which in turn depends on his personality traits and characteristics.

(ii) Psychodynamics theory

In this theory the motivational factors and process variables are considered important theory includes (a) the psycho-analytic theory, (b) the need theory and (c) the self theory. The psycho-analytical theory deals with the behavioural mechanism that an individual adopts to cope with life situations. His character and personality develop due to this behavioural mechanism which are responsible for the choice of vocation. The need theory of vocational choice takes into consideration, desires and wants which stimulate the individual to prefer one or the other occupation. The self theory of vocational choice stresses on the 'self' of the individual. The concept of self which an individual develops help him in selecting a particular vocation.

(iii) Developmental theory

This theory emphasizes the development of decision-making capacity of an individual. Decision making is a continuous process and starts in childhood. From childhood till early adulthood, an individual thinks about pros and cons of various occupations. He visualizes them in relation to his own traits, characteristic and environmental conditions. Thus he takes decision depending on present situation and
finally reaches a conclusion during early adulthood about his choice of vocation. Carter (1940) believes that individual acquires interest-patterns through his identification with some individuals of his environment. He concludes that interests change and develop with the growth in age. The important theories of vocational choice are:

(a) Ginzberg's theory,  (b) Super's theory,  
(c) Tiedman's theory.

(a) Ginzberg's theory

This theory is developed by Ginzberg et al. (1951). They give importance to developmental nature of vocational choice. They believe that vocational choice is a developmental process and an irreversible process which starts at the age of 10 years and continues up to the age of 21 years. The individual's needs and realities of life finally decide about the end point.

(b) Super's theory

The theory developed by Super (1951) suggests that the term 'development' should be used rather than 'choice' because it comprehends the concepts of preference, choice, entry and adjustment (Super, 1951). The term vocational maturity was introduced by Super (1951) and he maintains that as an individual matures vocationally, he passes through a series of life stages. He also believes that during this phase of development, he develops his self-concept.
(c) Tiedman's theory

Tiedman (1961) divides the whole process into two periods; period of anticipation and period of implementation. Period of anticipation includes four phases viz., the exploration phase, crystallization phase, choice phase and clarification phase. The period of implementation includes three phases; the induction, information and integration.

(iv) Decision theory

This theory of vocational choice emphasizes decision models. They are (a) Galatt model, (b) Hilton's decision making model and (c) Holland's typological model. Galatt (1962) believes that the decision taken by an individual may be terminal (final) or investigatory (calling for additional information). Hilton (1962) believed that the decision making model considered the cognitive dissonance as the principal variable. In this a person searches alternatives to make a decision till his dissonance is below threshold but an individual repeats and revises his premises or tries for another behavioural alternatives if his dissonance is above the threshold. Hilton (1962) and Holland (1959) evolve the typological theory of vocational choice. The theory emphasises that a person in a culture can be categorized into six types i.e., realistic, intellectual, social, emotional, enterprising and artistic. There are six corresponding types of work
environments. Individuals according to their skills and abilities select an appropriate environment and vocation.

The theories discussed above explore various factors, which affect individual's interest towards various occupations.

Personality and interest are related to each other (Darley and Hagenah, 1955; Roe, 1956). If interest are developed according to the traits of personality they give an individual the great satisfaction. Carter (1940) concludes that the selection of appropriate patterns of interest helps in good adjustment in vocation and life.

If the interest are inappropriate than it becomes necessary to discard or modify those interest patterns. Modification of interest-pattern can restructure the personality of individual bringing desirable changes in him.
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Human society has considerably developed and modernised due to scientific and technological developments. As a result there are better facilities and opportunities for the members of society but on the other hand the deviation from cultural and social norms has disturbed the whole world. Juvenile delinquency, a type of deviant behaviour is on the increase, not only in India but also in the whole world. In the recent years, this problem has attracted the attention of psychologists and sociologists. In the previous chapter, we have discussed the concept, psychology of delinquent behaviour and its measurements. In the present chapter a review of some of the important studies done in the field of delinquent behaviour has been presented.

DEMOGRAPHIC CORRELATES

AGE

Age and delinquent behaviour have been identified as important correlates (Cavan and Ferdinand, 1981; Moffitt, 1993; McGee, Williams and Feehan, 1992; and Warr, 1993). During early childhood period, child’s behaviour is to a great extent governed by his parents, his needs are satisfied by them and he is not in a psychological, biological or sociological conflicting stage. Hence his behaviour is thought to be normal but with the onset of puberty or during the period of late childhood there are biological, psychological and sociological changes in the environment, which bring child into a condition of tension, conflict and frustration and thus this stage is most prone for delinquent behaviour.
The Central Children Act (1960) Section 2(e) also specified that the term juvenile delinquent holds for a boy whose age range is 7 to 17 years and a girl who is between 7 to 18 years of age. Kenneth (1960, 1971) proposed the term youth and identified it as the stage of transition typified by tensions, ambivalence towards both, self and society, refusal of socialization and gradually more alienation to integration in society. While, Cavan and Ferdinand (1981) believe that 11 to 17 years of age is the actual age of delinquency. For delinquents whose criminal activity is confined to adolescent years, the causal factors may be proximal, specific to the period of adolescent development. In contrast, for persons whose adolescent delinquency is merely one inflection in a continuous life long antisocial course, the causal factors should lie in early childhood experiences and the continued troubled life.

Researches on childhood conduct disorder reveal that antisocial behaviour begins long before the age when it is first encoded in police data bank. It has been noted that there is a steep decline in antisocial behaviour between ages 17 to 30 years while there is steep incline during 7 to 17 years. (Loeber, Stauthamerloeb, & Farrington 1987; Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin, 1972).

An important question was to be answered related with age and delinquency. Does adolescence bring an increment in the number of people who are willing to offend or does the small and constant number of offenders simply generate more criminal acts while they are adolescents? The answer was given by Farrington (1986) who claimed that the adolescent peak reflects a temporary increase in
the number of people involved in antisocial behaviour, and not a temporary acceleration in the offense-rates of individuals. The findings were supported by Thornberry, Lizotte (1993) and Wolfgang, Figlio (1972).

Kazdin (1987) reported about mental health researcher's report of conduct disorder and concluded that manifestations of antisocial behaviour soar so high during adolescence that participation in delinquency appears to be a normal part of the teen's life (Elliott, Ageton, and Canter, 1979).

The etiology of adolescent onset delinquency was explored at different stages of child development. McGee, Partridge, Williams & Silvia (1991) considered 5 percent of pre-school boys as 'very difficult to manage'. The prevalence of conduct disorder among elementary school aged boys has been found to be a reinforcer for delinquent involvement as concluded by Goldstein (1980). He emphasized that adolescents try to prove maturity and autonomy which are strong personal motives for offenses. However, epidemiological studies have confirmed that adolescent initiation of tobacco, alcohol and drug abuse are reinforced because they symbolize independence and maturity to youth.

Farrington (1987) reported that boys from criminogenic circumstances who did not become delinquent, seemed nervous and withdrawn and had few or no friends.

This theory of adolescence limited delinquency advocated by Moffitt, (1993) explains that it is an adaptive response to contextual circumstances. As a result, the theory seems to predict that every teen will engage in delinquency, Elliott, et. al.
using self-report method of study, suggest that almost all adolescents do commit some illegal acts but the degree of intensity differs.

Age of onset of problem behaviour was examined by McGee, Williams and Feehan (1992) in a course of a prospective longitudinal study in a group of boys and girls of age 11 years. It was found that onset of problem behaviour occurred during the preschool years, by the first year of schooling or by the end of the second year of school. Onset was strongly related to information source pattern of comorbidity of disorder, the developmental language, perceptual motor and IQ measures.

