



SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS AFFECTING TO JUVENILE DELINQUENCY: A STUDY CONDUCTED AT BORSTAL JAILS OF PUNJAB

Mudassar Javed¹

Zarqa Azhar²

Haq Nawaz Anwar³

Malik Muhammad Sohail⁴

ABSTRACT

This study aims to explore the socio-economic factors effecting juvenile delinquency. The research was conducted at Faisalabad and Bahawalpur Borstal jails of Punjab. The main objectives of the study were to find out the background characteristics of the Juveniles, to explore social factors that influence on juvenile delinquency and to identify the economic factors that influence on juvenile delinquency. Quantitative approach was used to find out appropriate results and simple random sampling was used to collect data. Sample size of 140 respondents had been taken through simple random sampling. It was concluded in the present study that peers' negative influence, low income of family, family conflict, revenge, low literacy level and lack of parent supervision of their children were the main case of juvenile delinquency.

Key Words: Social Factor, Economic Factor, Borstal Jails.

INTRODUCTION

Juvenile delinquency refers to criminal acts committed by children or teenagers, particularly anyone below the age of eighteen. Common sentiment on this issue is that the crimes they commit hurt society and hurt the children themselves. The research is mainly focused on the causes of juvenile delinquency and which strategies have successfully diminished crime rates among the youth population. Though the causes are debated and controversial as well, much of the debate

¹ Scholar, Department of Sociology, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan

² Lecturer, Department of Sociology, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan

³ Chairman and Professor, Department of Sociology, G C University, Faisalabad, Pakistan

⁴ Visiting Lecturer, National Textile University, Faisalabad, Pakistan

revolves around the punishment and rehabilitation of juveniles in a youth detention center or elsewhere (Khalid, 2001). There are two different types of offenders that emerge in adolescence. One is the repeat offender, referred to as the life-course-persistent offender, who begins offending or showing antisocial/aggressive behavior in adolescence (or even childhood) and continues into adulthood ; and the age specific offender, referred to as the adolescence-limited offender, for whom juvenile offending or delinquency begins and ends during their period of adolescence (Moffitt, 2006). Delinquency a legal term for criminal behavior carried out by a juvenile is often the result of Escalating problematic behavior. Definitions of delinquency vary among different groups. To alleviate confusion we describe four perspectives on delinquency. According to first perspective that is a parental view about juvenile delinquency Parents may define disruptive and delinquent behavior as disobedience fighting with siblings destroying or damaging property stealing money from family members or threatening parents with violence. Second perspective is educational view about juvenile delinquency School staff members often regard delinquent behavior as that which interrupts or disturbs classroom learning violates the school code of conduct and threatens the safety of faculty and students. Third perspective is mental health view about juvenile delinquency (Steinberg, 1996).

The American public ranked crime as the most important problem had been facing the nation in 1999 (Gallup Organization, 1999). Juvenile crime, in particular, has received a great deal of attention from the public, the media (Washington Post 1999, Los Angeles Times 1999, Newsweek 1999), and social scientists. Some analysts argue that very little, if anything, can be done to discourage young Americans from participating in illegal activities. For example, DiIulio, (1996) indicates that urban ethnographers believe that today's crime-prone youngsters are too present oriented for any type of conventional criminal deterrence to work (Washington Post, 1999). In recent years, an increase in the number of juvenile delinquents has sparked interest and concern about juvenile delinquent behaviors and the effectiveness of the juvenile justice system. Many researchers and policy makers regard juvenile delinquency as one of the world's most critical social issues (Tarolla et al. 2002).

One of the most important issues in crime today is juvenile delinquency. Till 19th century, children who committed crimes faced about the same punishment as an adult criminals like public shaming, incarceration and even execution by hanging. Towards end of 19th century, reformers such as Jane Addams of Chicago worked to develop a new system of justice designed to protect the abused children from harm and reform trouble making youth (Nagaraja, 2011). The first court of justice for children was established in 1899 in state of Illinois's America and juvenile justice act come into effect in America from 1899. On July 3rd 1899, the first case of juvenile came for court hearing in America, the child named Henry Campbell, 11 years was arrested on the complaint of his mother, charging him with larceny. The juvenile court judge 'Reachedstuthill' held the nation's first juvenile court hearing in America and he disposed the case without charging him with offence as an informal one (ibid). Over subsequent decades, other states followed Illinois' lead and juvenile

