary from 70 percent to 58 percent and on the other hand increased in upper primary from 30 percent to 42 percent. Besides education family background of the child also plays an important role. Comparison of the data regarding family background of children in conflict with law since 2001 to 2010 revealed that 77.81 percent of children in conflict with law lived with their parents. Thus, the nature of parent-child relationship is significant in paving the way to juvenile delinquency. Further, it was also learned that economic status of juveniles’ family plays vital role in shaping his delinquent behaviour. The increasing trend of consumerism and attempts to fulfil unlimited desires also often bring children in conflict with law. Thus, although juvenile delinquency is a multifaceted problem but education, poverty and parent-child relationship are crucial in determining behaviour of children.

Silvern and Gries’s (2012), paper entitled “Multiple Types of Child Maltreatment, Post-traumatic Stress, Dissociative Symptoms, and Reactive Aggression among Adolescent Criminal Offenders” was based on an empirical study that focussed on psychological correlates of child maltreatment histories among male adolescent offenders. The sample consisted of 123 boys ages 14 to 18 years who participated in the Juvenile Intensive Supervised Probation (JISP), a multifaceted program for probationary adolescents with severe criminal histories. Their mean age at first arrest was 13.9 years. Based on District Attorney’s records, all youth had multiple adjudications and all had arrests for substance use and property crimes. Their
findings revealed that a good number of juvenile offenders have been exposed to at least one type of maltreatment; the majority had experienced multiple types. Multiple maltreatments positively predicted reactive aggression and dissociative symptoms. These relationships were stronger than relationships with traditional *Post-traumatic Stress Disorder* (PTSD) symptoms. The significant relationship between multiple maltreatment and reactive aggression was fully mediated by dissociative symptoms and partially mediated by PTSD symptoms. Their concluding remarks incorporated that many maltreated juvenile delinquent suffering from substantial post-traumatic symptoms, including dissociation, might be engaging in violent behaviours impulsively in response to trauma triggers and in the face of chronic dys-regulation. This “reactive” offending is very different from “proactive” or instrumental motivation for criminal behaviours.

Tatar, Kimons, and Skeem (2012) in their empirical study entitled “Victimization History and Posttraumatic Stress: An Analysis of Psychopathy Variants in Male Juvenile Offenders” suggested that theory and empirical research suggest that psychopathy may be disaggregated into primary and secondary variants. In practice, individuals with high scores on psychopathy measures are treated as a homogenous group. In this, interviewers recruited 355 incarcerated youth to assess potential differences in trauma history, posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) symptoms, and dissociative symptoms among high anxious (secondary) and low anxious (primary) variants of psychopathy. Results indicate that youth with secondary psychopathy report a greater history of traumatic experiences and past PTSD symptoms-but not dissociative symptoms. Psychopathy is a personality disorder characterised by superficial charm, pathologic egocentricity, untruthfulness and insincerity, and lack of remorse or shame. Although typically studied among adult criminal offenders, researchers have begun to examine psychopathy among adolescents. Psychopathy was distinguished as primary and secondary relates to emotional deficits since birth whereas, secondary psychopathy acquire emotional deficits through adverse environments. Given high rates of abuse and trauma experiences among juvenile offenders, secondary psychopathy is especially relevant. In the present study correlations were conducted to determine the association between variables. There were positive correlations between psychopathy total scores and anxiety, trauma history and past symptoms of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD)
suggesting that those scoring high on the Youth Psychopathic-traits Inventory (YPI) were more likely to be anxious, had experienced and exhibited prior symptoms of PTSD. The results of this study revealed three main findings. First, for male juvenile offenders with high scores on a measure of psychopathy, there were meaningful sub-groups with high and low levels of anxiety. Second, youth with secondary (high anxious) psychopathy reported a greater incidence of prior trauma than those with primary (low anxious) psychopathy. Third, youth with secondary psychopathy manifested more past symptoms of PTSD than those with primary psychopathy. However, no differences were observed in present PTSD symptoms, PTSD diagnosis, or dissociation. Together, the present findings support the presence of psychopathy variants within adolescent offenders that show measurable differences in terms of negative life experiences and to a lesser extent, in PTSD symptomatology.

Female Juvenile Delinquency

Statistics indicate that girls are less likely than boys to commit serious delinquent acts. This gender difference is consistent across time and culture. This disparity between girls and boys in the incidence of antisocial behaviours may help to explain why most attempts to explore the correlates, causes, and treatment of youth crime have focused on males. However, girls do engage in criminal behaviour, particularly less serious forms, suggesting that understanding the unique and shared causes of this behaviour is an important concern for justice professionals and service providers. It is for this reason that criminologists and psychologists have increasingly turned their attention to the criminal activity of females. Throughout the 1980s and early 1990s violent crime rates for both juvenile males and females increased. Early theories that attempted to explain women’s and girls’ crime and delinquency rates tended to focus on sex and gender stereotypes. Due to the women’s movement and increase in the number of Feminists criminologists, the field of criminology became aware that its theories have been biased and where the theories that used to explain male behaviour which was being applied directly to female behaviour. It is now held that girls commit crimes for different reasons than boys (Shoemaker, 2009).