Moffitt (1993) studied official rates of delinquency against age and found that the rates for both, prevalence and incidence of offending appear highest during adolescence, they peak sharply at about 17 and drop precipitately in young adulthood. Further, the majority of juvenile offenders were teenagers by the early 20, the number of active offenders decreases by over 50%, by age 28 years, almost 85 percent of former delinquents desist from offending (Blumstein and Cohen, 1988; Farrington, 1986).

Moffitt (1993) suggested two qualitative distinct categories of individuals. First category comprises those individuals whose antisocial behaviour is temporary and situational and the other category comprises those, whose antisocial behaviour is relatively stable and persistent.

In another study on age, peers and delinquency carried out by Warr (1993) it was analysed that peer relations (exposure to delinquent peers, time spent with peers, loyalty to peers) change
dramatically at the age of 11-21 years. It was also concluded that when measures of peer influence are controlled, the effects of age on self-reported delinquency become insignificant. Additional analyses show that delinquent friends tend to be 'sticky' friends (once acquired, they are not easily lost).

SEX

The delinquencies of boys tend to be more disturbing or threatening to the public than the delinquencies of girls. Boys more often than girls break into buildings, steal and assault people, while girls more often are incorrigible, runaways or minor thieves. Various studies have been carried out to compare male and female delinquents. Watson & Fitzgerald (1971) compared scores on EPPS of 49 delinquent boys and 46 delinquent girls in the age range of 15 to 19 years and found that delinquent boys scored significantly lower in achievement deference, affiliation and dominance while delinquent girls scored higher in hetero-sexuality and lower in endurance and deference. Carlota (1982) compared intellectual and personality characteristics of 31 female delinquents of age 19 to 21 years and 37 non-delinquent females of the same age group. She gave Raven Standard Progressive Matrices (SPM), the junior and senior High School Personality Questionnaire (HSPQ), the Sentence Completion Method (SCM) and selected cards from the T.A.T. She found that delinquent females scored low on the SPM and the intelligent factor of HSPQ. They were found to be less moralistic and more inclined to disregard rules. They were also critical, cool and aloof in their interpersonal relations, inclined to disregard their social obligations and more emotionally undemonstrative. Further analysis of the data
from SCM and T.A.T. indicated that female delinquents displayed a strong negative attitude towards themselves. They were found to be more critical of their abilities and behaviour. Thematic Apperception Test (T.A.T) was administered to 23 delinquent boys and 13 delinquent girls in the age range of 13 to 17 by Kallipouska (1992) and he found T. A. T. hostility index to be higher for boys than girls. Boys were found to express more physical and girls more verbal hostility in T.A.T. stories.

In another study by Krebs, Bartek and Taylor (1993) 20 female juvenile delinquents who acknowledged engaging in prostitution, 20 juvenile delinquents who denied doing so, and 20 same age control subjects responded to A-colby and L-Kohlberg's measurement of Moral Judgement Interview (MJI). Delinquents were found to score lower on moral maturity and coping and higher on defensiveness than non-delinquents.

SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS (SES)

As mentioned in the British Journal of Delinquency 1950, 'Delinquency is the co-efficient of friction between the individual and his environment'. Authors like Sutherland Shaw and McKay, have pointed to the high incidence of delinquency in lower socioeconomic classes and considered it to be the most important independent variables causing delinquent behaviour.

Delinquent behaviour is the result of psychological distress which is usually seen among the children of low socioeconomic status (Dohrenwend and Dohrenwend, 1969). Various studies carried out by Sociologists claimed that delinquent behaviour is
to a great extent associated with low socioeconomic status of the families.

Recent studies which investigate the impact of parental attitude, neighbourhood, social standing of the family and economic background of the delinquent behaviour have been summarised below.

Due to poor socioeconomic conditions, children do not get proper facilities for education and development, the ill-fed, ill-clad and illiterate often get diverted towards antisocial activities and tend to become delinquents (Lavania, 1993).

Burt (1929) found that the most delinquents were from economically needy families. Merrill (1947) found a marked difference in economic status of delinquent and non-delinquent children. Poverty as a contributory factor for delinquency was concluded by Mukhopadhyaya (1953). Glueck and Glueck (1956) found only five percent of the families to be from economically comfortable circumstances in his sample of 500 American families. Dadami (1965) also found delinquents to be from poor socioeconomic families.

Sullivan (1973) in his study concluded that the delinquent behaviour goes around the poor economic opportunities. Uttar (1975) observed that poverty, high rate of unemployment and low socioeconomic status caused frustration and despair which become the breeding grounds for delinquency. Singh (1980) on the basis of his study, found non-truants to be coming from families slightly better in socioeconomic status in comparison to truants. Kulshreshtha (1981) observed that poverty was high among
While viewing the impact of socio-psycho factors on juvenile recidivism, Joya Singh (1981) analysed their official records and found that juvenile recidivists are from undesirable home conditions. Further 77 percent of children were living in slum areas, therefore, the subcultural influence was also visualised. Other factors associated were uncontrolled and neglected children, employed children, inadequate spacing in houses, low income of parents and the like. A socio-demographic study by Channabasavanna and Bhaskar (1981) was planned in view of the background and tried to delineate, the environment of delinquent and also investigated the various antisocial delinquent acts committed by the delinquents. The sample for the present study was 60 inmates who were convicted by the Court. These were interviewed and their parents were also interviewed. It was concluded that the delinquents were from over crowded, urban slums or industrial and business areas. Further that, they were from poor & large families & had illiterate or poorly educated working class fathers.

Hinshaw (1992) found that antisocial behaviour and delinquency are clearly associated with under-achievement, low socioeconomic status and family adversity. In general, other studies may be classified into 3 broad categories:

1) Biogenic views of delinquency
2) Psychogenic views of delinquency
3) Sociogenic views of delinquency
BIOMETRIC VIEWS OF DELINQUENCY

Biogenic's visual inline law breaker as a person whose misconduct is the result of the faulty biology. Biogenic offenders are hereditarily defective, they may suffer from endocrine imbalance or brain pathology. Their bodily structure and temperament patterns are typical which push them towards delinquency. Lombroso (1835-1909) found that the delinquents and criminals were qualitatively different from other citizens. They had 'defective physique' and defective intelligence. Kretschmer (1925) identified 'body mind' types, cyclothymes i.e. reserved and the schizothymes i.e. outgoing. He believed that cyclothymes were less serious delinquents and criminals than the schizothymes.

Sheldon (1949) reported a relationship between body structure, temperament and delinquency. He discovered 3 basic body types: (1) Endomorphs, (2) Mesomorphs and (3) Ectomorphs. In an investigation, Glueck and Glueck (1950) compared 500 delinquent and non-delinquent children. The two groups were matched in terms of socioeconomic status, age, ethnicity and intelligence and compared them in terms of personality, temperament, family dynamics and bodily constitution. They found that most of the delinquents were mesomorphs and most of the non-delinquents were ectomorphs. They noticed that the delinquents were physically sturdier, more masculine, and typically of the mesomorphic, muscular, athletic type. In bodily measurements, however, they were inferior to non-delinquents. The components of general intelligence were significantly different for delinquents and non-delinquents. The delinquents did better on concrete performance on
conceptualisation. They also appeared to be markedly more emotionally inadequate, dynamic, aggressive, stubborn, adventurous and suggestible. They also showed conflict in friendly relations, and were found to be less co-operative, suspicious of the motives of others, more disruptive and defensive in their attitudes. Apart from body structure, appearance has also been found to be related to delinquent behaviour. Agnew (1984) examined the relationship between appearance and delinquency. The study was based on data from National Youth in transition survey. It was hypothesised that -

1) Unattractive individuals would be more delinquents.
2) Strain, labeling and social control variables would mediate the relationship between appearance and delinquency.

