

Juvenile delinquency among secondary school pupils in the Mthatha District of  
Education: A Self-Report Survey

BY

Enoch ZENZILE

(B.A. Honours, UNITRA)

A dissertation is submitted in fulfillment of the requirements of the Degree of

Master of Arts in the Department of Criminal Justice,

University of Zululand.

Supervisor : Professor P.J. Potgieter

Co-Supervisors : Me. C.Z. Zondi

: Professor J.M. Ras

Date of Submission : February 2008

DECLARATION

I Enoch Zenzile declare that *Juvenile delinquency among secondary school pupils in the Mthatha District of Education: A Self-Report Survey* is my own work, both in conception and execution and that all the sources that I referred to or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references in terms of the Harvard-method.

February 2008

.....

Mr. Enoch Zenzile

.....

Date

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Since the first day, many people had contributed to the success of this dissertation. I here extend my thanks and deep appreciations to all those who provided helpful suggestions. To all those who had opened their doors when I wanted help, I am indebted to.

I am especially grateful to Professor P.J. Potgieter for guiding me during the days of darkness so that I could see the success of this piece of work. Prof. indeed I derived considerable benefit and ideas through the consultations I had with you. It has not been easy neither difficult working with you but challenging.

Among other people who helped me in this piece of work, I would particular like to thank my colleagues, past and present, for keeping faith with this dissertation. Mr. L. Mulenga and Mr. J. Nasila you had to relinquish all other activities as you wanted to see the success of this research. Thank you.

I wish to record thanks to the WSU Library for having provided a storeroom of knowledge. And also library staff members (Librarians) for their willingness to give me the support I required.

To all those who encouraged me and speared enough time to stay away when they needed me most especially my mom, brothers, sisters, and my wife (Bomkazi) for the love and unwavering support you gave me. Thank you.

.....

E. ZEZNILE

IN MEMORY OF  
L.P ZENZILE  
1949-1996  
REST IN PEACE

## SUMMARY (English)

*TITLE: JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AMONG SECONDARY SCHOOL PUPILS  
IN THE MTHATHA DISTRICT OF EDUCATION: A SELF-REPORT SURVEY*

BY

E. ZENZILE

The self-report survey study conducted in Mthatha District of Education (Eastern Cape) revealed interesting results pertaining to juvenile delinquency. The study concerns itself with a sample of 451 respondents randomly selected from seven secondary schools. The main aim of this exploratory study was to uncover the root causes of juvenile delinquency in the most rural and semi-urban areas of the Eastern Cape. The survey was carried out through a pre-coded questionnaire, administered to Grade 10, 11, and 12 pupils with the assistance of the educators at the identified schools during spare periods in class.

It transpires that female (263 or 58.3%) respondents are the most dominant gender group in the sample. Results indicate that they are more or less outnumbering their male counterparts with regard to many cross-correlated delinquent acts, for example dagga smoking, dealing in dagga with the aim of earning extra income, scratching of teachers' motor car, etc.

Considering the age category, a large number of respondents is within the age of 17 years. The statistical results reveal that 114 of the respondents between 16-17 years have written mean things on school desks in the past twelve months. It also

transpires that 132 (29.3%) respondents in the same age group have objected once to three times against the disciplinary measures employed by their mothers or significant other people.

Furthermore, it is noticeable that the majority of the respondents come from intact families. The study reveals that over half of the respondents indicated that both their parents are economically inactive. It also transpires that the majority of families have three to four and five to six children to care for. Based on the statistic outcome it has been postulated that mothers play a more significant role in the socialisation process.

Considering the area of residence it appears that Mqanduli respondents slightly outnumbered Mthatha respondents in most delinquent acts cross-correlated in the study. The statistical results also reveal that 134 Mqanduli respondents compared to 93 Mthatha respondents bought liquor in the past twelve months without the knowledge of their parents.

**KEY TERMS:**

Juvenile delinquency, crime, status offense, youth, parental discipline, crime prevention.

## SUMMARY (IsiXhosa)

ITAYITILE: UBUNDLOBONGELA KULUTSHA – INGXELO  
NGOPHANDO ENDILWENZE NGOKWAM KWIZIKOLO  
EZIKWISITHILI SASEMTHATHA KWIPHONDO LEMPUMA KOLONI

NGU

E. ZENZILE

Olu phando ludulise izinto ezibaluleke kakhulu malunga nobundlobongela kulutsha. Ndithathe isandlana nje sabantwana abakula mabanga : 10, 11, 12, abangama – 451 kwizikolo zamabanga aphakamileyo ezisixhenxe. Eyona njongo yolu phando ibikukuzama ukuya engcajini yobu bundlobongela bubonakala ezilalini nasezilokishini kweli phondo. Ndisebenzise uxwebhu eliselinemibuzo; ndincediswe ziiitshala zezi zikolo ekulunikezeleni ebantwaneni endibasebenzise kuphando, xa zingaxakekanga.

Kuye kwabonakala ukuba amantombazana (ebengama – 263 / 58.3%) ayagqama kweli bathwana lam. Iziphumo zibonise ukuba amantombazana ayavelela amakhwenkwe kwizenzo zobundlobongela ezithi zingenwe ngala macala omabini, - izenzo ezinjengokutshaya intsangu, ukushishina ngentsangu, ukukrwela iimoto zeetitshala, njalo njalo.

Abaninzi kubo baminyaka ilishumi elinesixhenxe (17). Kwabangaphantsi kweli nani leminyaka kubonakala ukuba ikhulu elineshumi elinesine (114) libhala izinto zokusa ezidesikeni zalo wonke unyaka lo. Kubonakala kwakho into yokuba

kwakweli qela, ikhulu elinamashumi amathathu anesibini (132 / 29.3%) alizivumanga izohlwayo elizinikwe ngoonina nangabanye abantu abakhulu isihlandlo esinye ukuya kwezithathu.

Iye yazicacela into yokuba uninzi lwaba bantwana luphuma kumakhaya anabazali bobabini. Abazali babantwana abangaphaya kwesiqingathi seli qela lam abaphangeli. Kuvele nento yokuba amakhaya amaninzi anabantwana awondlayo abasukela kwisithathu ukuya kwisithandathu. Ivumba endilifumana kumanani am lithi ngoomama kula makhaya aba bantwana abadlala indima enkulu ekubumbeni isimilo somntwana.

Xa sithelekisa ngokweendawo kubonakala ukuba uMqanduli uyawuvelela uMthatha ngezenzo zobundlobongela kwimiba efanayo. EMqanduli likhulu elinamashumi amathathu anesine (134), eMthatha ngamashumi alithoba anesithathu (93) kwezi nyanga zidlulileyo zilishumi elinambini abantwana abathe bathenga utywala abazali bengazi nto nagloo nto.

### **AMAGAMA AMAKAQWALASELWE**

Ubundlobongela kulutsha, ulwaphulo mthetho, ulwaphulo-mthetho olujongwe ngokweminyaka, ulutsha, abazali noqeqesho lwabo, ukuthintela ulwaphulo mthetho

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title page.....	i
Declaration.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Dedication.....	iv
Summary (English).....	v
Summary (IsiXhosa).....	vii
Table of contents.....	ix
List of tables.....	xiv
List of Figures.....	xv
List of Annexure.....	xv

## CHAPTER 1

### GENERAL ORIENTATION

1.1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.2 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY.....	4
1.3 AIMS OF THE STUDY.....	5
1.4 HYPOTHESIS FORMULATION.....	5
1.5 RESEARCH DESIGN.....	7
1.5.1 Research approach.....	7
1.5.2 Research methods.....	8
1.5.3 Research techniques.....	8
1.5.3.....	.1
Questionnaire.....	9
1.5.3.2 Measuring scale.....	10
1.5.3.3 Sampling.....	10
1.5.3.4 Statistical techniques.....	12
1.6 DEMARCATION OF THE STUDY.....	12

1.6.1 Spatial delimitation.....	13
1.6.2 Quantitative delimitation.....	14
1.6.3 Qualitative delimitation.....	14
1.7 LITERATURE OVERVIEW.....	14
1.7.1 Age and criminal capacity.....	16
1.7.2 Youth culture.....	18
1.7.3 The Extent of juvenile delinquency in South Africa.....	22
1.8 Definition of relevant constructs.....	24
1.8.1 Juvenile delinquency.....	24
1.8.2 Crime.....	25
1.8.3 Status offence.....	26
1.8.4 Youth.....	26
1.9 Statistical description of the sample.....	27
1.10 CHAPTER DIVISION.....	30
1.11 SUMMARY.....	31
1.12 CHAPTER REFERENCES.....	32

## CHAPTER 2

### CAUSES OR RISK FACTORS FOR JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

2.1 INTRODUCTION.....	39
2.2 THE FAMILY AND DELINQUENCY.....	40
2.2.1 Family disruption.....	42
2.2.2 Parental discipline.....	45
2.2.3 Siblings and delinquency.....	49

2.2.4 Parental relationship.....	52
2.2.5 The family socio-economic status.....	55
2.3 PEER GROUPS AND DELINQUENCY.....	57
2.4 SCHOOL AND DELINQUENCY.....	59
2.4.1 The learner failure and extracurricular activities.....	67
2.4.2 School’s failure in child socialisation.....	69
2.4.3 Teacher/ pupil relationship.....	70
2.5 DRUGS AND DELINQUENCY.....	73
2.6 GANGS AND DELINQUENCY.....	86
2.7 THE IMPACT OF HIV/AIDS ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY.....	88
2.8 THE IMPACT OF UNEMPLOYMENT ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY.....	91
2.9 SUMMARY.....	93
2.10 CHAPTER REFERENCES.....	94

### CHAPTER 3

#### THEORETICAL EXPLANATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

3.1 INTRODUCTION.....	102
3.2 SOCIAL DISORGANISATION THEORIES.....	103
3.2.1 The Work of Shaw and McKay.....	104
3.2.1.1 Evaluation of Social Disorganisation theories.....	105
3.3 CULTURAL TRANSMISSION THEORIES.....	106
3.4 Differential Association: E.H. Sutherland.....	106
3.4.1 Evaluation of the Differential Association theory.....	108
3.5 Focal Concerns theory: Walter Miller.....	109
3.5.1 Evaluation of Focal Concerns Theory.....	111
3.6 Delinquency and Drift: Sykes and Matza..	112
3.6.1 Evaluation of Delinquency and Drift Theory.....	114