courts developed into a firm system trying to balance the protection and punishment. Juvenile court judges acted as doctors trying to diagnose the environmental factors that threatened to hurt kids or lead them astray. Industrialization and urbanization lead a tremendous role in the modern era of juvenile delinquency. Violence is a learned behavior and it is often learned in the home from parents and family members or the community, friends, peers or neighbors. Children in these situations are more aggressive and grow up more likely to become involved in violence either as victim or as an offender especially if they witness violent acts. The home is fertile breeding ground for violent behavior. Children who are exposed to domestic violence are more likely to abuse others as they grow older. Juvenile crimes often vary depending on the region, community and society (Doris, 2000).

Research Objectives

- ▶ To find out the background characteristics of the Juveniles
- ▶ To explore social factors that influence on juvenile delinquency
- ▶ To identify the economic factors that influence on juvenile delinquency.

Table-1: Conceptual framework

Background variable	Independent Variable	Dependent
Age	Peer group	Juvenile delinquency
Education	Media	
Family Income	Family Environment	
Mother's Education	Family Behavior	
Father's Education	Family structure	

Hypothesis

Hypothesis 1: Family structure is associated with the juvenile delinquency.

Hypothesis 2: Peer group is negatively highly correlated with juvenile delinquency.

Hypothesis 3: Family behavior has a great influence on juvenile delinquency.

Hypothesis 4: Family environment accompanies juvenile delinquency.

Theoretical Framework

Anomie Theory

Merton's Anomie theory is that when there is a discrepancy between the institutionalized means that are available within the environment and the goal that individual have learnt to aspire for in their environment, strain of frustration is produced and norms break down and deviant behavior may result. Merton, thus does not discuss individual motivational factor in deviance, (that is in selecting one of the five alternative modes of behavior suggested by him) of he fails to explain why all person in similar situation do not choose deviance (Khalid, 2001).

Gang Theory

Frederick Thrasher's Gang Theory concentrates on group delinquency and explains positive peer influence as Cohen's Cloward's, and Miller's Theories did later on. Thrasher does not say that the gang is a cause of delinquency but he says that gang facilitates delinquency. Explaining the process whereby a group takes on certain behavioral characteristics and then transmits them to its members, he says that a gang originates during the adolescent years from spontaneous play groups and conflict with other groups transform it into a gang for protecting its members rights and satisfying the needs which their environments and their family could not provide. Gradually the gang develops distinct characteristics such a mode of operation, and dissemination criminal techniques, excites mutual interest and attitude and provide protection to its member. Thrasher emphasized the point that not all gang activates were necessarily devious and that much of the gang members, time was spent in normal athletic activities as well as in other teenage endeavors. His thesis thus mainly describes how environmental pressure is conducive to delinquent behavior (Khalid, 2001).

Mead's Role Theory and Theory of the Self

George Herbert's Mead's Role Theory and Theory of The Self explains why only a limited number of persons assume criminal identities while majority of the people remain law abiding. He says becoming a delinquent and assuming a criminal identity involves more than merely associating with law violators. Such association has to be meaningful to the individual and supportive of the role and self concept that he wants to be committed (Khalid, 2001).

Research Methodology

Quantitative research method was applied to investigate the problem. Universe for this study was comprised on juveniles of borstal jail Faisalabad and Bahawalpur. There were total 280 juvenile delinquents in both borstal jails (184 in Borstal Jail Faisalabad and 96 in Borstal Jail Bahawalpur). A sample of 140 respondents from both Jails i.e. (92 from Borstal Jail Faisalabad and 48 from Borstal Jail Bahawalpur) were selected by using simple random sampling technique. Data were collected with the help of a well-designed interview schedule. Before starting actual data collection activity pre-testing on 20 respondents was carried out to examine the workability and sensitivity of the questionnaire. Pre-testing helped to check out the reliability of research tool.