The study included 1886, XI grade children as the subjects and were interviewed approximately for two hours. They also completed the scales measuring the seriousness of the delinquency, trouble with parents and delinquency, behaviour in school and were assessed on social control, strain and labeling variables. Results reveal that appearance had a greater effect on schools than the family delinquency. Un-attractive subjects were lower in many forms of social control and frustration. They had lower self concept also. Thus the data supported the hypothesis.

Neuropsychological aspect of juvenile delinquency was studied by Gorenstein (1990) it was hypothesized and concluded that many juvenile delinquents suffer from a subtle weakness in the inhibitory functions of the prefrontal cortex, the septal area, and the hippo campus and that this weakness is a factor
contributing to their delinquency. Anti-social juvenile delinquents were found to show behaviour that resembles that of brain damaged laboratory animals with respect to reduced fear of aversive events and stimulations seeking.

Hughes, Deville and Chalhaub (1992) compared relational maturity (object relatedness) of merely 100 juvenile offenders of age 15 to 18 years with level of violence, associated with actual crimes committed. Relational maturity was measured through analyses of the human content response of the Rorschach’s ink blot test administered to each subject. It was concluded that juvenile offenders with the lowest degree of relational maturity were more likely to commit sex crimes, than those juveniles with high relational maturity.

HEREDITY

Walters and White (1989) review research literature on hereditability of delinquent behaviour by 4 basic methodologies: family studies, twin studies, adoption studies and environment interaction studies concluded that delinquency is related to heredity. Rowe (1987) has given importance to genetic factor causing delinquency. His arguments are supported by Dworkin (1976) and Goldsmith (1983).

Over the years numerous theories have been proposed to account for criminal behaviour. Wilson and Herrenstein (1985) concluded that 'crime can not be understood without taking into consideration predispositions and their biological roots'.
A recent biological explanation of the aetiology of delinquency has been theorized in the (XYY) sex chromosome discovery, first reported by Jacob (1965) who speculated that the additional Y chromosome may predispose an individual to criminal conduct. Jacob, her colleagues and other investigators such as Lancet (1961), Price, Whatmore (1968) and Barlett (1962) have supported the contention that the carriers of extra Y chromosome often commit crime during their juvenile years. Further Sandberg et al. (1961) propounded that male possessing XYY chromosomal anomaly were thought to be taller more severely afflicted with acne, less intelligent, more physically aggressive and more likely to be found in prisons or mental hospitals compared with normal XY males.

HORMONES

The adolescent period has also been regarded as the age of delinquency (Blumstein & Cohen, 1988; Farrington, 1986; Hirschi, 1977; Loeber, et al. 1990). The adolescent period is marked by internal physiological changes, changes in social environment, changes in expectations of the parents, peers and the self. There are alterations of mood, attitudes and behaviour. These changes are particularly due to hormones (e.g. Freud, A., 1969; Freud, S., 1953; Kestenberg, 1967a & b). Hormones reawaken latent Oedipal feeling and stimulate new sexual urges (Kestenberg, 1967a, 1967b; Lerner, 1987). These feelings were assumed to create anxiety and emotional instability because (a) sexual feelings were morally unacceptable and needed to be sublimated or channeled into a more
acceptable outlet often leading to aggression, and (b) sexual urges were unfamiliar impulses that the adolescent did not have the knowledge or experience to handle (Jacobson, 1961). The psychoanalytical literature suggests that adolescent period is a time of internal flux and instability and may cause deviation in behaviour, but adds that adolescents with healthy egos can adapt to these changes without extreme or even observable signs of stress, but those having low ego strength turn out to be delinquents. From a psychological standpoint, hormones act on the brain to affect the behaviour in two ways (a) Organizational effect: sex hormones can influence personality and behaviour through direct effects on the course of early brain development. These effects are permanent. (b) Activational effects: Hormones may activate specific behaviour their impact on both peripheral and neural based processes. These effects are immediate or slightly delayed.

A study on humans conducted by Rubin, Reinish, & Hasket (1981) indicated that violent criminals and repeat offenders have higher concentration of testosterone than less violent offenders. Relationship between testosterone and aggression was also suggested by Rubin, et al. (1981) and Mazur (1983).

On the basis of above reviews it can be concluded that biogenic characteristics are responsible for delinquent behaviour of children.
PSYCHOGENIC VIEWS OF DELINQUENCY

Psychogenic approach indicates that the offender behaves as he does in response to psychological pathology of some kind. These investigations believe personality problems as a casual factor in delinquency. Psychogenic views are based on many views such as Sigmund Freud and August Aichorn, who hypothesized that his 'Wayward youth' rejected authority because he did not receive a balance of love, a condition that made him aggressive. Friedlander (1947) related the child's antisocial impulses.

Abrahamsen (1960) conceives delinquent conduct in terms of influence of the unconscious, upon human behaviour. But Erickson (1966) explains delinquency to be the result of series of crises through child's experiences for his identity. Delinquency was answered through Psycho-analysis by Alexander (1976).

AGGRESSION

Aggression is a trait of personality which is developed as result of repression of desires or imbalance homeostatic condition. A number of studies have been conducted on aggression in relation delinquent behaviour. For example Bandura and Walters (1959) viewed delinquency as a result of aggression. They studied dependency conflicts in aggressive delinquents. The subjects were 26 adolescent boys with a history of aggressive and destructive behaviour and 26 adolescent boys as control group between the age range of 14 to 17 years. Mathur and Kumar (1967). Mathew (1973) in their studies found the delinquents to be more aggressive as
compared to the non-delinquents. Convicts were found to be more dominant, hostile and aggressive than non-convicts (Dasgupta & Jayashree, 1981; Gupta, 1959; Jain, 1981; Rao & Sen 1979; Singh 1983) found aggression to be effective in delinquent behaviour. Kulshreshtha and Bhushan (1981) found that delinquent's main needs of prominence were aggression, dominance and affiliation.

Cowden and Cohen (1969) concluded that delinquents with histories of considerable use of fantasy aggression showed more aggressive behaviour than others. A comparative study between early delinquents and young aggressives was carried out by Farrington and West (1971). It was found that one fourth of the subjects were both aggressive and delinquents. They were found to be poor in conduct, retarded in scholastic attainment and intelligence, had large number of brothers and sisters with careless parents. Further it was concluded that overly aggressive school boys generally make up the actual potential delinquent population.

In a study by Misra (1981) direction of aggression and reactions of frustration in juvenile delinquents was examined. 90 delinquents and 100 control normals matched for age and education were used as subjects. They were administered Pareek's Hindi adaptation of Rosenzweig P.F. study. The result revealed that delinquents compared with normal suffer with inadequacy of social adjustment, which is indicative of paranoid tendency, displays ego weakness and over emphasises the resolution of frustrating problems.
Short and Siemmonson (1986) investigated the relationship of aggression to several social cognitive variables in 58 institutionalised male delinquent adolescents with mean age of 16 years, who were identified by peers as high aggressive or low aggressive. Subjects were administered measures of perspective, taking moral judgment and person perception. It was concluded that only perspective taking ability was significantly related to aggressive behaviour in the observed population. Highly aggressive subjects were less able to perceive other's viewpoints than the low aggressive subjects.

The direction of aggression among normal, deaf and dumb, and delinquent children was explored by Hussain (1986). It was presumed that these groups will vary in the direction of aggression, extra punitive, intro punitive and impunitive. The subjects were 90 male children (Normal: 30 Deaf and Dumb: 30 and Delinquent: 30). Results revealed that delinquent children scored significantly higher than deaf and dumb and normal children on extra punitive dimension of aggression. Normal, deaf & dumb children scored significantly higher than the delinquents on intro punitive. Normal children scored significantly higher than the deaf & dumb delinquents on intro punitive.