Contemporary investigators support the view that female delinquents have more dysfunctional home lives than male offenders. One focus is the effects of abuse on behaviour. Girls seem to be more deeply affected than boys by child abuse, and the link between abuse and female delinquency seem stronger than it is for male
delinquency. These experiences take a toll on their behaviour choices; research shows that girls who are the victims of childhood sexual abuse and physical abuse are the ones most likely to engage in violent and nonviolent criminal behaviour. Girls may be forced into a life of sexual promiscuity because their sexual desirability makes them a valuable commodity for families living on the edge. There are cases of young girls being “lent out” to drug dealers so their parents or partners can get high. Girls on the streets are encouraged to sell their bodies because they have little else of value of trade. Many of these girls may find themselves pregnant at a very young age. Physical and sexual abuse and the toll they take on young girls are not unique to any one culture. *Power Control Theory* explains critical feminist scholars have also attempted to create formal theories explaining gender differences in the delinquency rates. John Hagan and his associates have speculated that gender differences in delinquency are a function of class differences that influence family life. Hagan, who calls his view *Power Control Theory*, suggests that class influences delinquency by controlling the quality of family life. In paternalistic families, fathers assume the role of breadwinner and mothers have menial jobs or remain at home. Mothers are expected to control the behaviour of their daughters while granting greater freedom to sons. The parent-daughter relationships can be viewed as a preparation for the culture of domesticity which makes daughters involvement in delinquency unlikely. Hence, males exhibit a higher degree of delinquent behaviour than their sisters. In egalitarian families in which the husband and wife share similar positions of power at home and in the workplace-daughters gain a kind of freedom that reflects reduced parental control. These families produce daughters whose law violating behaviour mirrors those of their brothers. Ironically, these kinds of relationships also occur in households with absent fathers. Similarly, Hagan and his associates found that when both fathers and mothers hold equally valued managerial positions, the similarity between the rates of their daughters’ and sons’ delinquency is greatest. Therefore, middle-class girls are most likely to violate the law, because they are less closely controlled than lower-class girls. Research conducted by Hagan and his associates has tended to support the core relationships between family structures and the gender differences in delinquency. However, some of the basic premises of power control theory, such as the relationship between social class and delinquency, have been challenged. Power control theory encourages a new approach to the study of delinquency, one that addresses gender differences, class position, and family structure. It also helps explain
the relative increases in female delinquency by stressing the significance of changing feminine roles. With the increase in single-parent homes, the patterns Hagan has identified may change. The decline of the patriarchal family may produce looser family ties on girls, changing sex roles, and increased delinquency. Ironically, this raises an interesting dilemma: the daughters of successful and powerful mothers are more at risk for delinquency than the daughters of stay at home mothers. However, as Sociologist Christopher Uggen points out, there may be a bright side to this dilemma: the daughters of independent working mothers may not only be more likely to commit delinquent acts but also be encouraged to take pro-social risks, such as engaging in athletic competition and breaking into traditionally male dominated occupations, such as policing and the defence services. Hagan and his colleagues have conducted research whose findings support the core relationship predicted by power-control theory. Other social scientists have produced similar results. When it was measured the gap between brother-sister delinquency, they found that it is greatest in patriarchal families and least in egalitarian families, a findings consistent with the core premise of power-control theory.

Contemporary psychological views state that girls are socialised to be less aggressive than boys, it is possible that the young women who do get involve in antisocial and violent behaviour are suffering from some form of mental anguish or abnormality. Girls are also more likely than boys to be involved in status offences, such as running away and truancy, behaviours that suggest underlying psychological distress. Research indicates that antisocial girls do suffer a wide variety of psychiatric problems and have dysfunctional and violent relationships. Incarcerated adolescent female offenders have more acute mental health symptoms and psychological disturbances than male offenders. Female delinquents score high on psychological tests measuring such traits as psychopathic deviation, schizophrenia, paronia and psychasthenia (a psychological disorder characterized by phobias, obsessions, compulsions, or excessive anxiety). Clinical interviews indicate that female delinquents are significantly more likely than males to suffer from mood disorders, including any disruptive disorder, major depressive disorder, and separation anxiety disorder. For example, serious female delinquents have been found to have a relatively high incidence of callous-unemotional (CU) traits, an affective disorder described by a lack of remorse or shame, poor judgement, failure to learn by experience, and chronic lying. In sum, there are some experts who believe that female delinquents suffer from psychological deficits ranging from lack of self-control to
serious impairments. Socialization views were based on the idea that a child’s social development may be the key to understanding delinquent behaviour. If a child experiences impairment, family disruption, and other disruptions; he is susceptible to delinquent associations and criminality. In the 1950s, a number of researchers began to focus on gender-specific socialisation patterns. They made three assumptions about gender differences in socialisation; families exert a more powerful influence on girls than on boys; girls do not form close same-sex friendships, but compete with their peers; and female criminals are primarily sexual offenders. First, parents are stricter with girls because they perceive them as needing control. In some families, adolescent girls rebel against strict control. In other, where parents are absent or unavailable, girls may turn to the streets for companionship. Second, girls rarely form close relationship with female peers, because they view as rivals for males who would make eligible marriage partners. Instead, girls enter into affairs with older men who exploit them, involve them in sexual deviance, and further their illegitimate children. The result is prostitution, drug abuse, and marginal lives. Their daughters repeat this pattern in a never-ending cycle of exploitation (Siegel & Welsh, 2010).

Hoge and Robertson (2005) in their work entitled “The Female Juvenile Offender” focused specifically on the causes and treatment of juvenile offending among girls. Limited research that has evaluated female delinquency suggests that the basic principles of best practice are similar for boys and girls. Early risk factors such as neurological impairments, attention disorders, hyperactivity, learning disabilities and early conduct disorders evident during pre-school years serve as major predictors of anti-social behaviour. Family dynamics and parenting practices consistently emerge as significant correlates of female juvenile offending. There is evidence that girls are particularly sensitive to conflict within the family. Family stressors are not direct causes of criminal activity but they can impact parenting behaviour and emotional well-being of the youth serving as indirect contributors to anti-social actions. Educational achievements and experiences have frequently emerged as areas of significant risks for juvenile offending. Academic failure, conflicts with teachers and peers, truancy and learning disabilities are often associated with anti-social activities. Anti-social peer group association consistently emerged as a risk factor. However, the dynamics of the peer group experience and criminality behaviour link is different for male and female youth. Boys are more adversely affected by these
associations than girls. Peer groups often provide emotional support for the girls (in many cases substituting for its absence in the family) and are at the same time models for antisocial behaviour. Substance abuse was identified as risk factors in many cases. This may involve abuse of description drugs, illicit drugs or other substances. Under some circumstances, both substance abuse and antisocial behaviour may be products of emotional disorders such as anxiety, mood disorders or posttraumatic stress linked with earlier physical, sexual, or emotional abuse. Under other circumstances both the substance abuse and the criminal activity may be the result of associations with antisocial peers. Use of leisure time, although not extensively researched with females thus, emerge as a risk factor for girls as well. Clinical experience suggests that in many cases the youth gets into trouble simply because of boredom and having much free time. Dysfunctional personality and behavioural patterns are often associated with engagements in anti-social acts. A proneness to respond to frustration with aggressive actions places youths at high risks for violent criminal activity. Anti-social attitudes, values and coordination form an important group of predictors of anti-social behaviour for girls. Many of the youths treated held negative attitudes towards parents, teachers, police, the courts and the law in general. These attitudes are often directly linked with their delinquent activity. Also, there is often an absence of positive values about academic achievements or responsible behaviour. The literature analyses these modes of thoughts in terms of social cognitions. The anti-social behaviour is seen as a product of distorted cognitions regarding the actions of others and the available alternative courses of actions.