Analysis of Data

Data were analyzed through various statistical techniques as, univariate /descriptive, bivariate and multivariate techniques. In univariate analysis such as frequency, percentage and measures of central tendency (mean, standard deviation) were used to describe the data. In bivariate analysis, relationship among different variables was examined through applying chi-square and gamma tests. This revolutionary statistical analytical software system was called SPSS that stood for the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Nie et al. (1968) developed SPSS out of the need to quickly analyze volumes of the social science data gathered through various methods of research techniques. The SPSS was used first time at Stanford University. SPSS is the one of the most

widely used software packages in the world of social sciences. It has been very crucial in facilitating the data of research using individuals as well as discrete units of analysis (Wellman, 1998). Further it is clear that SPSS technology has made difficult analytical targets easier by advances in usability and to data access and also enabling the researchers to benefit from the use of quantitative techniques in making decisions. It helps researcher to input the data on computer and can save time from the laborious and exhaustive work of an analysis.

DATA ANALYSIS

Part-A (Uni-variate analysis)

Table-1: Demographic Details

Items	Frequency	Percentage
Age (in years)		
13-15 years	15	10.7
16-17 years	59	42.1
18-19 years	66	47.1
Income (Rs.)		
5000-15000	91	65.0
15000-45000	42	30.0
Above 45000	7	5.0
Education level		
Uneducated	39	27.9
Primary	35	25.0
Middle	38	27.1
Metric	23	16.4
FA	5	3.6
Family type		
Nuclear	103	73.6
Joint	30	21.4
Extended	7	5.0
Total	140	100

Table-1 indicates that more than one-fourth i.e. 27.9 percent of the respondents were uneducated, while one-fourth i.e. 25 percent of them were primary passed, 27.1 percent of them were middle, 16.4 percent of them were matriculated and only 3.6 percent of the respondents were FA. Table also depicts that 10.7 percent of the respondents had 13015 years, while 42.1 percent of them had 16-17 years of age and a substantial proportion i.e. 27.1 percent of them had 18-19 years of age. Table-1 also reveals that a large majority i.e. 73.6 percent of the respondents were in nuclear family system, while 21.4 percent of them were living in joint family system and only 5.0 percent of the respondents were living in extended family system. Table indicates that a large majority i.e. 65.0 percent of the respondents had Rs. 5001-15000 monthly family income, 30.0 percent of them had Rs. 15001-45000 and remaining 5.0 percent of them had above Rs. 45000 monthly family incomes. So majority of the criminals belonged to low economic class.

Table-2: Distribution of the respondents for type of crime which they committed

Type of crime	Frequency	Percentage
Murder	48	34.3
Theft	18	12.9
Dacoity	23	16.4
Pickpocket	2	1.4
Kidnapping	5	3.6
Prohibition abduction & rape	17	12.1
Narcotics	8	5.7
Any other	19	13.6
Total	140	100.0

Table-2 presents the type of crime which they committed. About one-third i.e. 34.3 percent of the respondents were involved in Murder case, while 12.9 percent of them told that they committed murder and 16.4 percent of them said that they involved in Dacoity. About 1.4 percent of the respondents of the respondents involved in pickpocket, 3.6 percent of them committed kidnapping, 12.1 percent of them involved in prohibition abduction and rape, 5.7 percent of them were involved in narcotics and 13.6 percent of them were involved in any others.

Table-3 presents the respondents' opinion about the family structure. Almost 13 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 22.9 percent of them were agreed that they felt that traditional way of family control has decreased these days, while a majority i.e. 63.6 percent of them was strongly disagreed with this opinion. Only 8.6 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and about one-fifth i.e. 20.0 percent of them were agreed that the thinking that lack of parental control is responsible for juvenile delinquency, while 2.9 percent of them were somewhat agreed and a large majority i.e. 69.3 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. About 16.4 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 17.1 percent of them were agreed that the thinking that a poor economical situation is major cause of delinquency, while 2.9 percent of them were somewhat agreed and a majority i.e. 62.1 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion.

Only 7.1 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 12.1 percent of them were agreed that the thinking that the lack of efficient link/communication among family members cause of delinquency, while 2.1 percent of them were somewhat agreed and a vast majority i.e. 77.1 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. About 13.6 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 12.1 percent of them were agreed that the thinking that improper socialization is responsible for juvenile delinquency, while 0.7 percent of them were somewhat agreed and a large majority i.e. 73.6 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. About 11.4 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 16.4 percent of them were agreed that they felt lack of supervision of parents become the cause of delinquency, while 0.7 percent of them were somewhat agreed and a large majority i.e. 71.4 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. About 16.4 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and little less than one-third

i.e. 30.7 percent of them were agreed that they felt disorganization in the family system is making youth delinquent, while 1.4 percent of them were somewhat agreed and more than a half i.e. 55.0 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion.