Childhood aggression, peer status and social class as predictors of delinquency was assessed by Roff (1990). Measures of aggression, peer status and social class was gathered during childhood of 711 boys taken as subjects. Multiple regression analysis indicated that aggression was the most significant predictor of delinquency followed by social class as the second
significant predictor. For peer rejected children, aggressive behaviour significantly predicted subsequent delinquency for boys.

In a study Tremblay (1992) associated four childhood behavioural dimensions with later anti-social behaviour. The four dimensions were aggression, hyperactivity, anxiety and prosociality. It was concluded that the aggression should be considered as an antisocial outcome and should not be included among the predictors of antisocial behaviour.

Aggression and stealing in a correlational study was analysed by Kosky and Heath (1992) by taking 2181 children in the age range of 0 to 15 years. On comparison with aggressive children with stealers, it was found that aggressive children were younger and more immature males and came from stressed families with a history of mental illness.

Dutton and Hart (1992) reviewed the institutional files of 604 male inmates to determine the impact of various types of childhood abuse and neglect on violent and aggressive behaviour in adulthood. They concluded that the men who had been abused as children were 3 times more likely to engage in violent acts as adults than non-abused men. It was further explored that specific forms of childhood abuse were associated with specific patterns of adult violence, for example, those who were physically abused were more likely to be physically violent, and those who were sexually abused were more likely to be sexually violent.

Weiss, Dodge and Bates, et. al (1992) conducted a study on consequences of early harsh discipline on child aggression. The results suggested that the effect of harsh discipline on child
aggression may be mediated at least in part by maladaptive social information processing patterns that develop in response to the harsh discipline.

Relationship between childhood aggression and adult criminality was established by Huesmann and Eron (1992). They argued that cognitive process formed early in life account for the high degree of continuity in aggression. It was suggested that aggression is apparent at the age of 6 and becomes stable characteristic of individual by age of 8, hence preventive measures should be taken by parents, teachers and socializing agents to check aggression.

Coie, Lochman, Terry and Hyman (1992) tried to predict the early adolescent disorder from childhood aggression and peer rejection. Subjects were children from 3rd grade and their adjustment assessment was done by parents and teachers ratings and by adolescent self reports at the end of 1st year of Middle School. It was concluded that both childhood aggression and peer rejection appeared to be significant predictors of adolescent disorder.

Thematic apperception test (T.A.T) was administered to 23 delinquent boys and 13 delinquent girls in the age range of 13 to 17 years by Kalliopuska (1992). Girls were also administered the Rorschach's test. Aggression measured by Rorschach was divided into inward and outward aggression. The T.A.T. hostility index was found to be higher for boys than girls. Boys expressed more physical and girls expressed more verbal hostility in T.A.T. stories.
Hudis (1992) while studying attribution for pride, anger and guilt among incarcerated adolescents, explored linkages between attributions and effect. He compared the content of causal thinking among incarcerated delinquent youths and their non-delinquent peers. The subjects were 26 incarcerated male adolescents in the age range of 14 to 18 years. For anger and guilt only few causes were found but a variety of causes were cited for pride. In second study 56 incarcerated adolescents were compared with 57 secondary school adolescents in the age range 11 to 19 years. The study was on causal attribution and its effect on pride. It was concluded that incarcerated youth attributes feelings for pride to activities which are culturally appropriate for adults. Female cited school success as a source of pride at twice the rate of male.

Using illustrative designs, Henzberger and Hall (1993) examined children’s judgment about aggressive retaliation against siblings and friends. It was analysed that physical and verbal retaliation were considered most wrong when directed at a young sibling, but when retaliation involved property damages, the aggression was considered to be least wrong. Further, retaliation against an accidental aggressor was considered to be more wrong in comparison to intentional aggressor. No gender difference was concluded in judgment to retaliation against siblings and peers. However, aggressive girls rated retaliation against sibling less severely than less aggressive girls but boys showed no such difference.
A recent study has been carried out by Atkins and Stoff (1993) on instrumental and hostile aggression in childhood disruptive behaviour disorders. The subjects were 8 to 12 years old aggressive boys (clinically referred) and it was found that in similar sample of normative group, both types of aggression will increase during provocation manipulation with moderate correlations between the two aggressive responses.

ANXIETY AND DEPRESSION

Anxiety is the expression of tension that results from real or imaginary threats to one's security. It reduces the efficiency of the individuals in satisfying their needs, disturbs interpersonal relations and produces confusion in thinking.

Kalliappan and Senthia (1984) hypothesized that destitute would have more anxiety than the normal but would have lesser anxiety than the delinquents. Subjects compared were 46 normal children, destitute and 36 delinquents in the age range 10 to 18 years. The study concluded that delinquents and destitute had more anxiety than the normals. It was suggested that anxiety reduction techniques should be included for the treatment of delinquent and destitute children.

INTELLIGENCE

Intelligence is general mental adaptability to new problems and new situations of life or it is the capacity to reorganise
one's behaviour patterns so as to act more effectively and appropriately in novel situations.

Various studies have suggested that intelligence has been found to be related to delinquency. For example, in a study, Cooper (1960) concluded that delinquency tends to be much more common among the feeble minded than among people in general. Later studies by Bhattacharya (1958), Gupta (1959), Kundu (1966), Chatterjee and Mukherjee (1973) showed that delinquents were of inferior intelligence.

Critchley (1968) confirmed earlier reports that the illiteracy is associated with delinquency. Sixty percent of 477 delinquent children were found to be two or more years retarded in reading.

Intellectual level and social background of juvenile delinquents were studied by Toberkova (1969). Subjects were 200 juvenile delinquents. Results suggested that juvenile delinquents have low level of intelligence. Gibson and West (1970) concluded that social and intellectual background indicate towards early delinquency. In their study subjects were 30 delinquent boys convicted before reaching age of 14 years, 87 classmates reported to be delinquents and 294 classmates reported to be non-delinquents. These were compared and administered Ravan’s Progressive matrices and a verbal comprehension test. These subjects were rated on a 7 point scale of social handicap. The results revealed that delinquents had lower I.Q. and had come from most impoverished and socially deprived families. Balastik (1970), Mirchandani (1970) Das (1975) Gupta and Gupta (1978) also found delinquency to be negatively related to intelligence.
Discrepancy between the data found in the literature was discussed by Balastik (1970). He indicated towards the frequency of mental deficiency found in juvenile delinquents to be ranging from 2 to 96 percent and that the mean I.Q. level of delinquents has both normal and sub-normal values. He made an attempt for the determination of following factors.

1. The average I.Q. of 258 juvenile delinquents.
2. Factors which could explain a decrease in I.Q.
3. Reasons for discrepancy in data.

Results in the above mentioned factors were analysed as follows:

1. An average I.Q. of 89 to 94 was evaluated.
2. Cause of decrease in I.Q. was that delinquents have lower intellectual performance level than normal subjects.
3. The reason behind discrepancy in data was due to intellectual intellectual insufficiency in aetiology and development of offensive behaviour which occur more during 15 to 17 years of age, than that in older age group.

A comparative study carried out by Reily (1985) in which he used 21 emotionally disturbed (ED) 20 mildly retarded (MR) and 40 learning disabled (LD) and 40 juvenile delinquents in the age-range of 10 to 17 years as the subjects. The sample was administered Wechler intelligence Scale, Wide range achievement test and Peabody individual achievement test. Results revealed that juvenile delinquents were similar to the (LD) and (ED) subjects in intellectual level.
Wilson and Herrnstein (1985) linked crime and low intelligence to lower levels of moral reasoning, shallowness of disapproval for wrong conduct and school failure. They also noted that less intelligent delinquents characteristically commit impulsive crimes that yield immediate gratification.