Allwood, Baetz, DeMarco and Bell (2012) in their empirical cross sectional study entitled “Depressive Symptoms, Including Lack of Future Orientation, as Mediators in the Relationship between Adverse Life Events and Delinquent Behaviours” supported the premise that depressive symptoms may mediate the association between adverse events and delinquency in adolescents. The participants were 123 seventh and eighth grade students from two Midwest schools in urban communities. The sample suggested and represented a moderately low income level family. The sample represented equal numbers of boys and girls. Adverse life events in childhood have been consistently linked to juvenile delinquency. The study found that violence exposure was the most common adverse event endorsed with 82 percent and 46 percent of participants reporting being witness to violence or victimised by
violence, respectively. More than 50 percent of the sample also experienced the sudden death or injury of a loved one. Fewer adolescents experienced disasters, serious medical treatments, and serious accidents. Chi-square analyses were conducted to examine differences in trauma and violence exposure among boys and girls, with the only significant difference emerging being that more boys than girls reported being victimised by violence. Boys also reported a greater mean number of victimisation experiences and engaging in significantly more delinquent behaviours than girls. However, boys and girls reported similar rates of depressive symptoms, hopelessness, and lack of future orientation. Although an overall link between depression and delinquency has been found, specific types of depressive symptoms may account for this association. For example, depress-sogenic cognitions, such as hopelessness or attributing the cause of an adverse event to global and stable forces, may be more strongly linked to delinquency than other depressive symptoms, such as loss of appetite. Feelings or thoughts of hopelessness often result in diminished concern regarding social norms and one’s future within society which may lead to involvement in delinquency.

Kerig (2012) in an article entitled “Dynamics and Developmental Mechanism” focused on research devoted to investigating the underlying development mechanisms accounting for the associations among exposure to traumatic events, posttraumatic stress reactions and delinquent behaviour. A substantial body of literature has established that youth in the juvenile justice system have experienced trauma at rates significantly higher than their peers and that youths in detention settings exhibit high rates of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) symptoms. Further the article also focuses on issues of concerns to the understudies but important phenomena of girls’ delinquency. Their results indicate that the relation between trauma exposure and decision making are accounted for by increase in anger, substance abuse, depression, somatic complaints and suicidal ideation. The data provide insights into what may lie beneath the mask of anti-sociality among girls, and paint to the possibility that their antisocial acts may reflect more desperation than cold calculation which was referred to as survival coping. In the final contribution author call attention to the fact that one group of girls is particularly vulnerable i.e., sexual minority status (SMS) girls. The intersections among trauma, SMS and the juvenile justice system are compelling.
Becker, Kerig, Lim, and Ezechukwu (2012) in the paper entitled “Predictors of Recidivism among Delinquent Youth: Interrelations among Ethnicity, Gender, Age, Mental Health Problems, and Posttraumatic Stress” revealed that although increasing attention has been drawn to the prevalence of mental health symptoms, and PTSD in particular, among juvenile-involved youth, limited research is available that examines the interrelations of mental health symptoms and demographic characteristics in contributing to recidivism. It is unclear whether mental health problems change over time as a function of repeated admissions to juvenile detention, and particularly, whether demographic characteristics or the presence of PTSD symptoms significantly account for any change. In considering these research questions, the study investigated the interrelations among mental health problems, posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), age, ethnicity, gender, and recidivism over a three-year period in a sample of 417 male and 70 female juvenile offenders of Midwestern County Juvenile Detention Facility. Girl juvenile offenders generally evidence higher rates of all mental health problems compared to boys, with the possible exception of substance use. In addition, both boys and girls in the juvenile justice system report significantly greater trauma exposure and PTSD symptoms compared to non-detained peers. Rates of PTSD among juvenile justice involved youth are generally higher among girls, with as many as one third of boys and half of girls in detention settings meeting criteria for PTSD. Taken together, research indicates that although both boys and girls in the juvenile justice system experience high rates of mental health problems, girls tend to be particularly disturbed. However, Girls with PTSD were more likely to re-offend than were their peers. With the increasing number of females entering the juvenile justice system, it is imperative to understand what is fuelling this trend. Recent research has pointed to the prevailing link between experiencing a traumatic event and delinquent activity, which is reportedly much stronger in adolescent female offenders than in their male counterparts. Exposure to a traumatic event has been found to be two-to-three times higher among adolescent offenders than in the general population, with the majority of adolescent female offenders having been exposed to more than one type of trauma. Though, the connection between experiencing a traumatic event and delinquency among adolescent females has been established by studies, few studies focus on trauma exposure and what mediates the impact of traumatic experiences on delinquent decision making among adolescent female offenders. Such an understanding is important because for females, physical or sexual
abuse tends to start earlier and last longer than it does for males. As a result, adolescent females are more likely to have a higher prevalence of mental health or emotional disturbances, which may contribute to poor decision making and subsequent delinquency.