3.7 SOCIAL CONTROL THEORIES.....	115
3.7.1 Theory of personal and Social Control: Reiss.....	115
3.7.2 Family focused theory of Social Control: Nye’s View Point.....	117
3.7.3                                   Containment                                   Theory:                                   Walter Reckless.....	119
3.7.4 The Social Bond Theory: Travis Hirschi.....	121
3.7.4.1 Elements of Social Bonding.....	123
3.7.4.2 Evaluation of Social Bond Theory.....	125
3.8 GENERAL STRAIN THEORIES.....	126
3.8.1 Social Structure and Anomie: Robert King Merton.....	127
3.8.1.1 Applicability of Merton’s theory to the Present Study.....	129
3.8.1.2 Evaluation of Social-Structure & Anomie Theory.....	130
3.8.2 Lower-Class Culture Theory: Albert Cohen.....	131
3.8.3 Theory of Differential Opportunity-Structure: Cloward and Ohlin .....	132
3.9 INTEGRATIVE THEORIES.....	135
3.9.1 Integrated Social Disorganisation and Anomie Theory.....	135
3.9.2 Integrated Control Theories.....	136
3.10 SUMMARY.....	137
3.11 CHAPTER REFERENCES.....	138

## CHAPTER 4

### THE CONTROL AND PREVENTION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

4.1 INTRODUCTION.....	142
4.2 PRIMARY CRIME PREVENTION.....	143
4.2.1       The       family       as       a       primary       socialising agent.....	143
4.2.2 The role of the police in primary crime prevention.....	146

4.2.3 The role of the community in the primary crime prevention.....	148
4.3 SECONDARY CRIME PREVENTION.....	149
4.3.1 The school in the secondary prevention of juvenile delinquency.....	149
4.3.1.1 The interaction between the family and the school.....	150
4.3.1.2 Factors within the school setting that contribute to delinquency.....	154
4.3.1.3 The reproduction of the social class.....	156
4.3.1.4 Inadequate curriculum.....	157
4.3.1.5 The teacher's role in juvenile delinquency.....	158
4.4 TERTIARY CRIME PREVENTION.....	162
4.4.1 Diversion of young offenders in South Africa.....	164
4.4.1.1 The current position of diversion in South Africa.....	165
4.4.1.2 The goals of diversion in South Africa.....	166
4.4.1.3 Diversion programmes that are implemented in South Africa.....	167
4.4.1.4 The evaluation of diversion programmes in South Africa.....	170
4.4.2 THE PURPOSE OF PUNISHMENT.....	171
4.4.2.1 Retribution.....	174
4.4.2.2 Deterrence.....	175
4.4.2.3 Protection of the society or incapacitation.....	176
4.4.2.4 Rehabilitation or reformation of the offender.....	177
4.5 SUMMARY.....	178
4.6 CHAPTER REFERENCES.....	180

## CHAPTER 5

### FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION.....	187
5.2 ACHIEVEMENT OF AIMS.....	188
5.3 HYPOTHESIS TESTING.....	190
5.4 FINDINGS.....	193

5.4.1 Family situation.....	193
5.4.2 School and delinquency.....	194
5.4.3 Use of illegal substance by school pupil.....	195
5.4.4 Prevention of juvenile delinquency.....	196
5.5 CONCLUSION.....	197
5.6 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	200
5.6.1 Research.....	200
5.6.2 Education.....	200
5.6.3 Juvenile justice system.....	200
5.7 CHAPTER REFERENCES.....	201

#### LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES NO	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
Table 1	Questionnaire distribution among three school grades in Mthatha, Eastern Cape	12
Table 2	Demographic particulars of respondents (N=451)	27
Table 3	Frequency distribution of respondents' family particulars (N=451)	44
Table 4	Frequency distribution of selected disciplinary measures taken during the past twelve months (N=451)	46
Table 5	Frequency distribution of respondents' objection to disciplinary measures (N=451)	48

Table 6	Cross-correlation of property stolen with value less than R10.00, by number of children in the family (N=451)	49
Table 7	Cross-correlation of other selected self-reported delinquent acts by number of children in the home (N=451)	50
Table 8	Frequency distribution of parental relationship (N=451)	54
Table 9	Frequency distribution of family socio-economic status (N=451)	56
Table 10	Cross-correlation of selected self-reported delinquent acts, by parents employment status (N=451)	61
Table 11	Cross-correlation of selected self-selected delinquent acts, by parents employment status and school grade (N=451)	71
Table 12	Drugs and delinquency, by number of children at home (N=451)	76
Table 13	Drugs and delinquency, by gender (N=451)	80
Table 14	Drugs and delinquency, by area of residence (N=451)	83
Table 15	Cross-correlation of objection of disciplinary measures, by age, school grades and marital status of parents (N=451)	151
Table 16	Frequency distribution of selected self-reported delinquent acts (N=451)	
Table 17	Cross-correlation of selected self-reported delinquent acts,	

by age, area of residence and school grades (N=451)

159

## LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF FIGURES	DESCRIPTION
PAGE NO	
Figure 1	Walter Miller and lower-class culture
110	
Figure 2	Schematic presentation of Robert King Merton's adaptation to anomic conditions
130	

LIST OF ANNEXURE	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
Annexure A	Detailed map of the Eastern Cape	
202		
Annexure B	Letter to the Mthatha District Manger (Mr. Dyasi)	
203		
Annexure C	Letter of reply from Mr. Dyasi.	205
Annexure D	Questionnaire	
206		



## **CHAPTER 1**

### **GENERAL ORIENTATION**

#### **1 INTRODUCTION**

Juvenile delinquency as a sub-field of study in criminology has been well researched and documented around the world. However, a South African study, analysing child (juvenile) involvement in deviant acts, has not been part of the recent research agenda in the Eastern Cape (Bezuidenhout & Joubert 2003:12). South African statistics show that by the end of February 2001, the number of juvenile delinquents under the age of 21 years in South African prisons accounted for 26 676 individuals; representing 16.0 percent of the entire population of inmates in the country's prison. Of these individuals, 11 380 were between the ages of 7 and 18 years (Hendersohn 2001:379).

Young people clearly form a substantial part of the South African society, because 39 percent of the total population is between 14 and 35 years. However, due to the policies of the previous government, a significant number of young women and men have not been afforded the opportunity to develop their full potentials in terms of education and other basic needs. They have experienced and are still experiencing poor housing conditions; and education is still in a mess for most of them; not only that there are very limited employment opportunities. As a result, it is mainly members of this age group that commit most crimes such as, corruption, murder, rape, robbery, etc. Furthermore, it has been observed that there has been a general disintegration of social networks and communities. Due to a lack of housing in Mthatha and the whole of South Africa for a very long time there is a subsequent establishment of informal settlements, where various categories of crime are rife (National Youth Policy 1997:03).

Youth who grew up during the apartheid era are generally referred to as the “lost generation” of South Africa. The researcher concurs with those that articulate such a statement; there is evidence that the present government has tried to address the unscrupulous misdemeanours of the apartheid government. The democratic government has introduced various policies, such as the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) in 1994. The RDP aims at the development of the youth, enabling young people to realize their full potential and participate fully in various aspects of society and their future. Furthermore, the government envisages that any development policy must by all means strive to restore the hope of youth in the ‘future’ with reconstruction and development as the key to life. This government has also acknowledged the role played by at least two generations of young people and students namely the generation of 1976 and the 1980s in changing the political landscape of the country. Many youngsters of those generations may largely be unable or unwilling to integrate into a post-apartheid dispensation peacefully. Some scholars (Kasese-Hara 2002:371; Van Zyl, Malan, Marais, Oliver, & Riordan 1994:09-18) aptly described this dichotomy in approaches at the time of the transition by asking whether the youth are the ‘heroes or villains’ while on the other hand others have asked whether South Africa’s black youth are ‘at war with the future’. Such questions can be attributed to the situation which is being portrayed by the youth who frequently show signs of people who have experienced frustration and aggression. As a result of the situation they seem to become predisposed in acts of violence and crime. Furthermore, those who had been socially and economically marginalized many of themselves turned to political activism and exhibited radical behaviour that landed them in trouble with the criminal justice system. Nowadays, some or most of them are increasingly exposed to drugs, sexual crimes, economic crimes, organized crime, etc. Despite many achievements, at an age of 16-24 years, youth are disproportionately represented with respect to many social problems like being

infected and affected by HIV/Aids and in this regard 60 percent of them are more likely to be infected or affected by HIV/Aids (Kasese-Hara 2002:371; Van Zyl, Malan, Marais, Oliver, & Riordan 1994:09-18; Seekings 1993; Bundy 1992).

More often than not the instability that may be attributed to the imbalances of the past is evident in some South African schools. Eliason and Frank (2002:2) maintain that violence in schools poses a serious threat to the goal of establishing peace, democracy and economic progress in South African societies and the nation at large. In the process of eliminating juvenile delinquency, it is important to find answers to the following questions:

- What is the nature, and scope of juvenile delinquency?
- Who are the transgressors?
- What are the most important causes of misconduct/unconventional behaviour?

Clarke-Stewart, Friedman, and Koch (1985:5) contend that in the past, environmental (nature) factors probably played a very significant causative role to misbehaviour in children and youth. It is a generally accepted belief that the well-being of society depends on parents' ability to socialise well-adjusted, responsible and educated young people to succeed the older generation. Unfortunately, a large proportion of the youth have been negatively affected by the decades of disadvantageousness. The result of this process is currently observed in high frequencies of crime such as: substance abuse, violence, and other forms of social pathology. In addition to that, unemployment and street-children (homelessness), etc. pose a bigger problem in South Africa today (Van Zyl *et al.* 1994: 09-18).

## **1.2 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

It is vehemently important to take into consideration the fact that although South African youth display ignoble serious misbehaviour, their actions cannot be condoned on account of the heritage of apartheid alone. Any country that cares about its children and youth has a responsibility, first and foremost, to identify and address the historical factors contributing to that misbehaviour and secondly, it has to identify other causative factors within the current dispensation, which may contribute to such misbehaviour ( Bezuidenhout & Joubert 2003:6).