After systematically reviewing the literature Quay (1987) concluded that low intelligence is one of many interacting variables that predispose a child towards delinquent behaviour. Duller children particularly temperamental, hyperactive or impulsive ones, may be more vulnerable to poor parenting and may even exacerbate parental inadequacies. These troubled youngsters were often found to alienate their peers and teachers and fail academically. Their limited social reinforcements and mental deficiencies combine to retard the development of important higher order cognitive functions such as moral judgment and interpersonal problem solving. These and other factors (eq. deviant role models) lead to unlawful behaviour or delinquency.

In order to evaluate the fundamental ability and achievement characteristics of institutionalized delinquents Trevor, Wally and Unruch (1992) studied four groups of subjects, they were:

1. Closed custody delinquents (n = 70)
2. Open custody delinquents (n = 20)
3. Social Services agencies (n = 30)
4. Controls (non-delinquents) (n = 24)
The subjects were of age range 14-16 years and were administered, Burt Vernon Graded Ward Reading Test, Missing Letter Abstraction Test, Vocabulary test and Graded Arithmetic Mathematics test, while evaluating ability and achievement characteristics of delinquent boys, no mean differences were found among four subgroups, though controls scored slightly higher than delinquents on all four tests.

Recent study explaining the relation between I.Q. and delinquency has been carried out by Lynam, Moffitt, Terrie and Stouthamer-loeber (1993). They established an inverse relationship between I.Q. and delinquency but did not specify the direction of effect, though the findings were more consistent with the hypothesis that the direction of effect runs from low I.Q. to delinquency. Using data on 13 years old boys in a high risk longitudinal study, differing explanatory accounts were empirically examined and it was found that the theory that interpreted the relation as false, or that inferred, that delinquency related factors led to low I.Q. received no response.

INTEREST

Some studies have suggested that interest-patterns of students have also some role in the development of delinquency in the children. For example, Chatterjee and Mukherjee (1979) conducted a study to examine the interest-patterns of delinquent and non-delinquent children. The study included 75 boys and 50 girls from delinquent home in the age range 12 to 16 years. A group of children having similar age range was chosen from among the
children living in different slum areas. A sample of school going children within the same age range was also selected. For the measurement of interest, Chatterjee's Non-Language Preference Record Form 962 was selected. The result revealed that the six groups varied widely with respect to interests in different fields. The children living in slum were closer to the delinquent children than school going children, so far as their interests were concerned. Delinquents and slum-living children were remarkably more interested in Fine Arts, Agriculture, Household work, Outdoor and Sports than the school going children. Further it was suggested that delinquent children can be identified with high degree of accuracy on the basis of their interest-patterns.

Ledikova (1964) describes interest as part of the motivational structure of the delinquent personality and hobbies. He discussed problems of developing socially acceptable interests in delinquent youth and suggests the use of specific hobbies within the institutions in which the delinquents live. He further analysed that hobbies according to the interest of children would reduce juvenile delinquency and restructure their personality.

Interest, personality and intellectual ability with respect to ordinal position was investigated by Dhillon (1987). The subjects were 120 boys and 120 girls belonging to three ordinal positions. They were administered standard progressive matrices by Raven (1950) Maudsley's Personality Inventory (1959) and Non-Language Preference Record Form 962 (1966). Results revealed that ordinal position affects intellectual ability but have no significant effect on personality and interest.
A comparative study of interest patterns of delinquent and non-delinquent boys was carried out by Gupta (1992). The subjects were 30 delinquent and 30 non-delinquent boys. They were administered Chatterjee’s Non Language preference Record Form-962. It was analysed that interests of the delinquent and non-delinquent were quite scattered over the ten different fields. Both delinquents and non-delinquents scored comparatively higher on medical and science fields with less interest in Agriculture and Literary work. However, both the samples indicated comparatively lower interests in Fine-Arts, Sports, Household work and outdoor activities.

PERSONALITY

An individual’s personality is the total picture of his organized behaviour and is a dynamic combination of various psychological traits with which he is born and others which he acquires after interpersonal relations. Distortion, deformation and/or deviation of personality traits may cause delinquent behaviour. Flick (1953) noticed that delinquent children perceive the world in a different way from an adult and because of this impressionability they become an early prey for participation in the violation of law. Similarly Rajangam (1959) studied personality structure of delinquents through case studies, interview, observation and intelligence performance test and found that delinquents were extremely emotional and impulsive.
Some other studies (e.g. Blackburn, 1969; Forrest, 1970; Frick, 1967; Haghughi, 1970; Kelley, 1969; Parrot and Guencaill; see Dagmar, 1985; Twomey and Hendry, 1969) have suggested that the delinquent children are emotionally unstable, low in average intelligence, show loss of self esteem and are more introvert. They are also found to be lacking in behaviour control, assertive, guilt-prone, tensed, dependent and more conforming.

Direct and projective method of personality assessment using Rorschach's Personality Inventory was applied on 10 delinquents and 10 non-delinquents by Mukherjee and Majumdar (1969). They observed low correlation among the following six variables viz. aggression, emotional stability, self-control, moral standard, conformity, insecurity and identification level.

Personality profile of delinquent boys using Cattell's High School Personality Questionnaire (HSPQ) on 532 boys, (11 to 17 years of age) was made by McQuaid (1970). It was found that delinquent children were lower in intelligence, higher in ergic tension and lower in super ego strength than 250 previously tested non-delinquent children of the same age group. Data from the sub-samples of the two groups indicated that both the groups were highly anxious but non-delinquent samples showed sober, mature, independent, calm and control traits of personality.

Watson and Fitzgerald (1971) made an attempt to determine whether or not EPPS scores differentiate institutionalized, delinquents and non-delinquent adolescents. Scores of 49
delinquent boys and 46 delinquent girls in the age range of 15 to 19 years were compared with scores of comparable non-delinquent groups. Delinquent boys were found to score significantly lower in achievement, affiliation and dominance while delinquent girls scored higher in heterosexuality and lower in endurance and defence.

Stott and Okzak (1978) examined the Jesnes Inventory of 72 male juvenile offenders with mean age of 14 years and 7 months to see the difference in personality characteristics of juvenile delinquents and status offenders. It was found that offenders were more disturbed than the juvenile delinquents.

The relationship between personality and antisocial behaviour was investigated by Zaklofske and Eysenck (1980). A sample of 72 well behaved, 45 badly behaved and 30 delinquent males in the age range of 13 to 15 was administered Devereux Adolescent Behaviour Rating scale. The only difference between delinquents and badly behaved subjects was in the degree of anti-social behaviour. It was suggested that badly behaved subjects might have potential delinquent behaviour.

Kulshrestha and Bhushan (1981) applied T.A.T. on 41 male delinquent children in the age range of 12 to 16 years. It was found that frequent use of ego defense mechanism, unintegrated ego and weak and under-developed super ego make an individual psychotic and neurotic.

In a study by Carlota (1982) intellectual and personality characteristics of 31 female delinquents of age 19 to 21 years were compared with 37 non-delinquent females. The results
suggested that the delinquent disregard rules. They were also critical, cool & aloof in their inter-personal relations, inclined to disregard their social obligations and more emotionally undemonstrative. They were also found to be more critical of their abilities and behaviour than the non-delinquent females.

In a study, Sharma, Gunthey and Singh (1982) investigated personal and personality factors associated with the juvenile delinquency. 20 delinquent children and 25 non-delinquent children of age, ranging from 14 to 18 years were given a personal data sheet and Jr. Sr. High School Personality Questionnaire (HSPQ). Results showed that the parent's income and education in case of delinquent children was significantly lower than those of parents of non-delinquent children. The delinquent group has considerably more middle born among them than non-delinquent groups. While comparing the personality factors of the delinquents and non-delinquents, it appeared that delinquents were less intelligent, more assertive, more worrying, depressed and guilt-prone. They also showed more tension and frustration and were more dependent.