Table-3: Distribution of the respondents following their opinion about family structure

Family structure	Strongly agree		Agree		Somewhat		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%
I feel that traditional way of family control has decreased these days.	18	12.9	32	22.9	1	0.7	0	0.0	89	63.6
You think that lack of parental control is responsible for juvenile delinquency.	12	8.6	28	20.0	3	2.1	0	0.0	97	69.3
A poor economical situation is major cause of delinquency.	23	16.4	24	17.1	4	2.9	0	0.0	87	62.1
The lack of efficient link/communication among family members cause of delinquency.	10	7.1	17	12.1	3	2.1	2	1.4	108	77.1
I think that improper socialization is responsible for juvenile delinquency.	19	13.6	17	12.1	1	0.7	0	0.0	103	73.6
I feel that lack of supervision of parents become the cause of delinquency.	16	11.4	23	16.4	1	0.7	0	0.0	100	71.4
I feel that disorganization in the family system is making youth delinquent.	23	16.4	43	30.7	2	1.4	0	0.0	77	55.0
I agree that criminal family background also effect on children's socialization.	30	21.4	10	7.1	7	5.0	0	0.0	93	66.4

Slightly more than one-fifth i.e. 21.4 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 7.1 percent of them were agreed that the criminal family background also effect on children's socialization, while a majority i.e. 66.4 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion.

Table-4: Distribution of the respondents following their opinion their family behavior

Family behavior	Strongly agree		Agree		Somewhat		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%
You feel free and comfortable talking to your parent/guardian about anything.	5	3.6	25	17.9	4	2.9	0	0.0	106	75.7
You ever experience violence in your home.	38	27.1	44	31.4	14	10.0	0	0.0	44	31.4

You obey the orders passed by your parents related to several issues of life.	4	2.9	69	49.3	16	11.4	7	5.0	44	31.4
I feel that conflict between the parents is the cause of delinquency.	5	3.6	64	45.7	1	0.7	0	0.0	70	50.0
You think that your parents are satisfied your everyday activities.	5	3.6	82	58.6	5	3.6	0	0.0	48	34.3
Your father gives you clear direction for your behavior.	101	72.1	32	22.9	2	1.4	0	0.0	5	3.6

Table-4 presents the respondents' opinion about the family behavior. Only 17.9 percent of respondents were agreed that they felt free and comfortable talking to their parents/guardian about anything, while a huge majority i.e. 75.7 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. More than one-fourth i.e. 27.1 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 31.4 percent of them were agreed that they ever experience violence in their home, while 10.0 percent of them were somewhat agreed and 31.4 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. Only 3.6 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and a major proportion i.e. 45.7 percent of them were agreed that they felt that conflict between the parents is the cause of delinquency, while 0.7 percent of them were somewhat agreed and 50.0 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. Only 3.6 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and a majority i.e. 58.6 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that their parents are satisfied with their everyday activities, while 3.6 percent of them were somewhat agreed and 34.3 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. A vast majority i.e. 72.1 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 22.9 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that their father gives them clear direction for their behavior, while 1.4 percent of them were somewhat agreed and 3.6 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. Table 5 present the respondents' opinion about the family environment. Almost 8 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and about a half i.e. 50.7 percent of them were agreed that their parents know about their friends, while 6.4 percent of them were somewhat agreed, 2.1 percent of them were disagreed and about one-third i.e. 32.9 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion.

Table-5: Distribution of the respondents following their opinion about family environment

Family environment	Strongly agree		Agree		Somewhat		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%
Your parents know about your friends.	11	7.9	71	50.7	9	6.4	3	2.1	46	32.9
Your parents check your daily activities.	10	7.1	89	63.6	2	1.4	3	2.1	36	25.7
You think that friendly environment of family have positive impact on your behavior.	12	88.4	7	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	6.4
Your parents support you for	13	95.4	5	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.4

getting education.	3	0
--------------------	---	---

Table-6: Distribution of the respondents following their opinion about peer group