Prevention
The majority of children defined as those under eighteen in conflict with law come from deprived and marginalised communities and their exposure to crime often reflects the failure of the state to protect or provide for them. In many countries there is a blurring of the boundaries between children who commit offences and children who are in need of protection such as those living on the street, those with mental illnesses and child sex workers. The result is that children in need of support from child protection and welfare agencies can find that their conduct is instead criminalised. Thus, States are encouraged to consider the increasing body of evidence that harsh treatment of children in conflict with law is counter-productive and does not reduce offending. The stigma of association with the criminal justice system can damage a child’s long term prospects. Depriving children of their liberty can lead to long term and costly psychological and physical damage, while overcrowding and poor detention conditions threaten their development, health and well-being. Girls are particularly at risk of sexual abuse and likely to suffer mental health problems as a consequence of detention. The removal of children from their family and community networks as well as from educational or vocational opportunities at critical and formative periods in their lives, can compound social and economic disadvantage and marginalisation. Penal Reform International (PRI) and members of the Interagency Panel on Juvenile Justice (IPJJ) believe that a fair and effective criminal justice system for children should be in conformity with international standard, promote the well-being of the child and react proportionately to the nature of the offence taking into account the individual characteristics of the child. It should aim to prevent crime, take decisions which are in a child’s best interests, treat children fairly and in a manner which is appropriate to their development, address the root causes of offending and rehabilitate and reintegrate children so they can play a constructive role in society in future. As far as possible it should deal with children outside of the formal criminal justice system (http://www.penalreform.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/10-pt-children-2nd-ed-cmyk-v7.pdf).
The Juvenile Justice System emerged in response to this belief. Subsequent analyses have shown that Juvenile Justice Models in different countries of the world have combined these objectives to evolve models to suit their own needs. In its wider perspective it includes provisions for the welfare and well being of all the children in need of care and protection, while the formal system of juvenile justice actually deals with those who are already in conflict with law or are likely to be so for various reasons. The term Juvenile Justice is, therefore, used to refer to social as well as judicial justice. Prevention and intervention are the two distinct and overlapping endeavours through which the justice system aims to fulfil its objectives. For the present purpose, prevention may be defined as community based activities aimed at helping youth avoid delinquent behaviour and consequently coming into contact with the Juvenile Justice System. Prevention programs are mainly developed and implemented by schools, social service agencies, mental and public health agencies and the like. Juvenile Justice Agencies are also often involved in this endeavour. Intervention refers to the response of Juvenile Justice System to cases which are formally accepted. It involves two components, a supervisory component and a treatment component. The supervisory component consists of some structure for monitoring or controlling youth’s behaviour, for example, probation supervision. The treatment component consists of activities or services provided within the supervisory structure that are intended to facilitate positive behavioural changes that will endure after supervision has ended such as counselling, victim-offender mediation, cognitive behavioural therapy and the like. (http://www.ipjj.org/fileadmin/datedocuments/strategies_planning/IPJJPRI_TenPointPlanFairEffectiveCriminalJustice_2012_EN.pdf).

The prevention and intervention strategies subsequently discussed by various authors are mentioned below.

Shumaker (1997) in an article entitled “Preventing Juvenile Delinquency through Early Family Intervention” suggested prevention is preferable to correction in any social problem. It is especially true in the case of juvenile delinquency, where recidivism is rampant and remediation often difficult. Any professional working in the field of juvenile corrections can attest to the impact of family dynamics in contributing to and maintaining delinquency behaviour and studies have for years linked family dysfunction with the problem of juvenile delinquency. While most research has been done by professionals in other fields, social workers frequently
provide intervention with these families. The problem of juvenile delinquency can be addressed by over viewing the aspects of family dysfunction which augment the risk of juvenile delinquency. He has offered suggestions for social work intervention in four areas: identification of families at risk, early intervention, service delivery, and preventive education.

Bhattacharya (2000) in his book entitled “Juvenile Delinquency: An India Scenario” suggested institutional as well as non-institutional means of preventing juvenile delinquency. According to him institutional training, treatment and post release assistance are a continuous process. After care service is, therefore, an integral part of child welfare work. After care service should be extended to all the needy children released from the institution. As a matter of fact, process of rehabilitation starts as soon as the child is admitted into the institution and continues till he is rehabilitated and adjusted in society. There are three phases of after care services: (a) planning of institutional care, treatment and pre-release preparation, (b) the period immediately after release from institutions and (c) post-release period. An after care plan should evolve out of the study of the child. It should be based on the child’s needs. While planning post-release assistance, factors like child’s personality, his weaknesses and strengths, his limitation and capabilities and his rehabilitation needs should be taken into consideration. In this respect, the role of probation officer plays a crucial role. Children who are detained in institution should be allowed to go to their respective homes and stay with their families during school vacations or during festivals or special occasions like marriage in the family, etc. As the child will ultimately go back to the family after being released from the institution, such leave or absence enables him to keep in touch with his family members. It is useful from the point of view of the rehabilitation of the child into the community after release from the institution. Thus, the Juvenile Justice Act in India provides that when a juvenile is kept in a juvenile home or special home, the state government may, if it so thinks fit, release the juvenile form the juvenile home or special home and grant him a written licence for such period and so on such conditions as may be specified in the licence permitting him to live with, or under the supervision of any responsible person named in the licence, willing to receive and take him for some useful trade. However, the release on licence in respect of a child is generally considered after two thirds of his commitment period is over. The success of the institutional program depends on the
effective after care and follow up services in respect of the released children from an institution. Non-institutional treatments of juveniles include community service, recreational and vocational training facilities. After-care service is, therefore, essential to facilitate rehabilitation of discharged inmates from institutions into the community. In fact, rehabilitation of ex-inmates begins from the time he crosses the threshold of the institution. Rehabilitation is the ultimate goal of institutionalisation and after care is the means to achieve the same.

Wasserman and Seracini (2001) in their article entitled “Family Risk Factors and Interventions” proposed that focused family based approaches, such as Parent Management Training (PMT) and Multisystemic Therapy (MST), have been found useful in reducing the risk of poor family management practices and physically abusive behaviour that, in turn, contribute to aggressive and anti-social behaviour in young children. Beyond this, lack of sensitivity to overlapping risks has led to the development of interventions that are too narrowly focused and that fail to adequately address the sources of risk for children in family life. Interventions for some aspects in family risk (e.g., family violence, divorce conflict) often do not consider children at all. Conversely, interventions for reducing aggression in young children do not commonly target certain family issues that may be contributory, including marital conflict or violence and a family history of Attention- deficit Hypersensitivity Disorder (ADHD) in both child and parents, even when effective treatments exist. Importantly, when traditional parent-child treatments are augmented by components addressing co-occurring difficulties in the lives of adult family members, parents are more likely to complete treatment and child treatment gains are more likely to be maximised. These gaps in available approaches for family-based interventions are especially troubling given the particular importance for child delinquency. Children and their families defy narrow descriptions. Risks for child delinquency arise from many sources, both within the family and in other systems where children live and learn. Scientists and practitioners often are divided by academic and professional disciplines in ways that inhibit accurate characterisation of the multiple levels of risk to children. Initiatives that promote a more integrated, boundary crossing approach are very much needed at this time.