The objective of any meaningful intervention in the life of the youth is mainly to limit ‘problem behaviour’ associated with adolescence and to prepare the youth for responsibilities of adulthood. The researcher takes it that experience has taught the present South African government that young people can make contributions to society if they are given a ‘stake’ in the system. Furthermore, history also clearly reveals that the anti-colonial movements, the peace movements, the youth and students of the 1960s forced societies to take into account for whatever was increasingly distinct in the society. The mainstreaming of development locates society’s responsibility for ensuring a human development and rights approach for all sectors of society, including the country’s young men and women. It seeks to ensure a macro environment which fosters the well-being of all young people and provides an enabling environment for youth to reach their full potential ([www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/pubs/umrabulo24/futureinvest.html](http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/pubs/umrabulo24/futureinvest.html)).

The present study seeks to set the search for the root causes of juvenile delinquency, which are many and diverse. The knowledge so gained, will be used to encourage the youth to change their behaviour to the benefit of society and themselves. In essence, this study explores juvenile delinquency in the context of

crime prevention, as informed by the knowledge of the causes of youth misconduct that is quite rife in South Africa.

### **1.3 AIMS OF THE STUDY**

The aims of the study are as follows:

**Aim 1:** To ascertain, through cross-correlation of data, whether significant differences exist between predictor variables (gender, age, area of residence, and school grade) and self-reported delinquency (variables 1-8; 23-48; Section A).

**Aim 2:** To explore and identify significant differences between variables relating to respondents' family situation and self-reported delinquency (variables 9-12; 23-48; Section B).

**Aim3:** To ascertain whether significant differences exist between male and female respondents relating to the exercising of *parental control and discipline* and self-reported delinquency (variables 13-16 Section C).

**Aim 4:** To establish statistical variations between *gender* and a typology of delinquent acts, based on self-reported data (variables 1; 23-48; Section A and D).

### **1.4 HYPOTHESES FORMULATION**

A hypothesis is a provisional explanation of a condition for which the evidence necessary for testing it is at least potentially available (Bailey 1982:42). In practice it is usually the accompanying null-hypothesis that is subjected to statistical

testing and not the research hypothesis. The following null-hypotheses have been formulated for empirical verification:

**Null-hypothesis 1(a):** Respondents do not differ significantly in terms of independent variables and self-reported delinquency (Aim 1; vars. 1-8; 22-48).

**Null-hypothesis 1(b):** Respondents' involvement in self-reported delinquency, do not increase significantly with *age* (variable 2) and *school grade* (variable 8) (Aim 1 and vars. 23-48).

**Null-hypothesis 2 (a):** There are no significant differences between respondents' *family situation* and self-reported delinquency (Aim 2; vars. 9-13, 23-48).

**Null-hypothesis 2(b):** No significant differences are observable when self-reported-delinquency between respondents from broken homes, are compared with those from intact (complete) families (Aim 2; vars. 9,10, 23-48).

**Null-hypothesis 2(c):** There are no significant differences in self-reported delinquency between respondents whose fathers are economically active (employed), compared to those whose fathers are economically inactive (unemployed) (Aim 2; vars. 9, 10, 23-48).

**Null-hypothesis 2(d):** There are no significant differences in self-reported delinquency between respondents whose mothers are economically active (employed), compared to those whose mothers are economically inactive (unemployed) (Aim 2; vars. 9, 10, 23-48).

**Null-hypothesis 3(a):** No significant differences are recorded when self-reported Delinquency is cross-correlated in terms of independent variables and parental control (Aim 3; vars. 1-8; 14-17; 23-48).

**Null-hypothesis 3(b):** Respondents' involvement in delinquent acts do not significantly decrease when cross-correlated with *family discipline* (Aim 3; vars. 18-22; 23-48).

**Null-hypothesis 4:** No statistical differences are observable between male and female involvement in self-reported delinquency (Aim 4; vars. 1; 23-48).

## **1.5 RESEARCH DESIGN**

Research design is the planning of any scientific research from the first to the last step. In this sense, it is a programme of guiding the research in collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data (Bless & Higson-Smith 1995:63). In the light of this statement, it is evident that the aim of the research design is to align the pursuit of scientific research with the practical considerations and limitations of the project being undertaken at an exploratory level.

### **1.5.1 Research approach**

The study follows a general, scientific approach that displays a strong positivistic (empirical) orientation and, as such, is both exploratory and descriptive in nature and conception (Van der Walt, Cronje & Smit 1982:117). Positivism represents a particular view of child and youth misbehaviour in Mthatha District of Education. Furthermore, the research will either confirm or reject the null-hypotheses specifically devised for the present study (see par. 1.4).

### **1.5.2 Research methods**

The goal of every scientific research undertaken is based on the assumption that all behaviour and events are orderly and has discoverable facts (Van der Walt *et al.* 1982:168).

In criminal justice research a researcher has a choice to adopt any of three research methods: case analysis, method of mass observation, or analytical research method. Each method has strengths and weaknesses, and certain concepts are more appropriately studied by some methods than by others (Maxfield & Babbie 1998:86). The present study adopts the analytical research method, which is a more neutral orientation. The analytical research method is supported by the method of mass observation to allow for the accommodation of statistical presentation of information.

### **1.5.3 Research techniques**

Research techniques are aids used by the researcher to enable him or her to observe and measure a social phenomenon (juvenile delinquency) that cannot be satisfactorily observed by the human sense alone. As aids, research techniques are therefore employed in empirical research to realize the goals of a particular research method (Van der Westhuizen 1982:12).

This study will employ descriptive techniques to enable the researcher to translate facts about child and youth misbehaviour into more understandable and analytical data. A data capture instrument (self-report survey) has been scientifically developed for this purpose according to strict scientific requirements to warrant validity of the data so collected.

### **1.5.3.1 Questionnaire**

The present study implements a pre-coded, structured questionnaire that has been divided into four sections (see Annexure D):

- Section A provides a demographic profile of the respondents and represents the independent (or predictor) variables.
- Section B concerns itself with a descriptive analysis of the family situation that may sometimes propel a child into deviant behaviour.
- Section C generates empirical information pertaining to parental control and discipline.
- Section D concerns itself with the identification of a self-reported juvenile crime index that could act as an antipode to juvenile delinquency.

Prior to administering the questionnaire, written and verbal permission was obtained from the District Manager (Mr Dyasi) in Mthatha District of Education and also from the principals of the schools who were approached for the research in question (see Annexure B). This approach, would have paved the way for data collection under controlled conditions. Permission has been granted by means of a reply letter – see Annexure C.

With the assistance of the educators at the identified schools questionnaires were administered to pupils of grade 10, 11, and 12 during normal class periods. The questionnaire was designed in such a way that made the anonymity of participants a reality. Educators were also selected to assist and expedite the process of completing the questionnaires. Their assistance (as field workers) was especially necessary in instances where there was a query from the respondents about a concept or term that was not clear to the participants. In formulating the statements contained in the questionnaire

attention was given to the following aspects (see Annexure D) (De Vos, Strydom, Founce, and Delport 2005: 160-163):

- Brief and clear formulation of sentences with vocabulary and style at the level participants could understand.
- Short questions relevant to the process of investigation.
- Avoidance of leading questions.
- Focusing on only one thought in each question.

The educators further outlined the purpose of the research in question so as to put the respondents at ease, and gain their trust.

### **1.5.3.2 Measuring scale**

The researcher employed a 5-point Likert-type scale. Nominal and ordinal levels of measurement were utilised.

### **5.3.3 Sampling**

A sample is a subset or proportion of the total population (Bailey 1982:86). Social research is characterised by probability and non-probability sampling techniques. Probability sampling concerns itself with representativeness based on known sampling estimates, in other words, known characteristics of the sampling units to be included in the social survey. The present study is, however, based on non-probability sampling procedures and more specifically, purposive (judgmental) sampling, blended with convenience sampling undertones. This technique is advantageous, because it allows the researcher to use his/her skills and prior knowledge to select respondents. Furthermore, non-probability sampling is less complicated, much less expensive and may be executed on the

‘spur-of-the-moment’ basis to take advantage of available respondents without the statistical complexity of probability sample selection.

For the purpose of sampling, researcher arbitrarily decided to include pupils from Grade 10, 11, and 12. The following senior secondary schools in the Mthatha District of Education were then randomly selected: Dalibaso Senior Secondary School, Umtata High School, Umtata International School, Lutubeni, Qokolweni and Gengqe Senior Secondary School.

Although the sample was selected in accordance with a non-probability sampling procedure, it clearly reflects an acceptable degree of diversity. The researcher took cognizance of the fact that the sample must be shaped in such a way that it would represent the population as widely as possible. In this regard, it has been arbitrarily decided to distribute more or less 200 questionnaires per *school grade* (i.e. Grade 10, 11 and 12) at the previously mentioned secondary schools. Questionnaire distribution took place in October 2006. Unfortunately, Grade 12 pupils were already in the process of preparing for the final matriculation examination; that being the reason why only 14 responses were secured for this grade. The researcher nevertheless decided to include these 14 responses due to the exploratory nature of the study.

Henceforth, the researcher decided to increase the expected frequency in respect of the remaining Grades 11 and 10 to 250 each. Table 1 show that an observed frequency of 231 (51.2%) and 206 (45.7%) for Grades 11 and 10 respectively, was achieved yielding an overall workable response rate of 64.4 percent (including 14 Grade 12 responses). Table 1 below clearly depicts the status of questionnaire distribution among the different, selected school grades.

TABLE 1 QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTION AMONG THREE SCHOOL GRADES IN  
MTHATHA, EASTERN CAPE

SCHOOL GRADE	EXPECTED		OBSERVED	
	FREQUENCY		FREQUENCY	
	n	%	n	%
Grade 12	200	28.6	14	3.1
Grade 11	250	35.7	231	51.2
Grade 10	250	35.7	206	45.7
TOTAL	700	100.0	451	100.0

#### **1.5.3.4 Statistical techniques**

Statistical techniques employed in this study are: frequency distribution and cross-correlation techniques in terms of which data will be portrayed and described according to their raw scores (N) and percentages (%). The Chi-square test ( $\chi^2$ ) will also be implemented to test for significant differences between 2 or more variables. All types of statistical analyses and calculations were carried out by means of the SPSS programme. The level of significance is set at  $p \leq .05\%$  (Hagan 2000:382).