Anolik (1983) compared personality, family, educational and criminological characteristics of bright delinquent with average delinquents. He administered the Personal Research Form E and personal opinion study to 30 male juvenile offenders with I.Q. 115 or above (bright subjects) and 30 delinquents with I.Qs. of 90 - 104 (average subjects). The case studies showed that (a) Both the groups had maladaptive family experiences (b) the majority was characterised as under achievers in schools. (c) the offences committed by bright and average delinquents were not different and
(d) Many subjects from both the groups were reported to be mildly psychologically disturbed.

In a study by Lahri (1963) an attempt was made to study the difference in personality patterns of normal and delinquent children. To verify the test hypothesis 200 male children 12 to 16 years old, 100 each from normal and delinquent population were chosen by employing respectively the methods of random and purposive sampling. The subjects were given Hindi version of Jr. Sr. HSPQ (1967) Form B. Results indicated that normal and suspected delinquents differed significantly in 9 factors. Delinquents have been found to be more sizothymic, lower in intelligence, higher in excitability, more desurgent, having higher guilt-proneness and lower ergic tension.

In another study, Bhaumik and Kundu (1983) compared the personality qualities of 50 delinquents (mean age 13 to 16 years) and 50 non-delinquents (mean age 13.8 years). The subjects were administered 'The Ravan Standard progressive matrices' (SPM) SES, language spoken, educational attainment and T.A.T. Results revealed that delinquents showed significantly more aggression, frustration and anxiety than the non-delinquents.

Personality and its relation with antisocial behaviour was studied by Berman and Timothy (1985) on 30 American juvenile males of 14 to 17 years. The subjects were administered the Eysenck's personality questionnaire and sensation-seeking scale form. Results indicated that the subjects who were convicted for assultive offenses exhibited significantly higher psychotism,
extraversion and neuroticism scores and lower lie scores than those convicted for property offenses.

A sample of early adolescent boys was tested and interviewed at entry to training school on a battery of personality and ability measures by Hundleby (1986). Similarly, a sample of public boys was also tested but not interviewed. A follow-up interview after three years was again taken. Results indicated that the indices of recidivism were only poorly predicted.

Patterns of personality deviation among violent offenders were analysed by Blackburn (1986). The Special Hospital's Assessment of Personality & Socialisation (S.H.A.P.S.) was used with male patients who were violent offenders. Results revealed that primary & secondary psychopath groups scored high on first factor, which measures hostility towards or rejection of others, easily aroused anger and the direct expression of anger. The two groups differed in second factor, which includes poor self esteem and avoidance with self acceptance.

Personality needs of non-delinquent and delinquent (wandering and theft) boys was studied by Kannappan and Kalliappan, (1988). The sample comprised of 35 non-delinquents studying in 6th to 10th standard, and 132 delinquents (101 wandering and 31 theft) studying in 6th to 10th standard in the age range of 13 to 18 years. The subjects were administered Sharma's Personality Need Inventory. The results indicated that the delinquent groups (wandering) score high in need achievement, need affiliation and need change of personality than non-delinquent group. While the
other delinquent group (theft) scores higher in need achievement and need order of personality than non-delinquents.

Role of personality characteristics in coping behaviour was examined by Nakano (1992). He administered coping check-list (Folkman and Lazarus, 1980) and the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (Cattell, Eber, and Tatsuoka, 1970) to the subjects. The results revealed that extroverted individuals showed more social support than did introverted individuals.

A comparative analysis of extra version, neuroticism and interest-patterns among delinquents and non-delinquents was done by Gupta (1992). A sample of 30 delinquent boys and control group of 30 non-delinquent boys in the age group of 8 to 16 years were administered Eysenck’s Maudsley personality Inventory (MPI) and Chatterji’s Non-Language Preference Record (CNPR-Form 962). Results revealed no significant differences with regard to Neuroticism between delinquents and non-delinquents children on the dimensions of extraversion. Delinquents were found to be scoring significantly lesser than non-delinquents.

In another study carried out by Krishna (1993) 200 urban based male adolescents in the age range of 13 to 15 years were administered the Juvenile Delinquency Inventory, Eysenck Personality Inventory, Manifest Anxiety Scale and Guilt Inventory to examine the impact of personality factors on delinquent behaviour. The findings reveal that the adolescent with high delinquent behaviour are more neurotic, extraverted, anxious and suffer more from guilt-feeling as compared to those with low
delinquent behaviour. Further, delinquent behaviour shows positive relationships with neuroticism, extraversion, anxiety, hostility and morality dimensions of guilt.

SELF-CONCEPT

Psychologists refer to personality as the self or the self concept. Self concept usually refers to a (presumably integrated) combination of perceptions and beliefs about oneself, whether or not accurate.

Self-concept as a predictor of delinquency has been conceptualized by Lively, Dimitz and Reckless (1962). A cross-sectional assessment of 12 to 15 years old children, suggests that the direction of socialization and an unfavourable self image are the most tangible components of insulation against a propulsion towards delinquency.

Epstein (1963) found impressive similarity between a delinquent and a non-delinquent group with regard to structural properties of the self. But in the context of self concept, significant differences were found. The delinquents' self-portrayal was highly negativistic of self and of future goals than that of non delinquents.

Self concept of the delinquent boys from intact homes and broken homes were studied by Song (1969). It was hypothesized that boys from intact homes would show relatively higher self-concept, self-acceptance and ideal self-scores. One hundred subjects were
used in the present study in the age range 13 to 17 years. Their I.Q. ranged from 80 to 125. It was discussed that love and affection are indispensable in the development of positive and accurate self-concept variable. Children from broken homes lack these ingredients, and are found to be severely deprived and rejected hence show relatively lower self-concept.

Thibaut (1971) studied patterns of self-perception, perception of parental attitudes towards the self and ego defense in delinquents and non-delinquents. A self-concept questionnaire and Rosenweig picture frustration study were administered to 36 institutionalized delinquents and 29 non-delinquent students in the age-range of 12 to 15 years. The results revealed that delinquents and non-delinquent did not differ in their self-concept and in the image of self, they ascribe to their parents. The delinquents with favourable self reports were higher on ego defense measure than non-delinquents with similar self-reports.

Thompson (1974) compared three groups designated as adjusted, mal-adjusted and having appeared before a court by their teachers. Subjects were tested for self-concept by a Semantic Differential Scale. It was concluded that delinquents rated themselves less favourably than maladjusted pupils and maladjusted less favourably than well adjusted.

In a behaviour modification treatment programme, the self-concept of delinquents was studied by Eitzen (1976). He administered a questionnaire with a semantic differential measure of self-concept several times during the stay on 16 male delinquents in a reformatory home. A control group of 82 male of
8th grade was also given the questionnaire once. It was concluded that previously delinquent group had more negative feelings about themselves than the control group, but during the completion of their stay they had much more positive self-concept. This shift in self-evaluation was concomitant with a shift in how the subjects perceived that significant others (mother, friends and teacher) evaluated them.

Martinez, Hays and Solway (1979) compared 30 delinquents and 30 non-delinquents in the age-range of 12 to 16 years, the factors that correlates with juvenile delinquency including self-concept, perception of family environment, attitude towards school and level of aspiration were taken for comparison. Subjects were matched for age and socioeconomic status and were administered Piers-Harris self-concept scale, the family environment scale, and school attitude scale. Results revealed that non-delinquent subjects score higher on self-concept, school attitude and level of aspiration than delinquents.