Interventions focused on the role of deviant peers and problematic peer relations in fostering child delinquency have been very limited in number. Coie and Johnson
(2001) in their article entitled “Peer Factors and Interventions” are of the view that there is a growing evidence for the iatrogenic effects of group treatment, and this point needs to be taken very seriously by prevention planners and those dealing with adjudicated offenders because the vast majority of treatment programs involve grouping of young offenders. Programs that include components directed at peer social skills training have the promise of reducing the deleterious effects of peers when they also include parenting components. The latter is a very important caveat because parental monitoring of peer associations is a key factor in reducing these associations and their negative impacts. There is evidence that many child delinquents lack the self-regulation and pro-social interaction skills to avoid physical confrontations with peers and this can lead to an escalating cycle of peer rejection, increased suspicion, hostility, and aggression, culminating in both greater individual violence and association with deviant peers. The ultimate form of youth deviant peer association is gang membership, which leads to further escalation in antisocial behaviour. In addition, programs that focus on one level, such as reducing gang pressure by suppression methods, may have indirect positive impacts on youths who are at earlier stages because these youths see negative consequences to juvenile offending.

Herrenkohl, Hawkins, Chung, Hill, and Pearson (2001) in their article entitled “School and Community Risk Factors and Interventions” reviewed research on risk factors for child delinquency and has tested school and community-based approaches to preventing child delinquency. Children with low academic performance, low commitment to school, and low educational aspirations during the elementary and middle school grades are at higher risk for child delinquency than are other children. These risk factors may be addressed directly by altering the organisation of classrooms, training teachers in effective classroom management, and promoting the use of instructional strategies that can enhance engagement and learning among students of different abilities. Introduction of violence prevention curricula seek to promote the development of norms against the use of violence in conflict situations and to improve students’ social, problem-solving, and anger management skills. Programs designed to reduce bullying in schools have focused on both perpetrators and victims. They have also focused on parent and school personnel as responsible adults who can reduce the occurrence of bullying through rule enforcement,
monitoring and effective supervision. After-school recreation programs, which may or may not take place on school grounds, can affect anti-social behaviour by reducing opportunities for delinquent peer involvement, by strengthening bonds to prosocial others and by building individual skills and competencies. Mentoring programs typically involve non-professional volunteers spending time with individual youths in a supportive and non-judgemental manner while acting as role models.

A report entitled “World Youth Report: The Global Situation of Young People” prepared by the United Nations (2003) reported that it is widely believed that early phase intervention represents the best approach to preventing juvenile delinquency. Prevention requires individual, group and organisational efforts aimed at keeping adolescent from breaking the law. Early prevention work may be carried out in several areas. Within the economic sector, professional development programs are being setup to provide legal alternatives for income generation. Supplying adolescents and young people with increased economic opportunities, professional training and education, new workplaces and assistance in organising businesses can help prevent youth involvement in delinquent activities. Educational programmes are helping young people learn how to engage in positive self appraisal, deal with conflict, and control aggression. The programmes debunk the myth of gang glamour and help young people find alternatives to illegal behaviour. Recreation and youth development activities are directly encouraged in the Riyadh Guidelines. Wide range of recreational facilities and services of particular interest to young persons’ should be established and made easily accessible to them. Often it is possible to reduce the level of juvenile delinquency by changing an urban environment, altering the physical features through architectural and landscape planning and providing opportunities to engage young people’s interest. Recently, greater attention has been given to the role and responsibility of local communities in dealing with juvenile delinquency. There are programmes designed to train groups and individual representatives of local communities in which juvenile delinquency has increased to informally control youth and include young people in constructive activities.

Hudley (2003) in the paper entitled “Cognitive-Behavioural Intervention for Childhood Aggressions” discussed the role of Cognitive-Behavioural Treatment as a strategy to forestall or reduce the development and display of aggressive behaviour in children. Preliminary comments on children’s social cognitions and a description of
social-cognitive theories of childhood aggression will help place this treatment in proper context. It has been suggested that prevention efforts should move from a focus on disorder (e.g., antisocial behaviour) to the enhancement of competence.

DeMatteo and Marczyk (2005) in the paper entitled “Risk Factors, Protective Factors, and the Prevention of Anti-social Behaviour among Juveniles” suggested that the prevention and treatment of juvenile offending can occur at primary, secondary and tertiary levels. Primary interventions attempt to reduce the incidence of violence before it begins; secondary interventions attempt to reduce the prevalence of existing violence and tertiary interventions attempt to prevent the re-occurrence of violence. The focus of primary prevention strategies is to keep violence from occurring. As such, the thrust of these prevention strategies is to identify adolescents who may be at high-risk for engaging in youth violence and then to address their needs before the violence occurs. Since the focus of these strategies is on the prevention of youth violence, as opposed to the treatment of youth violence after it has occurred, primary intervention strategies typically occur at broad levels such as the family, school and community. Family-based intervention efforts can be classified as parent-focused or family supportive. Parent-focused intervention efforts may include assisting parents to recognise warning signs for youth violence and/or training parents to effectively manage any behavioural problems that may occur. These techniques are often used in collaboration with other intervention strategies such as community or school-based intervention efforts. Family supportive intervention efforts seek to provide needed social support services to families particularly families from economically disadvantaged backgrounds. These services may include child care, medical assistance, counselling, and assistance from other social service agencies. School Based Interventions include preschool programs, social skill training (i.e., cognitive behavioural therapy) and broad based social interventions that are designed to alter the school environment. These approaches have shown success in terms of outcomes variables that are related to academic achievement. Community-Based Preventive approaches include intervention strategies such as increasing community organisation and making constructive activities available to adolescents. Many of the approaches utilised in primary prevention schemes such as parent-focused and community-based interventions can also be used as secondary intervention strategies. Some of the more common secondary intervention strategies
include diversion programs, alternative and vocational education, family therapy, and skill training. The recipients of tertiary prevention strategies these efforts are often chronic and serious juvenile offenders. This kind of intervention includes both inpatient treatment (i.e., institutional, residential) and community based treatment.

Heilbrun, Lee, and Cottle (2005) in the paper entitled “Risk factors and Intervention Outcomes: Meta-Analysis of Juvenile Offending” focused on meta-analysis of prevention and intervention strategies to reduce the risk of juvenile delinquency. Meta-analysis is a form of statistical analysis that estimates the strength of relationships among predictive variables across a number of studies. Meta-analysis conducted to assess the effects of intervention on general recidivism among juvenile offenders first appeared in 1980s, when previous qualitative literature reviews reported that interventions were not effective in reducing recidivism rates among juvenile offenders. The authors through their work made it clear that behaviourally oriented treatments are useful in reducing recidivism among certain groups of juvenile offenders and that psycho-dynamic approaches produced more marginal effects. Among the treatments reported by Garrett (1985), contingency management, family-therapy and cognitive-behavioural therapy were among the most successful in reducing recidivism among juvenile offenders. Other treatments that appear to have a significant effect include academic, substance abuse and outdoor programs.