#### **1.6 DEMARCATION OF THE STUDY**

A criminological researcher has to define his/her field of study and the groups being investigated (Van der Walt *et al.* 1982:390). Delimitation of the study will be affected at three levels:

##### **1.6.1 Spatial delimitation**

Due to financial constraints and time, the study has been conducted in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa. Economically, the Eastern Cape Province is in deep poverty where illiteracy, unemployment and poor access to basic social services characterises this province. The setting of this research is the Oliver Reginald Tambo Municipal District (O.R. Tambo District) with Mthatha as the main economic growth point. This district falls under the King Sabata Dalindyebo Municipality (K.S.D. Municipality) which has a population of approximately 430,000 unemployment rate of 46 percent. The O.R. Tambo District Municipality has a population of 1.7 million people, most of whom live in rural areas. The most dominant official language being used in the area is isiXhosa (O.R. Tambo District Municipality Integrated Development Plan 2002; K.S.D. Municipality Integrated Development Plan 2002).

During the apartheid era, Mthatha was formally the capital of the erstwhile Transkei territory. On its port, the Transkei formed one of the TBVC states (with Bophuthatswana, Venda and Ciskei). In the Mthatha area, most secondary schools are located in villages where learners are envisaged to be exposed to higher levels of violence than their white counterparts (Coetzer 1998:1-2; Kabali-Kagwa 1997:3; Gasant 1994:64-66; Nzimande 1993:4-6; Seekings 1993:86). Black people's struggle against apartheid roused emotions of which violence was often the end result (Coetzer 1998:1-2; Kabali-Kagwa 1997:3; Gasant 1994:64-66; Nzimande 1993:4-6; Seekings 1993:86).

It is against this backdrop that the present study will contribute to the existing body of knowledge on juvenile delinquency in the Eastern Cape. See Annexure A for a geographical map of the research area and clear indication of its location.

### **1.6.2 Quantitative delimitation**

Quantitatively, an expected frequency of 700 questionnaires has been envisaged. Altogether 451 observations from the Senior Secondary School in the Mthatha Educational District were recorded as observed frequency and included in the statistical analysis in more or less equal proportions in terms of school grade - see paragraph 1.5.3.3.

### **1.6.3 Qualitative delimitation**

Although the present study entails the employment of quantifiable data, it becomes necessary to indicate that the qualitative nature of the study rests on the calculation of eight independent variables, etc. These variables reflect the demographic 'make-up' of the sample - see Section A of the questionnaire (Annexure D).

## **1.7 LITERATURE OVERVIEW**

South Africa appears to be demographically young because the vast majority of people (54 percent) are below the age of 25 years. It is also well-known that the involvement of young people in crime is disproportionately high. The criminal career of such young people begins during adolescence and reaches its peak during their mid-twenties (Glanz 1996:05). The researcher also opines that the high rate of incidences of crime sometimes may be ascribed in part to the high percentage of young people.

Since 1994, when South Africa gained democracy, vast numbers of people migrated from rural to urban areas. People have been migrating to the cities with the hope of getting better employment, shelter, living standards, etc. As a result, this migration *indaba* has directly contributed to shortages of housing in urban

areas. Consequently, massive informal settlements, inadequate services and large-scale unemployment in urban areas have increased. These circumstances provide a breeding ground for crime and juvenile delinquency in the country. Urbanisation in South Africa is not something new as it was much more evident for a period of 10 years following the abolition of influx control laws in 1986. Since then the situation has made some youngsters to become independent at very early ages of their lives. Most of them are becoming independent at a time that they are supposed to be under the guidance of their parents (Glanz 1996:06).

The preceding paragraph indicates that the movement of many youths who migrated to the cities did not yield positive results but, instead rather added to the problem of unemployment that had long existed in the cities. That can be attributed to the fact that the country does have an inadequate education system that apparently precipitates poor preparation for the labour market. Although education system is in process of undergoing far-reaching transformation, at the moment, the process will still take a long time to cause education and training to be accessible to everyone and to prepare them for a happy structured life and the labour market. The education that existed in South Africa during the apartheid era has been largely criticised and regarded to be too academic and had not provided sufficient preparation for life and job skills (Cf. Glanz 1996; Cf. Glaser 2000).

In addition, there appears to be also a problem relating to illegal immigrants in the country. An immense number of people from neighbouring countries have crossed the South African borders illegally to seek work and settle in urban areas where employment was already a compounding problem. This is so because they have to compete for scarce jobs not only among themselves, but with locals too. This situation makes these youngsters susceptible to crime. The existing literature, further points out that the factors involved in youth unemployment have remained fairly constant from the mid-1930s up to the present. As alluded to already, one

explanation for youth unemployment faced by South African youth is competition between them and the migrants in the job market. Employers mostly prefer to employ migrants rather than local youth. Migrants are deemed to be more acquiescent, ‘respectful’, and reliable than their local counterparts; and do not mind receiving lower wages (Glaser 2000:32).

### **1.7.1 Age and criminal capacity**

In South Africa, the minimum age of criminal capacity is determined by the *doli capax/doli incapax*-rule. Given this rule a child below the age of seven years, is presumed to lack criminal capacity (Skelton 1996). Furthermore, the rule argues that children between the ages 7 and 14 years are presumed *doli incapax* unless proven otherwise. To illustrate further, those children under 14 but over 7 years older, are deemed to lack criminal capacity unless the State proves that the child in question can distinguish between right and wrong and knows the wrongfulness of offending at the time of commission of the offence. Though such presumptions were designed in order to protect children, legal practitioners have noted that it is all too easily rebutted, and that it does not in fact present an impediment to the prosecution and conviction of young people. For instance, mothers of children are asked to indicate whether their children understand the difference between right and wrong. An answer in the affirmative is often considered sufficient grounds to rebut the presumption of *doli incapax*. Furthermore, the courts have noted that caution should be exercised where the accused are illiterate, unsophisticated, and more so when they are children ‘with limited grasp of proceeding’ (Skelton 1996; South African Law Commission 1997; S v M 1982 (1) SA 240 (N)).

However, Snyman (2002:177) points out that in practice a short cut is usually taken by asking whether a child was aware that what she/he was doing was wrong. Such a formulation of the test has been criticised and unacceptable for the following reasons:

- a) Firstly, the formulation confuses completely the distinct requirements for liability, namely criminal capacity and awareness of unlawfulness.
- b) Secondly, the traditional test employed by the courts involves only one aspect of the accused knowledge, namely his knowledge of the wrongfulness of the act. His or her knowledge of the factual nature and consequences is equally important.
- b) Thirdly, the traditional formulation contains no reference to the accused ability to act in accordance with his or her appreciation of wrong and right.

Badenhorst (2006:50) opines that Skelton (1996:180) is of the view that the minimum age of 7 years is unacceptably low, should South Africa wish to retain the *doli incapax* presumption, then better safeguards should be adopted so that the presumption will be more difficult to rebut. With regard to the issue of the minimum age of criminal capacity The Child Justice Bill, 2002 was introduced into Parliament in August 2002 (Badenhorst 2006:50; Ondogo 2003:1; Sloth-Nielsen 2003:175). The Child Justice Bill 2002 proposed the age of 10 years as the minimum age for criminal capacity. On 26 February 2003 both the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation and the Child Justice Alliance made submissions to the Portfolio Committee (Parliamentary Monitoring Group 2003:1) that they support the raising of the minimum age of criminal capacity to 10 years and the retention of the *doli incapax* presumption. The Community Law Centre, the Child Justice Alliance and the South African Catholic Bishops are among the organisations that objected to the 10 year proposal saying it is still too low. They had rather intensified calls to Parliament to increase the age at which a child can be held responsible for criminal conduct to 12 years. It also needs to be noted that the United Nations criticised countries that fix their minimum age of criminal capacity at less than 12 years. Calls to raise the age of criminal liability is supported by the fact that there are other countries where it is set even higher than 12 years as is the case in Italy where the age of criminal capacity is 14 years and in the Philippines it is set at 15 years (Cf. Mail & Guardian 2008).

Nevertheless, the minimum age of prosecution set by the Bill in South Africa is 10 years which means that no child under the age of 10 years can be held criminal liable for his or her actions. A child who commits an offence while under the age of 14 years is presumed not to have had the capacity to appreciate the difference between right and wrong, unless the criminal capacity is proved in accordance with section 56 (Child Justice Bill 2002:7).

### **1.7.2 Youth culture**

The notion of a ‘youth culture’ was developed from the psychological term ‘adolescence’ which implies youthful behaviour that lies in physical bodily changes and emotional upheavals surrounding the onset of puberty (Muncie 2002:156). The youth culture is mostly envisaged as a subculture, a term that has not existed in the literature of the social sciences for some ages. Subculture can be defined as a subdivision of the national culture, composed of a combination of factorable social situations such as class status, ethnic-background, regional and rural or urban residence. Such factors may include religious affiliation. Put together, all these forms a functional unity which has an integrated impact on the participating individual (Cf. Gordon 1947).

The youth subculture represents a separate culture in society. It is being assumed that not all values, beliefs, or norms in a society have equal status, and that some priority allocation of them is made which a person in a subculture partially accepts and partially denies. The representatives of the subculture may even construct the antithesis to elements of the central or dominant values while still remaining within the larger cultural system. Judging by the latter supposition, anyone is free to assert that a subculture implies that there is a cluster of value judgments, or a social value system, which is both apart from and a part of the central value

system. Taking from the viewpoint of the dominant culture, the values of the subculture prevent total integration, and occasional cause or open or covert conflicts. It has also been envisaged that the dominant culture may directly or indirectly promote this apartness. Some of the values which are apart from those of the dominant culture are learned by the participants in the subculture, and these values differ in quantity and quality. A subculture of the youth then is totally different from the parent culture. Some of the values of the subculture may be more than different from the large culture; they may be in conflict or at wide variance with the latter. Mostly the participants of the subculture usually engage in delinquent activities, which mean that the youngsters who affiliate to the subculture are somewhat dysfunctional and also antithetical to the broader social system. The subculture that is only different is a tolerated deviation (Cf. Knudten & Schafer 1970).

As indicated already, a subculture like any culture is composed of values, conduct norms, social situations, role definitions and performances. Considering sharing, transmission, and learning of values, there is a substantial reason to speak about the youth subculture in South Africa. The dichotomy between youth in developed and developing countries is becoming less pronounced with urbanization, globalisation and the emergence of a global media-driven youth culture. Despite the generally disparaging adult views on youth culture today, there is a recognition of many of the positive aspects of the path today's youth seek to steer. There are growing types of music such as kwaito, hip-hop, house, etc. that are total different from the traditional music of the past and most young people associate themselves with the latter types of music. The music is envisaged as an expression and validation of a way of life more especial the township life style. Mostly the South African youngsters are unique when one looks at their dress code and the language they speak (*Tsotsi* language), dance, etc (Cf. Glaser 2000). Placing the youth subculture within the context of the new freedom after the 1994 elections of the

democratic government, one observes that many changes have taken place in South Africa. People had to enjoy the freedom of speech which afforded the youth the opportunity of expressing their feelings about the life they are living.