Peer group	Strongly agree		Agree		Somewhat		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%
I spend most of the time with my friends.	34	24.3	55	39.3	1	0.7	2	1.4	39	27.9
My friends involve in bad deeds.	57	40.7	26	18.6	0	0.0	2	1.4	55	39.3
You think that your friends perform things that are against the law.	50	35.7	20	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	70	50.0
You think that your friends were members of any gang.	41	29.3	16	11.4	1	0.7	0	0.0	82	58.6
You agree that your friends involve in drug addicting.	39	27.9	15	10.7	2	1.4	1	0.7	83	59.3
You think that bad company of friend's effect negatively on you.	50	35.7	21	15.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	69	49.3
You think that bad company of friends forces you to drug addicting.	37	26.4	6	4.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	97	69.3
I feel that drug addicting force me to commit crime.	20	14.3	3	2.1	1	0.7	1	0.7	11	8.1
Your peer group motivated you to commit this crime.	36	25.7	19	13.6	1	0.7	0	0.0	84	60.0
You involved in Pete-crimes with your friends.	39	27.9	17	12.1	1	0.7	0	0.0	83	59.3

Almost 6 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and about a majority i.e. 63.6 percent of them were agreed that their parents had checking of their daily activities, while 1.4 percent of them were somewhat agreed, 2.1 percent of them were disagreed and about one-third i.e. 25.7 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. A huge majority i.e. 88.6 percent of the respondents was strongly agreed and 5.0 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that friendly environment of family have positive impact on their behavior, while 6.4 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. A huge majority i.e. 95.0 percent of the respondents was strongly agreed and 3.6 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that their parents support them for getting education, while only 1.4 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. Table-6 presents the respondents' opinion about the peer group. About 39.3 percent were agreed that they spend most of the time with their friends. A major proportion i.e. 40.7 percent of the respondents was strongly agreed that their friends involve in bad deeds. More than one-third i.e. 35.7 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed with the thinking that their friends perform things that are against the law, while about a half i.e. 50.0 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. About 39.3 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed that their friends were members of any gang, only one respondent was somewhat agreed and a majority i.e. 58.6

percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. More than one-third i.e. 35.7 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 15.0 percent were agreed with the thinking that bad company of friends effect negatively on them and about a half i.e. 49.3 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. About one-fourth i.e. 26.4 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 4.3 percent were agreed with the thinking that bad company of friends forces them to drug addicting and a majority i.e. 69.3 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. About one-fourth i.e. 25.7 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 13.6 percent were agreed with that their peer group motivated them to commit this crime, only one respondent was somewhat disagreed and a majority i.e. 60.0 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion.

Table -7:Distribution of the respondents according to their opinion about mediaN = 140

Media	Strongly agree		Agree		Somewhat		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%
You understand that media has negative impact on you.	19	13.6	50	35.7	2	1.4	1	0.7	68	48.6
You follow the action of actor after watching movie.	9	6.4	12	8.6	1	0.7	0	0.0	118	84.3
You watch the action movies.	70	50.0	24	17.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	46	32.9
Media can be a cause of crime.	16	11.4	19	13.6	3	2.1	1	0.7	101	72.1
I think that violent movies motivate me to become criminal.	15	10.7	20	14.3	3	2.1	1	0.7	101	72.1

Table-7 presents the respondents' opinion about the media. About more than one-third i.e. 35.7 percent of them were agreed that they understand the media has negative impact on them, while a little less than a half i.e. 48.6 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. About a half i.e. 50.0 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed that they watch the action movies, while about one-third were strongly disagreed with this opinion.

About 11.4 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 13.6 percent of them were agreed that the media can be a cause of crime, while 2.1 percent of them were somewhat agreed; only one respondent was disagreed and a majority i.e. 72.1 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. About 10.7 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 14.3 percent of them were agreed with the thinking that violent movies motivate me to become criminal, while 2.1 percent of them were somewhat agreed; only one respondent was disagreed and a majority i.e. 72.1 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion.