Wilson and Lipsey (2000) analyse the effects of wilderness challenge programs on recidivism among delinquent youth. The authors reported that programs involving more intense physical activities and those incorporating a distinct therapy component (i.e., individual counselling, family therapy) yielded larger reductions in delinquency and anti-social behaviour than programs without these components. Despite growing interest in the specialised treatment of juvenile sexual offenders only a few studies have investigated such interventions. Borduin (1990) studied adolescence for a variety of sexual offences. The participants were randomly assigned to receive either multi-systemic therapy (MST) or individual therapy. The author suggested that MST had a superior impact. Recidivism for the MST group was 12.5 percent for sexual offences and 25 percent for non-sexual offences; the rates of recidivism for the individual therapy group were 75 percent for sexual offences and 50 percent for non-sexual offences. The difference in effectiveness might be explained by the fact that MST focused on changing behaviour within the community.
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Kahn and Chambers (1991) conducted a retrospective comparison of institution-based versus community-based treatment programs with 221 juvenile sexual offenders. The authors reported that juveniles who participated in out-patient programs were somewhat less likely than others to be convicted of subsequent sexual offences.

Guerra, Kim and Boxer (2008) in their paper entitled “What Works: Best Practices with Juvenile Offenders” focus on early prevention of problem behaviours rather than on treatment. According to them regressively evaluated programs that have consistently demonstrated significant positive effects on reducing offending and related behaviours include Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST), Functional-Family Therapy (FFT) and Multi-Dimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC). MST is a family based therapeutic intervention for youth that focuses on helping the families deal more effectively with their children’s behavioural problems and the risk factors contributing to delinquency. These risk factors include low levels of parental monitoring of activities, poor discipline practices, associations with delinquent peers and poor school performance. In addition to improving parents’ abilities to address these causes of delinquency, MST also addresses barriers to family empowerment and effective functioning within the family ecology. FFT is a family behavioural intervention designed several decades ago to work with less serious and generally younger delinquent youth. It is a structural intervention that focuses to improve family functioning through increased family problem-solving skills, enhanced emotional bonds among members and improve ability of parents to provide structural guidance to their children. The program is relatively short-term and is delivered in the home by individual therapists. MTFC differs from MST and FFT because participating youth do not live at home but in a therapeutic living environment with foster parents. MTFC is an alternative to group residential treatment for youth with more serious delinquency who need out of home placement. Families form the community are recruited and trained to provide structure and behaviour management for these groups and family therapy is also provided for the youths biological families. This program is particularly noteworthy as an alternative to incarceration, given that custodial programs generally are less effective than community based programs for any type of intervention.
Guerra and Leaf (2008) in their paper entitled “Implementing Treatment Programs in Community and Institutional Settings” have emphasised on four principles for effective treatment of juvenile offenders:

1. **Closer to Home Principle:** Whenever possible, youth should receive treatment in the communities where they live, with incarceration in state institutions used as a last resort. When youth cannot live with their families of origin, they should be assigned to residential, community based facilities that provide treatment in small cottages or homes with foster families.

2. **Rehabilitation Principle:** Treatment will be most effective if there is an institutional and political support for a rehabilitation orientation in juvenile justice programming. Efforts should be directed towards reframing issues so that offenders are seen as young person who can become productive citizens rather than deviance that must be treated harshly.

3. **Evidence Based Principle:** Treatment should follow evidence-based principles for programming and implementation.

4. **Risk-Focused, Strengths-Based Principle:** Treatment programs for offenders must address multiple types of risk for reoffending and the different pattern of risk through comprehensive programming.

Juvenile offenders often receive fragmented-uncoordinated, insufficient or inappropriate services from multiple agencies and systems. These services may not be addressed appropriately to the offenders. To address this issue several states have engaged in comprehensive planning and system reform towards creating a more integrated, effective and coordinated juvenile justice system. *The Colorado Division of Youth Correction* embarked on an effort for a systems improvement which was based on a *Continuum of Care Model*. The central idea behind this reform effort is that youthful offenders comprise a diverse group needing a broad array of services in settings that range from least restrictive for example diversion, to moderately restrictive for example community residential programs to most restrictive for example secure residential placement. The overarching goal of this initiative is to match youth with the most effective services in the most appropriate settings in order to meet their rehabilitation needs.
Dabir (2008) in a paper entitled “Children in Conflict with the law: Need and scope for Social Work Interventions” proposed that the present state of affairs of children in conflict with law demands for reforms and interventions at different levels in order to protect their rights. There is a vast scope for social work intervention in this field. The intervention may be in the form of direct work within the justice system, children in conflict with the law; advocacy, awareness generation and initiating a campaign for bringing the issue in the public domain. Use of Diversion and Restorative Justice will go a long way in reducing the number of cases entering the formal justice system as well as cases of recidivism. The police, prosecution or other agencies dealing with juvenile cases shall be empowered to dispose off such cases at their discretion without recourse to formal hearing. Social work agencies can play a major role in establishing models of diversion. It can be done through advocacy at various levels and establishing practices of restorative justice at the community level. Juvenile Assistance Centres with a multiple disciplinary team of social worker, lawyer, counsellor and outreach workers can be a very useful resource for children in conflict with law and their families.

Shoemaker (2009) in the book entitled “Juvenile Delinquency” discussed many treatment and prevention programs in connection with specific topics such as family and school based or drug prevention programs. He suggested that correctional institutions can be designed for short-term or long-term accommodations. Short-term facilities are often called detention centres or homes. They typically serve populations of juveniles who are awaiting a juvenile court hearing or a transfer to the state correctional system. Long-term institutions are designed to house and care for juveniles who have been committed to the state juvenile correctional system by a juvenile court judge. Traditionally, long-term juvenile institutions were known as industrial schools, training schools or reform schools. Today these kinds of institutions still exist, but there have also developed other kinds of juvenile facilities. For example, in several states there are forestry camps, wilderness programs, ranches or other challenge facilities. Often, the facilities are open or minimally secured, meaning no constant surveillance. The programs focus on teaching youth to be more self-reliant and aware of their need to depend on others for successful completion of projects. Other kinds of juvenile correctional institutions include group homes and half-way houses which serve as a community-based alternative to confinement in
long-term institutions. These facilities serve to help integrate the juvenile into the community or serve as a location for treatment and rehabilitation services outside the home and neighbourhood where the child previously lived. The individually oriented treatment programs for institutionalised youths are often based on psycho-therapeutic efforts. However, many programs also utilize group treatment techniques, such as guided group interaction or positive peer culture. The community based prevention programs are exemplified by such programs as restorative justice and monitoring. In addition, current thinking on the impact of treatment and prevention suggests that multi-strategy approaches are more effective than single focus efforts. One such approach that is gaining acceptance is Multi-systemic Therapy (MST). The goal of the therapist using MST is to locate specific behavioural problems and associated treatment strategies for all of juvenile’s environment, including families, schools and peers although MST is often used in family-based counselling programs for juvenile offenders and at-risk youth. The principle of incorporating multiple levels and strategies of interventions for treatment and prevention programs is potentially applicable to a variety of settings.