There is also an easy emersion of youth culture now due to advanced technology (television and radio, computers, cellular phones, internet, etc.). Technological advancements are both advantageous and disadvantageous when it comes to the socialization of the youth these days. This includes the rather astonishing development where ten to fourteen year olds are seen as a market for advertising. It is also important to note that technology is one area where young people have an urge for more. Young people are often the innovators in the use and spread of Information and Communication Technology (ICT); they adapt quickly and are generally quite hungry for the great quantities of information that can be accessed through ICT. Improving access to and the use of ICT among young people has become an important part of youth development strategies. For example, the Gauteng Provincial Government places access for youth to ICT at the foundation of its programme to build a 'smart province' because the ICT sector is generally seen as one of the few sectors with greater possibilities for entry and success for young entrepreneurs (Cf. Gauteng Provincial Government 2005). There is also an instant awareness of news and the rapid spread of innovations in dress, dancing, and dating habits quickly unify people from different cultures. This makes the sharing of values and norms across the entire country remarkably rapid (Cf. Knudten & Schafer 1970).

It is now evident that there is deviance from the adult models among the youth. However, it has been discovered that the more committed the youth into their subculture, the more captive they become to their conformity. The more they strive to be loved, recognized, wanted, and feared within their own group culture, the more they contribute to their captivity (Cf. Whyte 1955). The researcher is of

the opinion that the latter submission is more evident in South Africa, as a developing country. One often hears that the youth in this country is out of control due to the developments that they are exposed to. The adults had not witnessed or experienced such developments in their time as youths. And besides, things develop so fast that not all of us can keep up to it, especially older people.

Therefore, it can be expected that socialisation of the youth these days is deemed to be further hindered by the problem of poor adult models. Throughout the social classes, it appears that the search for the adult to be emulated is often a desperate and futile quest. Part of the reason for this futility is due to the very rapid social and technological changes and occurring in the society which makes it difficult for the adults to perform their traditional role of socialisation. In addition to that, growing up no longer means learning how to fit into society because society into which the young people will someday fit into perhaps has not yet been developed or could even not be properly imagined. Many youth feel detachment and premature cynicism may set in because society seems to offer youth so little that is stable, relevant, and meaningful. They often look in vain for values, goals, means, and institutions to which they can be committed because their thrust to commitment is strong (Kenston 1965:191-222).

### **1.7.3 The extent of juvenile delinquency in South Africa**

The extent of juvenile delinquency in this country is illustrated by the following incident. Four young men from Alexandra township broke into a house in a neighbouring suburb, on June 13, 1998. The young men, who had been drinking heavily, found a white suburban family made up of parents and two young

children. The family was sitting down to dinner. The youngsters armed with handguns, shot and killed both parents and raped the daughter while the son took cover in the bathroom. The attackers left in the family car and were arrested later that night when the vehicle was spotted outside a night-club in central Johannesburg. Later on, the accused were linked to a number of other cases in the same area for over a period of five years. South Africa is riddled with violent crimes, such a case caught the headlines for one day and then the ‘story’ faded. Yet, the incident is illustrative of crime and its impact on South African society. The case is also a reflection of the weakness and inability of the police to prevent and control lawlessness. Although this case at least got the media coverage, some do not (The Citizen 1998).

It is now an accepted practice in South Africa to argue that official crime statistics, that is, those collected and released by the South African Police Service provide decreased levels of crime and juvenile delinquency in the country. This is because official crime statistics never seem to match the personal experiences of citizens or their fear of crime, and most of the time crime statistics are often unsurprisingly, interpreted to serve political purposes (Cf. Nedcor ISS 1998).

An accurate measure of crime in any jurisdiction is thus dependent upon the relationship between people and the police and, in effect, the willingness of citizens to report crime to the authorities in the belief that something can and will be done about it. In South Africa, the historic divide between the people and the police has complicated this process. The police during the apartheid era were regarded as the instrument of repression; reporting crime to them seemed to be of little value. Disrespect for the police continues to prevail among black South Africans, and is now worsened by their apparent inefficiency. It is also hardly surprising, that most South Africans continue to have a *healthy* disrespect for rules and for those who enforce them. There is also a feeling among some young South

Africans that the ending of apartheid has not brought the material benefit that were promised. Thus there is high youth involvement in criminal activities as a way of life (Cf. Shaw 2002).

Young people in South Africa are becoming more involved in acts of delinquency, both as perpetrators and as victims. It has been further discovered that there are two major forms of crime and violence present in South Africa such as violence resulting from political influences and violence resulting from social or structural violence. During the apartheid era youth played a central role in the struggle and the series of protests that ensued after 1976. As a result of that, between 1984 and 1986, 300 children were killed, 1,000 wounded, 11,000 detained, 18,000 arrested on protest charges, and 173,000 were awaiting trial. Furthermore, consulted literature reveals that lately the average age of people committing crime is reducing; whereas it was 22 years of age in 1988, in 1990 it had dropped to 17 years. Gangsterism in the townships as a result of youth marginalisation has added a new sub-culture and dimension to youth violence and crime. Other forms of violence that have been found to increase among the youth are domestic violence, rape and sexual crimes. In 2006/2007 the Department of Correctional Services (DCS) reported the custody of 25,827 youth people. It has also been found that younger children are experimenting with drugs more than ever in the history of South Africa, and it appears to be widely spread over all the racial, cultural and economic sections of society. Children as young as 10 and 11 years become addicted to heroin and other substances. However, it is difficult to measure the true extent of juvenile delinquency in this country because most parents deal with their drugging kids outside the legal system.

Clanwilliam in the Western Cape had witnessed a shocking tale of two children, one twelve years and the other seven years, who are accused of murdering their

classmate who was 8 years old for R5 he owed them (National Youth Commission 1997; Mail & Guardian online 13 March 2007; [www.dcs.gov.za/WebStatistics/totcrime.aspx](http://www.dcs.gov.za/WebStatistics/totcrime.aspx)).

## **1.8 DEFINITION OF RELEVANT CONSTRUCTS**

### **1.8.1 Juvenile delinquency**

A very difficult problem in studying juvenile delinquency is the decision which exact definition of the term itself should be adopted as the point of departure. In a broader sense, juvenile delinquency refers to the anti-social acts of children and of young people under a given age. Such acts are specifically forbidden by law or may be lawfully interpreted as constituting delinquency or as requiring some form of official action (Vedder 1963:03). Mennel (Cf. 1973) observes that children have always misbehaved. Yet, the notion of juvenile delinquency was unheard of until the eighteenth century, when organised state responses to adolescent crime and deviance first took shape. It has been also propounded that for centuries problem children were handled mainly in family setting, with little or no involvement by the state. However, the system of familial relations began to weaken during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as a more and more people migrated to the cities in search of work and shelter.

### **1.8.2 Crime**

There are divergent opinions about the definition of crime. Criminologists do not always reach congruency on how crime should be defined and what should form a criminological perspective of crime *per se*. The present study will elucidate two

important approaches striving to define crime. Firstly the juridical approach according to Cloete and Stevens (1990:26) define crime as an unlawful act or omission which is either a prohibition or behaviour which is punishable by authorities. While according to Snyman (Cf. 2002) crime is unlawful, blameworthy conduct punishable by law. Some criminologists criticise both definitions given above, apparently because *crime is a relative concept*. The kinds of behaviour covered by laws and statutes are not fixed and unchanging but vary according to time, place, and circumstances. For example, what the law prohibits today may not be regarded illegal tomorrow (Vetter & Silverman 1986:6). Secondly, the exponents of a criminological approach to defining crime are not always happy with the legal specifications. They actually prefer a broader or wider definition of crime. Such a wider definition extends beyond the boundaries of legally prohibited behaviour and includes anti-social conduct or behaviour which harms the individual and the society. Van der Walt (In Cloete & Stevens 1990:27) defines crime as ‘an act that conflicts with or is injurious to the healthy normal existence of an individual, his relatives and the community’. This definition is also open to criticism. It has been argued that concepts used in the definition, such as ‘normal existence’, ‘healthy existence’ and ‘anti-social’ are too vague to define. ‘Normality’? Whose standards are being used to define the notion of normality? The term normal is relative, because what is normal to one might be abnormal to another. However, the study will confine itself to the legal definition of crime, because most of the important ingredients of the present study revolves around criminal actions being committed by young people in school context.

### **1.8.3 Status offence**

The term status offence can be defined as behaviour that is unlawful for children, even though the same behaviour would be legal for adults. What transforms the conduct into public offence is the age of the actor. The most common status

offences are truancy, running away from home, purchase or drinking of alcoholic beverages or various sexual and drug abuse acts (Kratcoski & Kratcoski 1982:05)

#### **1.8.4 Youth**

This may be an ambiguous concept; there is no sociological consensus about its limits. The term has been used to describe a specific political or sub-cultural element. Pre-industrial African societies were clearly age graded, in actual sense; youth is slotted into a transitional phase between childhood and adulthood/eldership. In traditional Xhosa society, for instance, this stage is known as *intlombe*. Boys and girls are expected to go through a process of initiation from around the time of puberty and sexual awakening. Girls are taught skills in domesticity and child-rearing and exit the period of initiation earlier than males, at the point of marriage and childbearing. For males the initiation period is seen as a time of boisterous rebellion, mobility, fighting, assertion of independence, and sexual experimentation. Within this age set, sexual and social prestige is attached to being a good fighter. Socially, the young men are kept largely separate from the wider community (Glaser 2000:2). According to The White Paper on Social Welfare (Cf. 1997) a young person is a woman or man aged between 16 to 30 years of age. While the Child Care Act (1983) defines a child as a male or female aged from 0 to 18 years of age. The National Youth Commission is being directed by the definition contained in its policy (i.e. 14 to 35 years of age). It is clear that there is inconsistency when it comes to the issue of age; the study will use the definition of Child Care Act of 1983 which is a more widely accepted definition of youth around the globe.

### **1.9 STATISTICAL DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE**

The demographic characteristics of the sample selected for the present study will be described below – see Table 2.