In a study Suzuki, Nishimur and, Takashashi (1984) attempted to extract patterns of self concept among 1,422 junior high school students and 2,073 senior high school students to determine conditions conducive to juvenile delinquency. Three types of self-concept were identified among delinquents they are, sense of unfulfilment, lack of egonism and feeling of powerlessness.

In another study Eyo (1984) investigated the relationship between need for social approval (NSA) as defensiveness need and self concept in the age-range 14 to 22 years and 208 non-
delinquents in the age range 14 to 20 years. Subjects were administered the children's social desirability scale and the Tennessee self-concept scale. Findings revealed that need for social approval and self-concept relate more poorly for deviants than for non-deviants.

Leung and Lauging (1989) examined relationship between self-concept and delinquent behaviour and hypothesized that perceived approval of delinquent behaviour might be related to the frequency of their occurrence. The subjects for the study, 1668 students in the age range 11 to 16 years in grades 7 to 9 were given a questionnaire. The analysis revealed that poor academic self-concept and poor relationship with school and parents were related to a higher frequency of delinquent behaviour. Further it was analysed that higher frequency of delinquent behaviour was related to a more positive self-concept with regard to social and physical ability and also higher perceived approval from parents of peers was related to more delinquent behaviour.

SOCIOCENIC VIEWS OF DELINQUENCY

Sociogenic approach assumes that juvenile delinquent is not an isolated offender but rather a product of society. In the view of sociological theorists delinquent conduct originates in the abnormalities of the juvenile's social existence or the behaviour of the society towards him. Sociological factors include child's relation in family environment, school environment and his relations with sibling and peers. Various studies have been
carried out in this context. A few relevant studies have been cited here.

FAMILY

Broken homes have been believed to be one of the most influential factors causing delinquency (Bakwin, 1955; Hennessy and Palmella, 1978; Marino and Cavan, 1977; Sikka, 1979; Song, 1969).

Reiss (1952) described various social correlates of psychological type which may result into delinquency. Another study by Srivastava (1959) conducted on 300 families of male vagrants between 7 to 18 years of age revealed that broken homes, family structure, marital and extra marital relationship, parental habits and addictions, patterns of inter-personal relations in the family were thought to be responsible for delinquent behaviour.

Similarly, Andry (1960) studied 80 delinquent and 80 non-delinquent boys and their parents. The sample was checked upon Bowlby’s concept of maternal-deprivation. Results revealed that relationship of delinquent boys was more satisfactory with their mother than their fathers. Further, delinquents had less communication with their fathers and suffered from inadequate post-infancy training specially from their fathers. The delinquents were more aggressive to stress situation, less constructive in outside social activities. Cortes & Gatti (1972) found that delinquents more often came from broken homes than did a control groups. This finding was in line with Bennett (1960), Glueck & Glueck (1956).
A comparison of 40 delinquent males (median age 16 years) and 42 non-delinquents (median age 15 years) was made by Deitz (1969). It was observed that delinquents were less accepting, less closely identified with their parents and feel less understood by their parents. Since socioeconomic status was held constant, it was suggested that delinquency should be explained through personal conflict as rooted within family processes.

Maskin and Brookin (1974) with a sample of 126 females in the age-range of 13 to 17 years, studied the effects of parental composition on recidivism rates in delinquent girls. They divided their sample into three categories according to their parental composition:

1. Thirty subjects lived with single parent.
2. Fifty six subjects lived with natural parents.
3. Forty subjects lived with foster parents.

All groups were equated on age, I.Q. academic grade in school and nature of offense. Chi-square analysis indicated significant difference in recidivism rates between groups in both residential and after care programme. It was concluded that broken homes are predictor of delinquency and consequent recidivism, marital adjustment, family solidarity and agreement appear to be highly related to successful treatment of the delinquents and that therapeutic approaches should concentrate on the parents and family, as well as on the offenders.

There is effect of parent absence on children’s behaviour. Broken homes was found to be responsible for causing delinquency
among children (Marino, Cavan & Richard, 1977). In another study Rao and Sen (1979) investigated the salient features of home-background of delinquent children and observed that defective parental discipline, parental rejection, poverty, large size family, personal and social maladjustment, insecurity, excessive use of repression, introversion, aggression and high need for achievement are characteristics of such homes.

Adjustment among major hard rural and major casual rural delinquent children was examined by Wangu and Marual (1987). The subjects were 80 juvenile delinquents who were administered Bell’s Adjustment Inventory. Results indicated that major hard rural delinquents show high positive correlates of total adjustment with home, health and emotional environment, and major casual rural delinquents were also found to have positive correlation with home, health and emotional adjustment.

Tygard (1991) explored about the general analytical model, that increase in family size & decrease in family lead towards greater peer group influences and ultimately increase delinquency. The subjects for the study were 400 Male and 400 Female of 10th grade. Data supported that most of the relationship between increase in family size and greater delinquency was attributable to the greater delinquency rates of middle rank order siblings.

A comparison was made by Le Blanc (1992) between importance and organisation of the family characteristics that explain self reported delinquency at different moments in time and adult criminality later. A questionnaire was completed by 458 male adolescents of age 12 - 16 years and it was concluded that early
adolescent offending was the result of a specific mix of structural, environmental, bonding and constraint factors in which family attachment and parental supervision have an equal direct impact on delinquency. Further it was analysed that during late adolescence, structural factors are absent and only constraint variables show a direct relationship with self-reported delinquency.

An association between patterns of family functioning and level of ego development was established by Novy, GAA, and Frankiewicz (1992). They analysed that lower levels of ego development were associated with shared dysfunctional perspectives of family dimensions by the juvenile offender and parents.

Another study conducted by Henry, Moffitt, and Robins (1993) tested the utility of 29 maternal and family characteristics for identifying children who are at high risk for antisocial and delinquent outcomes. Three groups of 11 year old children (50 antisocial, 37 other disordered and 220 non-disordered) were compared on family variables. Nine variables were found to differentiate anti-social children from non-disordered children.

Adolescent runaways behaviour was observed by Deman, Dolan, and Pelletier (1993) in a sample of 347 boys and girls. Results suggested that runaways tend to be boys and girls who come from incomplete families where relationships with the parents was perceived as difficult, who had depressed and suicidal thoughts and a drug use and theft.
FAMILY RELATIONS

The effect of parent-child relationships on children’s subsequent behaviour patterns was studied by Thilagraj (1983) by interviewing 40 delinquent boys and their parents. Results showed that 60 percent of subjects reported parental attitudes of indifference which lead subjects to delinquency. Because of the feelings of insecurity and craving for recognition and affection they became delinquents. Further parents reported insufficient time and occupational constraints as factors accounting for their inattention towards children. About 32 percent of subjects experienced hostility or rejection due to parental conflicts and lack of co-operation. 17.5 percent subjects reported overly strict or inconsistent parental discipline as the cause of delinquent behaviour. While 40 percent subjects whose mothers were employed tended to become delinquents because of absence of maternal supervision. 54 percent of parents were engaged in constant quarreling while 21 percent had normal relationship. 12.5 percent families had separated parents or had been deserted by male parent. Thus unhealthy parent-child relationship was suggested to be the sufficient cause of delinquency. In a study by Stephen (1993) the relationship between perceived family conditioning, attribution of responsibility and juvenile delinquency has been examined. Three subtypes of delinquents were identified: Conduct disorder, Generalised problems and anxious withdrawn. Delinquents were found to differ from others in the family functioning and attribution measures. The data analysis partially confirmed the
hypothesis that delinquents and their parents differed in the degree to which they accept the responsibility for deviant behaviour, and also that delinquents are more likely to be found in families usually have low or high levels of conflicts. McCord (1991) analysed family relationships, juvenile delinquency and adult criminality. The results suggested that the causes of juvenile crime are different from those of adult criminality. Juvenile delinquency was found to be related to maternal competence and high expectations, but adult criminality could be explained through components based on role expectations. Both adolescent and parental perception of how family members interact with and feel about one another were examined by Krohn, Stern and Thornberry (1992) to determine their relationship to official and self-reported delinquent behaviour. It was found that adolescent perceptions of family processes were weakly related to those of their parents. Parental measures contributed more towards explaining official data than did adolescent measures when compared to the results for self-reported delinquency. Family violence as determinant factor in juvenile mal-adjustment was explored by Osuna, Alarcon and Luna (1992). A total of 189 young people (110 boys and 79 girls) were studied. The subject’s age ranged from 11-18 years. It was found that aggressive behaviour rules, norms, values, opinions and attitudes towards aggressiveness can be held responsible for delinquent behaviour. In a recent investigation by Kruttschmitt and Dornfield (1993) indicated that the age at which offending begins has link with the frequency, severity and duration of subsequent offending. Further exposure to family violence has been related to a variety of early behaviour problems as well as subsequent delinquency and adult
offences. Cuddle (1993) concluded that if proper training is given for fatherhood then offences by young children may be reduced.