Siegel and Welsh (2010) in the book entitled “Juvenile Delinquency: The Core” suggests that one of the ways of preventing delinquency is to monitor kids who are at risk for delinquency. Mentoring programs usually involve non-professional volunteers spending time with young people who have been targeted as having the potential for dropping out at school, school failure, and other social problems. Programs that enhance the lives of adolescents are the key to reduce gang delinquency. A more effective alternative would be to devote more resources to the most deteriorated urban areas where gangs are likely to recruit and to reach out to children with school based programs at the earliest age possible. Juveniles on probation may be placed in a wide variety of community based treatment programs that provide services ranging from group counselling to drug treatment. When applied correctly, community treatment maximises the liberty of the individual and at the same time vindicates the authority of the law and protects the public; promotes rehabilitation by maintaining normal community contacts; avoids the negative effects of confinement, which often severely complicate, and greatly reduce the financial cost to the public. Community corrections have traditionally emphasised offender rehabilitation whereas, Juvenile Intensive Probation Supervision (JIPS) involves
treating offenders who would normally have been sent to a secure treatment facility as part of a very small probation caseload that receives almost daily scrutiny. The primary goal of JIPS is **decarceration**; without intensive supervision, youngsters would normally be sent to secure juvenile facilities that are already overcrowded. The second goal is **control**, high risk juvenile offenders can be maintained in the community under much closer security than traditional probation efforts can provide. The third goal is **maintaining community ties and reintegration**; offenders can remain in the community and complete their education while avoiding the pains of imprisonment. They also have emphasised that restorative justice can be an effective strategy in reducing repeat offending by juveniles who have committed violent crimes. Besides, face to face conferences can be effective in preventing victims from committing crimes of retaliation against their perpetrators. Perhaps not surprisingly, across all studies, victim satisfaction levels strongly favoured restorative justice compared to traditional juvenile justice proceedings. Successful results have also been demonstrated in other restorative justice programs for juvenile offenders. Individual counselling psychotherapy which is highly structured counselling in which a therapist helps a juvenile solve conflicts and make a more positive adjustment to society. **Reality Therapy** is a kind of counselling that emphasises current behaviour and requires the individual to accept responsibility for all of his actions. Behaviour modification is a technique for shaping desired behaviours through a system of rewards and punishments. **Group Therapy** which involves counselling several individuals together in a group session whereas, **guided group interaction** (GGI) in which through group interactions, a delinquent can acknowledge and solve personal problems with support from other group members. Positive peer culture involves counselling program in which peer leaders encourage other group members to modify their behaviour and peers help reinforce acceptable behaviours. **Milieu Therapy** includes all aspects of the environment are part of the treatment and meaningful change, increased growth, and satisfactory adjustment are encouraged. **Educational Programs** are an important part of social development and have therapeutic as well as institutional value; they are an essential part of most treatment programs. What takes place through education is related to all other aspects of the institutional program-work activities, recreation, and clinical services. **Wilderness Probation** includes programs involving outdoor expeditions that provide opportunities for juveniles to confront the difficulties of their lives while achieving positive
personal satisfaction. Aftercare involves transitional assistance to juveniles’ equivalent to adult parole to help youths adjust to community life. The most effective secure correction programs are those that provide individual services for a small number of participants. Evaluations of community treatment provide evidence of a number of successful ways to prevent delinquency without jeopardising the safety of community residents.

White (2011) in the paper entitled “The Line of Prevention” discourages incarceration of children. It is not only that prisons have limited opportunities and resources but also because that with the proper support system, education, guidance and opportunity young delinquents will reject the path of crime and deviance. Further, there are extensive investments in the educational and youth programs whereas, the resources used to incarcerate and punish young delinquents are a neglected sphere. Thus, continuation of the prosecution and imprisonment of children would speak not about their lack of morality but to our own.

Cox, et al. (2011) in the book entitled “Juvenile Justice: A Guide to theory, Policy, and Practice” suggested that earlier the intervention can be introduced, better the opportunity to change the behaviour. They support this approach noting that most adult offenders begin their criminal careers as juveniles. Thus, if we prevent juvenile offending, we can prevent the beginning of adult criminal offending. Some of the commonly used strategies for the prevention of juvenile offending include prevention programs, diversion programs, wilderness programs, restorative justice programs, children and family services, federal programs, drug courts etc. There are three major types of prevention programs i.e., primary prevention, which is directed at preventing the acts among the juvenile population before they occur by alleviating social conditions related to the offenders, secondary prevention seeks to identify juveniles who appeared to be at high-risk for delinquency and to intervene in their lives early, tertiary prevention attempts to prevent further illegal acts among offenders once such acts have been committed. Diversion is often used to describe pre-juvenile justice as well as post-juvenile justice activities. Some diversion programs are designed to suspend or terminate juvenile justice processing of juveniles in favour of release or referral to alternate services, known as secondary diversion. Secondary diversion programs may include formal or informal processing by the police, or limit the youth’s penetration into the justice system. On the other hand pure diversion
programs involve referrals to programs outside the justice system prior to juveniles entering the system. In this case the youth may be channelled to a noncourt institution such as after-school outreach programs or community service. Most diversion programs occur after an arrest so they involve both a justice and a service component. *Wilderness Programs* involve small, closely supervised groups of juveniles who are confronted with difficult physical challenges that require team work and cooperation to overcome them. The intent of the programs is to improve the self-esteem of the juveniles involved while teaching them the value of cooperative interaction. The philosophy of *Restorative Justice* centres on the assertion that crime and delinquency affect persons instead of the traditional assertion that crime affects the state. It advocates programs such as victim-offenders’ mediation, community service and community sentencing. *Restorative Justice Approaches* are designed to hold youth accountable, take responsibility for the needs of the victims and involve the community in support of the offending youth and victim. *Federal Programs* are sponsored by government which although not designed specifically as delinquency prevention programs, encourage children to accept and attain lawful objectives through institutionalised means of education and employment. *Drug Courts* are another attempt to prevent children and adults from continuing deviant behaviours. They aimed to stop the abuse of alcohol and other drugs through the use of intensive therapeutic supervision.