TABLE 2 DEMOGRAPHIC PARTICULARS OF RESPONDENTS (N=451)

Gender		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	188	41.7	41.7	41.7
	Female	263	58.3	58.3	100.0
	Total	451	100.0	100.0	
Age groups		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	under 16 years (i.e. 15, 14)	29	6.4	6.4	6.4
	16 years	88	19.5	19.5	25.9
	17 years	119	26.4	26.4	52.3
	18 years	77	17.1	17.1	69.4
	19 years	61	13.5	13.5	82.9
	20 years	54	12.0	12.0	94.9
	21 years	21	4.7	4.7	99.6
	+21 years	2	.4	.4	100.0
	Total	451	100.0	100.0	
Population group		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	African	417	92.5	92.5	92.5
	Coloured	19	4.2	4.2	96.7
	Indian	3	.7	.7	97.3
	White	7	1.6	1.6	98.9
	Other (not Indicated)	5	1.1	1.1	100.0
	Total	451	100.0	100.0	

Table continues.../28

Mother language		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Xhosa	420	93.1	93.1	93.1
	Southern SeSotho	3	.7	.7	93.8
	English	20	4.4	4.4	98.2
	Afrikaans	3	.7	.7	98.9
	Other	5	1.1	1.1	100.0

Total		451	100.0	100.0	
<b>Any church affiliation?</b>					Cumulative Percent
	Frequency		Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	Yes	393	87.1	87.1	87.1
	No	58	12.9	12.9	100.0
	Total	451	100.0	100.0	
<b>Name of the church</b>					Cumulative Percent
	Frequency		Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	Methodist	85	18.8	18.8	18.8
	Zion	86	19.1	19.1	37.9
	Presbyterian	51	11.3	11.3	49.2
	Anglican	24	5.3	5.3	54.5
	Other	150	33.3	33.3	87.8
	Not applicable	55	12.2	12.2	100.0
	Total	451	100.0	100.0	
<b>Area of residence*</b>					Cumulative Percent
	Frequency		Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	Mthatha surb	49	10.9	10.9	10.9
	Mthatha village	81	18.0	18.0	28.8
	Mthatha township	37	8.2	8.2	37.0
	Mqanduli town	38	8.4	8.4	45.5
	Mqanduli village	184	40.8	40.8	86.3
	Other	62	13.7	13.7	100.0
	Total	451	100.0	100.0	
<b>School Grade</b>					Cumulative Percent
	Frequency		Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	grade 12	14	3.1	3.1	3.1
	grade 11	231	51.2	51.2	54.3
	grade 10	206	45.7	45.7	100.0
	Total	451	100.0	100.0	

\*The researcher arbitrarily decided not to reflect a list of the names of secondary schools around Mthatha District of Education. Instead, a decision was taken to rather afford respondents the opportunity to indicate their areas of residence (see variable 7). This outcome was necessitated by the fact that most secondary school pupils do not necessary attend the schools located within their area of residence. Some school pupils attend schools in East London, Queenstown, Port Elisabeth, etc. It is assumed that area of residence would be a better predictor of school delinquency, especially with the influence of the home and environmental factors that might have been present at the time of this survey.

Table 2 describes a female dominated sample (58.3%), where male respondents account for 41.7 percent. The overrepresentation of female participants in the current study may be attributed to the fact that the majority of school-going pupils are female. And more so, this must not be surprising given the South African situation where more than 50 percent of the total population is female.

In as far as the age group is concerned, the largest number is within the age of 17 years (26.4%) followed by 18 years (17.1%) which is commonly the expected age at the high school level of education. There are also participants who are under 16 years (6.4%) and 16 years (19.5%), probably these respondents at the time of study had started school earlier by a year or two. However, the sample also consists of respondents who are normally expected to be more or less at first, second or third year at a tertiary level of education (19 years:13.5%, 20 years: 12%, and 21 years: 4.7%), which this may be attributed to the fact that these respondents had started school late or had failed in one of their grades. Half of the respondents at the time of the study were at grade 11 (50.3%), followed by grade 10 (45.2%), and only 2.4 percent has admitted to be at grade 12.

As could be expected, the respondents are Africans (92.5%), followed by Coloureds (4.2%), Whites (1.6%) and Indians (.7%).

The most dominant mother language of the respondents is isiXhosa (93.1%), followed by English (4.4%) while compared with both Southern seSotho and Afrikaans which are both at 0.7 percent.

It is evident that the majority of respondents (87.1%) are affiliated to a church, while compared to 12.9 percent which denied any affiliation with a church. However, church affiliations tend to differ, where 19.0 percent of the respondents are affiliated to church like the Zion, followed by Methodists (18.8%), and others

who are affiliated to Presbyterian (11.3%), Anglican (5.3%) and other churches (33.3%) (Mthatha Christian, Old Apostle, Assembly of God).

The sample is dominated by respondents who reside in the rural areas of Mqanduli (40.8%), followed by those residing in the Mthatha rural (18.0%) areas, compared to those who reside in the urban areas like in one of Mthatha suburbs (10.9%), Mqanduli town (8.4%), Mthatha townships (8.2%), and other areas (13.7%) like Libode, Xhora, Tsolo, Qumbu.

### **1.10 CHAPTER DIVISION**

Whereas Chapter one presents the general orientation of the study, Chapter two focuses on the causes or factors relating to juvenile delinquency. Chapter three deals with the theoretical explanation of juvenile delinquency. While Chapter four deals with the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency. Finally chapter five accounts for the conclusions and recommendations resulting from the study.

### **1.11 SUMMARY**

This chapter has introduced juvenile delinquency as a rich field for research in criminological context. Though existing literature seems to have documented the incident of juvenile delinquency, there have not been enough investigations

carried about the subject in the whole of South Africa. To be precise, insufficient studies have been conducted on the youth evolving in the rural setting of the country. Furthermore, the existing theories do not adequately address the situations which are prevalent in South Africa when considering juvenile delinquency. Such a situation could be attributed to the fact that there are few theories, if any, that does have an African origin. In addition, juvenile delinquency has been viewed as an instance that continues to destroy the moral fabric of South Africa as many criminal offences are being perpetrated by young people. It has also been maintained that there is a sub-culture that has started to develop which has not been evident in the past generations.

The researcher adhered to the scientific method of an inquiry to the best of his abilities when, investigating juvenile delinquency in Mthatha District of Education. A structured questionnaire in the form of a self-report survey divided into four sections has been employed to measure juvenile delinquency as a social phenomenon.

## **1.12 CHAPTER REFERENCES**

Badenhorst, C. 2006. *Criminal capacity of children*. Unpublished Doctoral thesis. Pretoria: University of South Africa.

Bailey, K.D. 1982. *Methods of Social Research*. Second Edition. New York: The Free Press.

Bezuidenhout, C. & Joubert, S. 2003. *Child and Youth Misbehaviour in South Africa: A Holistic view*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Bless C. & Higson-Smith C. 1995. *Fundamentals of Social Research Methods: An African perspective*. Second Edition. Kenwyn: Juta & Co. Ltd.

Bundy, C. 1992. At war with the future? Black South African youth in the 1990's. *South African Rapport*, 8(1):18.

C de Wet. 2003. Eastern Cape Educators' Perceptions of the Causes and the Scope of School Violence. *Acta Criminologica*, 16 (3):89-90.

Clarke-Stewart, A., Friedman, S & Koch, J. 1985. *Child Development: A topical approach*. New York: Wiley.

Cloete, M.G.T. & Stevens, R. 1990. *Criminology*. Pretoria: Southern Books.

Coetzer, C. 1998. *Misdaadvoorkoning by besigheidskomplekse: 'n Gevallestudie by die Centurion Sentrum*. Pretoria: University of South Africa.

De Vos, A., Strydom, H., Founce, C. & Delpont, C. 2005. *Research at grass roots. For the social and human service professions*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Eliason, N. & Frank, C. 2002. Crime and Violence in schools in transition: a survey in twenty schools in the Cape Metropole and beyond. Institute of

Criminology: *Social justice Resource Project*. University of Cape Town.  
<http://www.uct.ac.za/depts./sjrp/publicat/crivial.html>. Accessed on 13-07-2006.

Gasant, M.W. 1994. Group and interpersonal conflict at Rockland Secondary School: An organizational analysis to ascertain the implication for policy making. M.Ed Script. Cape Town: University of Cape Town.

Glanz, L. 1996. *Crime in South Africa: Perceptions, fear and victimisation*. Pretoria: HSRC.

Glaser, C. 2000. *Bo-Tsotsi: The youth gangs of Soweto, 1935-1976*. Cape Town: Heinemann.

Gordon, M.M. 1947. "The concept of the sub-culture and its application." *Social Forces*, 26.40.

Hagan, F.E. 2000. *Research methods in Criminal Justice and Criminology*. Fifth Edition. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.

Hendersohn, J. 2001. *Crime and security*. South African Survey 2001/2002. Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations. (pp 360-401).

Kabali-Kagwa, P.N. 1997. Can whole school organization develop, as an intervention, impact on the quality of life in our communities? Available at url: <http://boleswa97.tripod.com/kabalikangwa.html>.

Kasese-Hara, M. 2002. *Race, culture, and psychological theory*. In D. Hook, J. Watts & K. Cockroft (Eds), *Developmental psychology* (pp. 343-96). Lansdowne: University of Cape Town.

Kenston, K. 1965. Social Change and Youth in America, in Erik H. Erikson (Ed), The Challenge of Youth, pp. 191-122.

Knudten, R.D., Schafer, S. 1970. *Juvenile delinquency: A reader*. NewYork: Random House.

Kratcoski, P.C. & Kratcoski, L.D. 1990. *Juvenile Delinquency*. Third Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NewJersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Mail & Guardian: March 13, 2007. Available online at [www.mg.co.za/printPage.aspx?area=/the\\_teacher/teacher\\_features/&articleId=3018](http://www.mg.co.za/printPage.aspx?area=/the_teacher/teacher_features/&articleId=3018). Accessed on 17/03/2007.

Mail & Guardian. 2008. Rights groups upset by age of criminal capacity. Available online at [www.mg.co.za/printPage.aspx?area=/breaking\\_news\\_national/ &arti...](http://www.mg.co.za/printPage.aspx?area=/breaking_news_national/ &arti...) Accessed on 6/21/2008.

Maxfield M.G. & Babbie E.1998. *Research Methods for Criminal Justice and Criminology*. Second Edition. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Wadsworth.