Table-8: Distribution of the respondents according to their opinion about juvenile delinquency

Juvenile delinquency	Strongly agree		Agree		Somewhat		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%	F.	%
You destroy family property for purpose	43	30.7	22	15.7	0	0.0	1	0.7	74	52.9
Purposely damaged or destroyed property belonging to a school.	32	22.9	17	12.1	1	0.7	0	0.0	90	64.3
You tried to steal a motor vehicle, such as a car or motorcycle.	14	10.0	5	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	121	86.4
Stolen money or other things from your parents or other members of your Family	39	27.9	6	4.3	0	0.0	1	0.7	94	67.1
You Hit (or threatened to hit) one of your parents.	4	2.9	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.7	134	95.7
Had (or tried to have) sexual relations with someone against their will.	13	9.3	36	25.7	5	3.6	1	0.7	85	60.7
Used force (strong-arm methods) to get money or things from a teacher or other adult at school.	13	9.3	4	2.9	0	0.0	1	0.7	122	87.1
You destroy any public property	19	13.6	18	12.9	2	1.4	0	0.0	101	72.1
Been suspended from school.	35	25.0	23	16.4	2	1.4	0	0.0	80	57.1
Made obscene telephone calls, such as calling someone and saying dirty Things.	37	26.4	17	12.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	86	61.4
Commit the crime due to poverty	33	23.6	9	6.4	0	0.0	1	0.7	97	69.3
Was that an accidental incident/act done by you?	76	54.3	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	63	45.0
You commit this crime just to fulfill your own need	82	58.6	4	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	54	38.6

Table-8 presents the respondents' opinion about the juvenile delinquency. About 30.7 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 15.7 percent of them were agreed that they destroy family property for purpose, while only one respondent was disagreed and little more than a half i.e. 52.9 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. About 10.0 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 3.6 percent of them were agreed that "they tried to steal a motor vehicle, such as a car or motorcycle", while a huge majority i.e. 86.4 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. Almost 28 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed with the statement "stolen money or other things from their parents or other members of their family", while a majority i.e. 67.1 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. Almost 3 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and only one respondent was agreed with the statement "they hit (or threatened to hit) one of their parents", while one respondent was disagreed and a huge majority i.e. 95.7 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. So majority of the respondents never hit their parents. About one-fourth i.e. 25.7 percent of the respondents were agreed that they had (or tried to have) sexual relations with someone against their will, while one respondent was disagreed and majority i.e. 60.7 percent of them were strongly

disagreed with this opinion. So majority of the respondents never tried to have sexual relations with someone against their will.

About 13.6 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 12.9 percent of the respondents were agreed that they destroy public property. About one-fourth i.e. 25.0 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 16.4 percent of the respondents were agreed that they been suspended from school. About one-fourth i.e. 26.4 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and 12.1 percent of the respondents were agreed that they made absence telephone calls, such as calling someone and saying dirty things, while a majority i.e. 61.4 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. Little less than one-fourth i.e. 23.6 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed that they committed the crime due to poverty, while a large majority i.e. 69.3 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this opinion. More than a half i.e. 54.3 percent of the respondents were strongly agreed and only one respondent was disagreed that they were an accidental/act done by them and 45.0 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this statement. A majority i.e. 58.6 percent of the respondents was strongly agreed and 2.9 percent of them were disagreed that they commit this crime just to fulfill their own need and 38.6 percent of them were strongly disagreed with this statement.

Table-9: Indexation

Variable	No. of items in Matrix Question	No. of categories in Index variable	Min. Score	Max. Score	Mean Score	SD	Alpha value
Juvenile delinquency	14	5	23	71	44.32	8.16	.6987
Poor Family Structure	8	5	10	32	25.80	5.49	.7456
Family Behavior	6	5	7	22	15.85	2.60	.7309
Family Environment	4	5	4	18	7.62	2.13	.6801
Peer group	11	5	11	43	28.53	10.51	.9204

TESTING OF HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis-1: Family structure is associated with the juvenile delinquency.

Table-10: Association between family structure and juvenile delinquency

Family structure	Juvenile delinquency			Total
	Low	Medium	High	
Low	3 14.3%	4 19.1%	14 66.7%	21 100.0%
Medium	5 10.7%	24 52.2%	17 36.9%	46 100.0%
High	18	50	5	73

	24.7%	68.5%	6.8%	100.0%
Total	26	78	36	140
	18.6%	55.7%	25.7%	100.0%

Chi-square = 18.85, d.f = 4, significance = 0.006**, Gamma = -0.396, **= highly-significant

Table-10 presents the association between family structure and juvenile delinquency. Chi-square value shows a highly-significant association between family structure and the juvenile delinquency. Gamma value shows a negative relationship between the variables. It means poor family structure had more influence on the juvenile delinquency as compared to high family structure. So the hypothesis “Family structure will be influence the juvenile delinquency” is accepted.