**PEERS AND SIBLING RELATIONS**

Association with sibling, size of the family and cognitive abilities are important factors which may effect delinquent behaviour (Rosenberg, 1966). Relation with peers and sibling and its impact on delinquent behaviour has also been explored. Rowe, Rodger and Maseck-Bushey (1992) studied sibling delinquency and family environment by a sibling research design to evaluate shared and unshared environmental influences on delinquency. Sibling correlations for birth orders one to four in family sizes of two, three and four siblings were compared. Taking a sample of 5863 adolescents siblings aged 15 to 22 years. On analysis, no unshared family environmental influences were found for sisters and for mixed sex siblings but that it may exist for brothers. Results support a shared model or familial resemblance rather than one based on unshared environmental influences except for brothers. Brother-brother pairs had slightly high correlations than sister-sister pairs and substantially higher correlation for the mixed sex pairs.

Roff (1992) in another study gathered measures of aggression, peer status and social class during the subjects childhood which were assessed as predictors of later delinquency. Results revealed that aggression was the most significant predictor of delinquency and social class as the second, while childhood peer status emerged as a significant predictor of later adjustment. Pabon and Gurin (1992) argue that peer relationships among delinquents provide a
sense of group belongingness which also provide opportunities for learning and development in the field of delinquency and substance use. Friendship characteristics of delinquent adolescents and non-delinquent adolescents were compared by Claes and Simard (1992). Data were collected by questionnaire administered to 92 youths from delinquent shelter and 352 non-delinquent high school students in the age range 14 - 18 years. It was found that delinquents had more friends and were interested in opposite sex. Delinquents usually made their friends outside school while non-delinquents in their schools. Delinquent teens were more likely to view conventional peers, delinquent peers and life styles, or no one at all as influencing their sense of self and identity. They were less likely to perceive parents and other adults as influential.

Parents and peers and their relationship with delinquency was recognised by Warr (1993). He argues that if peers are treated as potential stimulators of delinquency (following differential association theory) and parents as potential barriers to delinquency following control theory it is possible to counteract parental influence with delinquent peers. Analysis of data reveals that the amount of time spent with family is indeed capable of reducing and even eliminating peer influence. By contrast, attachment to parents apparently has no direct effect on delinquency nor does it counterbalance the influence of delinquent friends. The results also suggest that weekend time spent in the company of the family may have the greatest preventive effect on delinquency.
Warr (1993) in another study analysed the data from National Youth Survey on persons aged 11 - 21 years which reveals that peer relations (exposure to delinquent peers, time spent with peers, loyalty to peers) change dramatically over this age span. It was suggested that if measures of peer influence are controlled, than the effects of age on self-reported delinquency are largely rendered insignificant.

In a study conducted by Esbensen, Huizinga and Weiner (1993) it was observed that juvenile gangs are contributory factors for delinquent behaviour. Another study, in which juvenile gangs were found to facilitate delinquent behaviour, was carried out by Thornberry, Krohn and Lizotte (1993). They noticed that gang members, as compared to non-gang members did not have higher rates of delinquent behaviour before entering into the gang, but once they become members, their rates increased substantially. Moreover, when gang members left the gang, their rates of delinquency typically were reduced.

SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

Another important factor influencing, is school environment which affects delinquent behaviour. A research investigating academic, behavioural and social competencies of handicapped and non-handicapped adjudicated youth was done by Campbell (1990). ANOVA indicated statistically significant differences between non-handicapped, learning disabled, and emotionally or behaviourally disordered adjudicated juveniles in reading achievement,
mathematics achievement, and teacher generated measures of classroom behaviour.

Juvenile misbehaviour as related to school was analysed by Driscoll (1992). It was explored that juvenile misbehaviour not only harms individual but also society in general. Hirschi's social control theory proposes that juveniles become delinquent because they have failed to form or maintain a bond to society. Four hundred twenty eight delinquent completed self-report questionnaire. The subjects were in the 7 to 9 grade. Three years later the same questionnaire was again administered. It was concluded that juveniles with strong attachments to parents and school were less involved in juvenile misbehaviour.

Tremblay (1992) studies early disruptive behaviour, poor school achievement, delinquent behaviour and delinquent personality. Regarding school achievement it was analysed that it is not a necessary factor causing delinquent behaviour.

SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

In addition to family, siblings and peers, social environment is an important factor responsible for the development of delinquency among the children. Many studies have been conducted in this field. For example Keplan and Johnson (1991) studied elaborate base line model in which negative social sanction is modelled as a consequence of prior deviance and having direct, and indirect effects on later deviance. Results support the argument that the reinforcement of deviant behaviour occurs via the effects of negative sanctions on increasing alienation from the conventional
world, increasing interaction with deviant peers and motivating
the person to positive value and identity with deviant status.

The relationship among perceived social support, self-esteem
and perceived stress in delinquent adolescent was examined by
Weidemann (1991). Subjects were 39 male residents in the age range
of 13 - 18 years. Social support questionnaire, the perceived
stress scale were used. It was found that social support and
perceived stress did not differ significantly from college
samples, but self-esteem was significantly higher than a general
junior school population. A significant relationship was not found
for social support with self-esteem or stress.

Davis (1993) explained psychological and sociological factors
for explaining delinquency and emergence and persistence of
juvenile gangs.

Brownfield and Sorenson (1993) concluded that the self-
reported delinquency was affected by time spent on home work and
parental attachment as well as measures of peer delinquency and
belief.

Social functioning and delinquency was studied by Hollins and
Swaffer (1993). For this study a delinquent sample between 15 and
20 years of age was examined in the field of social cognition and
social performance. Results indicated that while social perception
scores correlated with social performance scores, scores on social
problem solving task did not correlate with either social
perception or social performance.
In a study by Oyserman and Saltz (1993) it was hypothesised that social and communication skills will influence delinquency directly and indirectly through their effects on impulsivity, balance and attempts to attain possible selves. These factors discriminated well between high school and incarcerated youth.

Junger and Polder (1993) examined the relationship between religiosity and delinquent behaviour. The results showed that there is modest relation between religiosity and delinquent behaviour.

Agnew (1994) examined the intervening mechanism between 'Social Control' variables and delinquency and concluded that social control variables also cause delinquency because they lead to strain and association with delinquent peers.

The above referred review of literature explains that many demographic, biological, psychological and sociological factors are responsible for the development of delinquency in the children. A careful application of these researches may prove useful for the eradication of delinquency in order to develop a healthy society.
CHAPTER THREE

PROBLEMS AND HYPOTHESES