Mennel, S. 1973. *Sociological theory: Uses and unities*. London: Nelso.

Mthatha. 2002. King Sabata Dalinyebo Municipality Integrated Development Plan. Municipal publication.

Mthatha. 2002. O.R. Tambo District Municipality Integrated Development Plan. Municipal publication.

Muncie, J. 2004. *Youth & Crime*. Second Edition. London: Sage Publication.

National Youth Commission. Available online at [www.nyc.gov.za](http://www.nyc.gov.za). Accessed on 2/05/2005.

National Youth Policy, 1997.

[www.polity.org.za/html/govdocs/policy/intro.html](http://www.polity.org.za/html/govdocs/policy/intro.html). Accessed on 29/07/2006.

Nedcor ISS. 1998. The Nedcor project on Crime, Violence and Investment: Main report. Johannesburg, p.82.

Nzimande, B.1993. *Schooling in the context of violence*. Durban: University of Natal (Education Policy Unit).

Odongo, G.O. 2003. Public hearing by the Justice and Constitutional Development Portfolio Committee on the Child Justice Bill. 5:1.

Parliamentary Monitoring Group. 2003. Justice an Constitutional Developmental Portfolio Committee. *Child Justice Bill*. Public Hearing. Available at [http://www.pmg.org.za/viewminute.php?id=2441\(1of10\)](http://www.pmg.org.za/viewminute.php?id=2441(1of10)) Accessed on 15/09/2006.

S v M 1982 (1) SA 240 (N).

Seekings, J. 1993. *Heroes or villains*. Johannesburg. Ravan Press.

Shaw, M. 2002. *Crime and policing in post-apartheid South Africa transforming under fire*. United Kingdom: C. Hurst & Co.

Skelton, A. 1996. Developing a juvenile justice system for South Africa: International instruments and restorative justice. *Acta Juridica*, pp. 180-196.

South Africa. 1983. Child Care Act (Act 74 of 1983). Pretoria: Government Printer.

South Africa. 2002. Child Justice Bill. Pretoria: Government Printer.

South Africa. 2005. Gauteng Provincial Government.

South African Law Commission. 1996. Juvenile justice. Issue Paper No. 9. Project 106. Available online at: [www.law.wits.ac.za/salc/salc.html](http://www.law.wits.ac.za/salc/salc.html). Accessed on 6/07/2006.

Sloth-Nielsen, J. 2003. Submission to the Portfolio Committee on Justice and Constitutional Development: The Child Justice Bill 49/2002. Available at <http://www.childjustice.org.za/submissions/SlothNielsen.htm>. Accessed on 15/5/2006.

Snyman, C.R. 2002. *Criminal law*. Durban: Butterwoths.

Sunday Times. 2007. *Little boy killed over R5 he owed to schoolmates*. 3 June.

The Citizen. 1998. *The Bedfordview and Edenvale news*. Johannesburg.

The White Paper on Social Welfare. 1997. *Principles, guidelines, recommendations, proposed policies and programmes for developmental welfare in South Africa*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Van der Walt, P.J., Cronje G. & Smit, B.F. 1982. *Criminology: An introduction*. Pretoria: HAUM.

Van der Westhuizen, J. 1982. *Introduction to criminological research*. Pretoria: UNISA.

Van Zyl, F., Malan, C., Marais, H., Olivier, J.R. & Riordan, R. 1994. *Youth in the new South Africa: Towards policy formulation*. Pretoria: Human Science Research Council.

Vedder, C.B. 1974. *Juvenile offenders*. Fifth Edition. Illinois: Thomas.

Vetter, H.J. & Silverman, I.J. 1986. *Criminology and crime: An introduction*. New York: Harper & Row.

Whyte, W.F. 1955. *Street Corner Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/pubs/umrabulo/umrabulo24/futureinvest.html](http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/pubs/umrabulo/umrabulo24/futureinvest.html). *Future investment in South Africa's youth*. ANC National Youth Policy. Accessed on 10/05/2006.

[www.dcs.gov.za/WebStatistics/totcrime.aspx](http://www.dcs.gov.za/WebStatistics/totcrime.aspx). *Crime statistics on detention of young people in correctional facilities*. Department of Correctional Services. Accessed on 20/04/2006.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **CAUSES OR RISK FACTORS FOR JUVENILE DELINQUENCY**

#### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

According to Bezuidenhout and Joubert (2003:137) there should be a great investment made in the future of the youth. If this be the case, crime prevention

best begins with the youth because the country will be led by the present day youth when the adults opt for retirement or any other circumstances occur. However, in order for crime prevention to be successful the causes and phenomena associated with crime need to be identified. Notwithstanding this realisation it should be noted that, knowing what causes crime is not necessarily the same as reducing or addressing crime. All things considered it is important to know the causes or factors or phenomena that need to be present in order for crime to occur.

It has been envisaged that the exact causes of crime has been a concern among criminologists for centuries. In a marked departure from previous attempts to identify significant variables, or risk factors, which, when present, can irrefutably increase the likelihood of individuals to commit crime this study adopts the...view. According to Maree (2000:57) many criminologists are increasingly referring to correlates, rather than causes of crime. This view stresses that in understanding of juvenile delinquency, there is a fact that need not to be ignored. The fact is that some people usually succeed in spite of poor opportunities. However, the opposite is equally true. It is against this backdrop that this chapter will examine the following variables that are likely to be correlated with juvenile delinquency, viz: family; school; peer group; Aids; unemployment; drugs; and gangs.

## **2.2 THE FAMILY AND DELINQUENCY**

The family is the 'first line of defense' against juvenile misbehavior, because the family is regarded as the first socialising agent. It is the institution that has to play a major role in shaping a child's attitude towards the other institutions in society (Roberts 1981:536). Because a child belongs to a first and foremost the family provides shelter, protection from undesired intrusions, and material well-being for

its members. It has been envisaged that one of the most critical aspects of socialisation is the development of moral values in children. Moral education, or the training of the individual to be inclined towards the good, involves a number of things, including rules, that is the do's and don'ts, and the development of good habits (Benett 1993:11). According to Wyatt and Carlo (Cf. 2002) youths who have developed higher levels of pro-social moral reasoning, such as operating according to empathetic motives and internalizing values that would lead youth to act in ways to benefit others and society, are less likely to engage in aggressive behaviour and juvenile delinquency. The family teaches moral values and an individual uses the family as a part of entry to many other institutions in the community, such as religious fellowship, marriage partners, etc. According to many researchers the family plays a critical role in the unfolding of juvenile delinquency (Roberts 1981:536; Quinsey, Skilling, Lalumiere, and Craig 2004:80).

Patterson, Dishion, and Bank (Cf. 1984) argue that the family context and interactions within it are both directly and indirectly related to the development of antisocial behaviour. It has also been noted that the family provides both parents and children with supportive companionship which in itself is a trail basis for family stability. However, it is evident that the family is no longer the sole source of companionship for either parents or children. The family has lost its purpose due to the fact that the companionship is no longer available within it but somewhere else, because of various immense factors such as HIV/Aids, migrant workers and urbanisation (Barlow & Ferdinand 1992:156).

There are certain characteristics within the family setting which can propel a child to take to the street. Children in families that are characterized by instability suffer more consequences than those from stable homes. Parental discord often leads to

bitter quarrels over children. Gottfredson and Hirschi (1994:150) argue that adolescents who have low self-control are more attracted to delinquency than are youth with greater self control and that the primary “cause” of low self control thus appears to be ineffective childrearing. Hence, childrearing practices are a frequent point of contention. Disagreement between parents often confronts children with conflicting demands from their parents. In a nut-shell, parental discord is at the root of poor parenting, low levels of supervisions, ineffective discipline, and parental rejection, are closely related to delinquency. Children are most likely to imitate the style of their parents who often quarrel and end up being abusive in their relationships (Barlow & Ferdinand 1992:156; Regoli & Hewitt 2006: 294). In some cases as a result of such quarrels between parents, children deem it necessary to choose one parent over the other. When the turmoil takes its toll, parents lose any desire to supervise and guide their children, so that means children are left to follow their whims and inclinations. It has also been envisaged that weak parental involvement, and particularly weak fatherly involvement, is strongly related to delinquency (Loeber & Stotchammer- Loeber 1986:41-43).

### **2.2.1 Family disruption**

Family disruption is one of the causes of juvenile misbehaviour. It may occur through divorce, which is more common. However, since it is usually accompanied by family discord, ‘divorce’ may not be a good measure of family disruption. Even so, it should be noted that single parenting, as a consequence of divorce and the very process of going through divorce produces adverse

consequences for children in the family. Furthermore, divorce may produce 'family wars' in which relatives and friends pick sides and attempt to 'win' by attacking the former spouse. As a result, children are caught in the middle. Children are often defined as 'victims' of or expected to accept new definitions of the former spouse. Such situations produces stress for children and may lead to various situations such as decreased self-control, increased rates of psychological disturbances, drug use, gang affiliation etc. (Davidson 1990: 40-44; Barlow and Ferdinand 1992:156). However, the mere fact that family disruption may occur in a variety of ways such as through death, debilitating illness, illegitimacy, desertion etc., should not to be overlooked. In one way or another disruption results in one parent, usually the mother, being the one left with the duty or burden of childrearing and taking care of the children. A mother left alone with children may end up looking for work. Inevitably this will result in children having a part-time mother and no father at all. Under such circumstances children are deprived of adequate family-based socialisation and such children may drift to delinquency (Barlow and Ferdinand 1992:156). According to Turner and Peck (2002:72) the incidence of the absence of a father figure may result in community disintegration and crime, especially youth crime, which continues to grow. The majority of prisoners are male. With the preceding sentiments in mind, another person may not be far-fetched to postulate that a great number of children end up having an imprisoned father. This state of affairs contributes to the risk of youth becoming involved in criminal activities.

According to Bezuidenhout and Joubert (2003:59) this incident of single parent families is evident in South Africa where some mothers are employed a distance from home and spend many hours traveling. These working mothers leave home early in the morning and return late in the afternoon or evening. Others may stay in town during the week, to remain close to their work place. They often visit their

families one weekend per month. In some households guardians such as grandparents or older brothers and sisters substitute such parents and look after the younger children.