Hypothesis-2:Family behavior has a great influence on juvenile delinquency

Table-11: Association between family behavior and juvenile delinquency

Family behavior	Juvenile delinquency			Total
	Low	Medium	High	
Low	3	13	6	22
	13.6%	59.1%	27.3%	100.0%
Medium	19	52	21	92
	20.7%	56.5%	22.8%	100.0%
High	4	13	9	26
	15.4%	50.0%	34.6%	100.0%
Total	26	78	36	140
	18.6%	55.7%	25.7%	100.0%

Chi-square = 1.97, d.f = 4, significance = 0.741^{NS}, Gamma = 0.057, NS = non-significant

Table-11 presents the association between family behavior and juvenile delinquency. Chi-square value shows a non-significant association between family behavior and juvenile delinquency. Gamma value also shows no relationship between the variables. It means family behavior never influence on the juvenile delinquency. So the hypothesis “Family behavior will be influence the juvenile delinquency” is rejected.

Hypothesis 3: Family environment accompanies juvenile delinquency.

Table-12: Association between family environment and juvenile delinquency

Family behavior	Juvenile delinquency			Total
	Low	Medium	High	
Low	1	7	4	12
	8.3%	58.3%	33.3%	100.0%
Medium	13	39	17	69
	18.8%	56.5%	24.6%	100.0%
High	12	32	15	59
	20.3%	54.2%	25.4%	100.0%
Total	26	78	36	140
	18.6%	55.7%	25.7%	100.0%

Chi-square = 1.12, d.f = 4, significance = 0.890^{NS}, Gamma = -0.076, NS = non-significant

Table-12 presents the association between family environment and juvenile delinquency. Chi-square value shows a non-significant association between family environment and juvenile delinquency. Gamma value also shows no relationship between the variables. It means family environment never influence on the juvenile delinquency. So the hypothesis “Family environment will be influence the juvenile delinquency” is rejected.

Hypothesis 4:Peer group is negatively highly correlated with juvenile delinquency.

Table-13: Association between peer group and juvenile delinquency

Peer group	Juvenile delinquency			Total
	Low	Medium	High	
Low	20 33.9%	31 52.5%	8 13.6%	59 100.0%
Medium	5 12.5%	28 70.0%	7 17.5%	40 100.0%
High	1 2.4%	19 46.3%	21 51.2%	41 100.0%
Total	26 18.6%	78 55.7%	36 25.7%	140 100.0%

Chi-square = 31.02, d.f. = 4, significance = 0.000**, Gamma = 0.604, **= highly-significant

Table-13 presents the association between peer group and juvenile delinquency. Chi-square value shows a highly-significant association between peer group and the juvenile delinquency. Gamma value shows a strong positive relationship between the variables. It means poor group had more influence on the juvenile delinquency. So the hypothesis “Peer group will be influence the juvenile delinquency” is accepted.

CONCLUSION

The research aimed to find out how Socio-economic factors effecting on juvenile delinquency. Research results indicated that peers’ negative influence, low income of family, family conflict, revenge, low literacy level and lack of parent supervision of their children are the main case of juvenile delinquency. Since children who were inadequately supervised by parents, whose parents fail to teach them the difference between right and wrong, whose parents do not monitor their where about activities, whose parents discipline them erratically and harshly, and those who experience some measure of violence in the home are more likely to become delinquent. It has therefore become apparent that a healthy home environment is the single most important factor Necessary to keep children from becoming delinquent.

REFERENCES

- Doris, R. (2000)** Human scope. Organization and communication consultant – Delhi.
- Gallup, O. (1999)** Gallup poll of social and economic indicators. Princeton: Gallup Organization.
- Khalid, M. D. (2001)** Social work, fourth edition, chapter: 28, juvenile Delinquency, pp. 437
Frederick Thrasher' Gang Theory (1936)
- Moffitt. (2006)** Life course persistent versus adolescent limited antisocial behavior.
- Tarolla, S., Wagner, E., Rabinowitz, J., Tubman, J, (2002)** Understanding and treating Juvenile Off enders: a review of current knowledge and future directions, Aggression and Violent Behavior, Vol. 7, pp. 125-143.
- Wellman, B. (1988)** The community question re-evaluated. pp. 81-107 in Power, Community and the City, Edited By Michael Peter Smith. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.