Seifert (2012) in the book entitled “*Youth Violence: Theory, Prevention, and Intervention*” stated that many prevention programs seek to teach at-risk parents effective parenting strategies with the belief that these will strengthen the bonds between parents and children, promote family resilience, avoid child abuse and neglect, and thus, in the long term, prevent further violence. Often, these programmes are administered at the home, since it is the most convenient way to reach at risk families. Youth who are at risk for aggression typically have multiple complex problems. One way of helping them is to provide services for all family members and to coordinate those services for efficiency and better outcomes. Outcomes for this population can be improved by supporting families, coordination of care among agencies and community groups, offering prevention services, providing services at the time of the first offending, and providing a continuum of care from light services to intensive services for severe and chronically aggressive youth. Changes are also
needed in the individual agencies that serve this population. The juvenile justice system needs to emphasise treatment and rehabilitation more strongly, and should use empirically based risk assessments and evidence based practice. The social service system needs to look at addressing the needs of maltreated children and those exposed to domestic violence. School typically fail to meet the needs of at-risk youth. The educational system still leans in the direction of punishment rather than treatment, even though suspension and expulsion usually leads to more problems for the child. School based mental health can be an important treatment option. The legal system continues to grapple with the concept of whether youth from the ages of 13 to 18 years are juveniles or adults. Some have proposed a third category of youthful offenders that are managed in a separate system that combines treatment and security for high risk offenders and hybrid sentencing that can hold a youth beyond his 21st birthday when needed. Improvements in public agencies might better serve these children and their families before they commit acts of violence. Stringent monitoring of children and their families are required along with consultation of public agency staff in order to get smooth family functioning, counselling, child development, trauma, sexual offending, case management, substance abuse. Increased services to abusive and neglectful families, use of highly qualified child and family experts to determine child and family needs are some of the programs to prevent juvenile delinquency.

Girls in the juvenile justice system have been found to experience high rates of traumatic childhood events. Despite the well-documented coexistence of trauma and delinquency, few programs integrate the treatment of both disorders. Smith, Chamberlain, and Deblinger (2012) in their paper entitled Adapting Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care for the Treatment of Co-occurring Trauma and Delinquency in Adolescent Girls provides a theoretical rationale for adopting a community-based intervention. Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC), to treat adolescent girls with co-occurring trauma and delinquency, describes the intervention approach, and presents outcomes from a small-scale pilot study. MTFC is a community based intervention for the treatment of chronically delinquent adolescent and their families. Originally designed as an alternative to group home treatment or state training facilities for the treatment of delinquent boys, MTFC has since been adopted to treat girls who have problems with chronic delinquency. The participants were randomly
assigned to Multi-dimensional Treatment Foster Care-T (MTFC+T) or treatment as usual. The girls and their caregivers were assessed at baseline and at twelve months post baseline using a multi-method, multi-agent assessment approach that included a standardized interview and questionnaires for the girl and her caretaker, an interview with the juvenile caseworker, and the collection of juvenile court records. Four measures of delinquency were examined: (a) Official arrests, (b) self reported delinquency, (c) caregiver-reported delinquency, and (d) number of days spent in detention. The girls’ number of days spent in detention was measured by self reports of total days spent in detention, correctional facilities, jail, or prison. At twelve months post baseline, the MTFC+T girls were found to have significantly lower levels of delinquency and trauma related mental health symptoms compared to the group care (GC) girls. GC is the services-as-usual condition provided for girls referred to the juvenile justice system in Oregon and has served as the comparison condition for prior MTFC studies. The primary theory underlying GC is positive peer culture, where peers are instructed and supported to monitor each other’s behaviour and attitudes and to provide daily feedback on progress and problems. The benefits of the MTFC+T intervention was demonstrated with a group of particularly high risk girls with early starting delinquent behaviour, which highlights the potential for trauma treatment to be effectively integrated with delinquency interventions without adverse treatment effects (e.g., drop-out and low satisfaction).

Literature review in the present study has been divided into three major parts. The first part deals with common causes of juvenile delinquency. The second part covers up female juvenile delinquency, its causes and other related aspects and the third part highlights preventive approaches that can mitigate the problem of juvenile delinquency. The first part of literature review suggests that juvenile delinquency is not caused by a single factor; it is rather a multidimensional phenomenon. Some of the factors that were highlighted by most of the authors are violent media content, literacy level of children and their parents, migration, urbanization, peer influence, no or low supervision of parents/guardian, economic status of the family, communication pattern of parents, parents and children’s addiction to alcohol/drugs etc. The second part of review of literature highlighted female delinquency, where it was found that extremely limited studies have dealt with female offending and its related aspects. It was observed that as compared to their counterparts, girls involve in fewer
delinquents acts and the reasons are plenty to consolidate the fact. According to the available literature, girls mostly commit offences only when they face victimization and abuse (sexual and physical). The last and third part of the review of literature covers up preventive approaches of juvenile delinquency. Scholars suggested institutional as well as non-institutional means of preventing juvenile delinquency. According to them institutional training, treatment and post release assistance are a continuous process. After care service is, therefore, an integral part of child welfare work. After care service should be extended to all the needy children released from the institution. While others emphasized upon the need to execute community based prevention programs. It was also suggested that multi-strategy approaches are more effective than single focus efforts. Apart from that, *Educational Programs*, *Wilderness Programs*, therapies of varied types like *Multi-systemic Therapy* (MST), *Functional-Family Therapy* (FFT) and *Multi-Dimensional Treatment Foster Care* (MTFC) were also proposed as preventive approaches of juvenile delinquency. Supplying youths with increased economic opportunities, professional training and education, new workplaces and assistance in organizing businesses can help prevent youth involvement in delinquent activities. *Restorative Justice* and *Diversion Programs* have also been suggested to address juvenile delinquency.