It should be mentioned that it is common for children and young people to be reared by relatives other than the mother or father. Such relatives include grandparents, aunts, or uncles. This is partly due to the former policy of separate development, where the majority of black South Africans were confined to living in defined ‘homelands’ mostly in rural areas. While the father at times or the mother, would seek for work in urban areas would leave children in the care of relatives; surprisingly enough even when South Africa has attained democracy this is still the case (Cf. Wedge, Boswell, & Dissel 2000).

According to Barlow and Ferdinand (1992:158) youth misbehaviour may be prevented if the family is tied together as the foundation for sound development where parents and children relationships are solid. If that happens the child in turn will avoid engaging in destructive activities because of the bond that exist between him or her and the parents. Table 3 depicts the nature and extent of family particulars in the Mthatha District of Education.

TABLE 3 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS’ FAMILY PARTICULARS (N=451)

Marital status of parents		Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Valid	Married	288	63.9	63.9	63.9
	Never married	77	17.1	17.1	80.9
	mother deceased	14	3.1	3.1	84.0
	father deceased	26	5.8	5.8	89.8
	Both parents deceased	13	2.9	2.9	92.7
	divorced or separated ( but both are still alive)	32	7.1	7.1	99.8
	Other	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	451	100.0	100.0	

Parent/ Guardian of Respondents:		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Biological parents (either father/ mother or both)	311	69.0	69.0	69.0
	grand mother/ father	63	14.0	14.0	82.9
	step mother/ father	13	2.9	2.9	85.8
	uncle/ aunt	29	6.4	6.4	92.2
	Brother/ sister	20	4.4	4.4	96.7
	Nobody	8	1.8	1.8	98.4
	Other	7	1.6	1.6	100.0
	Total	451	100.0	100.0	

$p \geq .05$

Table 3 reports that 288 (63.9%) respondents come from intact families (i.e. families where both parents are still alive and married). As a result, 311 (69.0%) families are being headed by either a father or mother or both. It also appears that that 77 (17.1%) of the respondents come from incomplete families as their parents never got married. It has also been reported that families could be incomplete because either of the deceased parents may be a father (5.8%) or a mother (3.1%) or even both (2.9%). It is also observed that both parents may be still alive but are divorced (7.1%). In instances where the family is incomplete for one reason or another it is easy for it to be headed by a grand mother/father (14.0%). At this point it has to be noted that the family is one entity that when it is disrupted find it very difficult to control child behaviour. For example, children who live in incomplete families are likely to display behavioural problems than children from intact families (Cf. Thornberry, Terrence, Smith, Rivera, Huizinga, and Stouthammer-Loeber 1999).

### **2.2.2 Parental discipline**

Loeber and Stouthammer-Loeber (1986:152) see the parental disciplinary style or approach as also a cause of juvenile delinquency. Extreme strictness, leniency, and inconsistency disciplinary approaches are largely associated with delinquency. The

exercise of parental discipline consists in the parent way of creating, or neglecting to create a specific order in the lives of their children. It has been indicated that families of aggressive children support the use of aversive and aggressive behaviour in their children by inadvertently reinforcing aggressive behaviour and by not adequately reinforcing pro-social behaviour. Parents also demonstrate coercive discipline practices involving high hostility, scolding, nagging, and threatening to use punishment without following through. Among many parents there is a lack of monitoring (i.e., not knowing where the child is, who the child is with, what the child is doing, or when the child will be home). Monitoring has been envisaged to be more important as children become older because they are increasingly likely to spend unsupervised time with their friends (Cf. Patterson 1982; Quinsey *et al.* 2004:82). Furthermore, some parents use discipline to lay the basis for the socialization of their off-springs. Even though parental discipline does not mean that the children behaviour is always directly regulated, though discipline sometimes it is taken to mean just that.

According to Chaiken (2000:17) the dearth of adult supervision is the probable cause of violence during the hours immediately before and after school. It has been found that the vast majority of boys (75%) spend quite a number of after school hours without the supervision of parents. By comparison, it has been realised that those boys who are likely to be supervised by the adults stands less chances of drifting into delinquency, while those who are not being supervised by their parents will drift more often than not into delinquency. Table 4 is curious to know about the nature and extent of disciplinary measures which are commonly employed by parents in the socialisation of their children.

TABLE 4 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED DISCIPLINARY MEASURES TAKEN DURING THE PAST TWELVE MONTHS (N=451)

Type of object/instrument		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Sjambok or similar object					
Valid	Always	44	9.8	9.8	9.8
	Sometimes	184	40.8	40.8	50.6
	Often	43	9.5	9.5	60.1
	Never	146	32.4	32.4	92.5
	Not applicable	34	7.5	7.5	100.0
	Total	451	100.0	100.0	
The use of verbal warning					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Always	85	18.8	18.8	18.8
	Sometimes	233	51.7	51.7	70.5
	Often	43	9.5	9.5	80.0
	Never	53	11.8	11.8	91.8
	Not applicable	37	8.2	8.2	100.0
	Total	451	100.0	100.0	
Grounding of the youngster					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Always	48	10.6	10.6	10.6
	Sometimes	145	32.2	32.2	42.8
	Often	47	10.4	10.4	53.2
	Never	173	38.4	38.4	91.6
	Not applicable	38	8.4	8.4	100.0
	Total	451	100.0	100.0	

Table continues.../47

Permission to visit friends denied		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Always	66	14.6	14.6	14.6
	Sometimes	192	42.6	42.6	57.2
	Often	33	7.3	7.3	64.5
	Never	131	29.0	29.0	93.6
	Not applicable	29	6.4	6.4	100.0
	Total	451	100.0	100.0	

$p \geq .05$

Table 4 reports the results obtained from a cross-correlation of data pertaining to a few selected disciplinary measures which were commonly employed by parents/guardians during the socialisation process of their children. This table also

reveals that parents/guardians used different forms of punishing their children.

It appears that the passive form of discipline in the form of *verbal warning* has been applied by most of the parents and/or guardians. Altogether 85 (18.8%) of the respondents have indicated that this type of punishment has always been exerted, while 233 (51.7%) indicated only sometimes and 43 (9.5%) often. The second type of punishment applied, appears to be the *denial to visit friends*. A total of 66 (14.6%) of the respondents reported this measure to have been always implemented. Further, 192 (42.6%) respondents indicated that it has been applied only sometimes and 33 (7.3%) indicated often and 131 (29.0%) said never.

A third popular disciplinary measure was the *grounding* of youngsters, i.e. they were refused permission to leave their homes, except to go to school, church, or for other valid reasons. There were 48 (10.6%) of the respondents who have indicated that this type of punishment has been always implemented in their cases, while 145 (32.2%) reported only sometimes, 47 (10.4%) often and 173 (38.4%) never. Physical punishment (using either a cane, sjambok or similar instrument) appears to have been least implemented as a disciplinary measure. Only 44 (9.8%) of the sample indicated they have been punished in this way. Altogether 184 (40.8%) indicated only sometimes, 43 (9.5%) often, while 146 (32.4%) were never subjected to this kind of punishment. Barlow and Ferdinand (1992:157) opines that the parental disciplinary style also influences the child's delinquency. Nagging, strictness, leniency, and inconsistency have all been associated with delinquency or aggressiveness. Table 5 will provide an overview of the general position of the respondents regarding the disciplinary measures employed by parents to socialise the youngsters.

TABLE 5 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS' OBJECTION TO DISCIPLINARY MEASURES (N=451)

Respondent's objection to the disciplinary measures utilised by parents		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	83	18.4	18.4	18.4
	once or twice	176	39.0	39.0	57.4
	three or four times	87	19.3	19.3	76.7
	Five times or more	80	17.7	17.7	94.5
	Not applicable	25	5.5	5.5	100.0
	Total	451	100.0	100.0	

$p \geq .05$

Table 5 reveals the results of an ordinary frequency distribution of data pertaining to the degree in which respondents have objected to their parents' disciplinary measures (see variable 22) during the twelve months period preceding this survey. It should be noted, however, that Table 15 reflects the statistical outcomes of cross-correlations between three selected independent variables (age, school grade, and parent marital status) and the dependent variable (# 22) operationalised as respondents' objection or protestation to the parental/guardian disciplinary measures applied to them during the same period (see Chapter 4 in this regard). From Table 5 it could be seen that 176 (37.0%) of the total sample (N=451) objected or rebelled once or twice to parental discipline, while 167 (39.0%) did so three or more times. Only 83 (18.4%) unconditionally accepted the disciplinary measures taken against them.

### **2.2.3 Siblings and Delinquency**

A London-based study into delinquent misbehaviour by Barlow and Ferdinand (1992:156) identified a correlation between the probability of a youngster being involved in delinquent behaviour where a family member is involved. It is evident from that study that, 4.3 percent of families, which took part in the study, produced 46.9 percent delinquents. In addition to that Glueck and Glueck (Cf.

1950) reports that 65.2 percent of their delinquents had delinquent brothers, whereas only 25.8 percent of their non-delinquent control group did not. When older siblings portray elements of delinquency to their younger brothers, they are guiding them directly into misconduct.

Furthermore, if one child is especially aggressive, the siblings are also usually aggressive and are much more likely to assault others when they reach adolescence. Table 6 and 7 are particularly curious about self-reported delinquent acts when cross-correlated with the number of children in the family.

TABLE 6 CROSS-CORRELATION OF PROPERTY STOLEN WITH A VALUE LESS THAN R10.00, BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN THE FAMILY (N=451)

Number of children at home	Never	Once to three times	four times or more	Not applicable
	n %	n %	n %	n %
one only	11 2.4	14 3.1	4 .9	3 .7
Two	21 4.7	20 4.6	5 1.1	2 .4
Three to six	117 25.9	78 17.29	20 4.43	11 2.4
seven to eight	49 10.9	26 5.8	3 .7	2 .4
More than eight	19 4.2	22 4.8	2 .4	2 .4
Not a single one: I am the only child	11 2.4	8 1.8	0 .0	1 .2
Total	228 50.6	168 37.3	34 7.5	21 4.7

$p \geq .05$

Table 6 clearly shows that just over half (228 or 50.6%) of the respondents never got involved in petty theft of property worth less than R10.00. Likewise, it appears that 168 (37.3%) of the respondents took property with a value less than R10.00 on one to three occasions. The question that arises, is to what extent did the

number of the children in the family influenced this kind of delinquent behaviour. The table indicates that 78 (7.4%) of the respondents fell prey to petty theft of property with a value of less than R10.00 where three to six children were present in such families. This trend is to lesser extent, also observable among families where seven to more than eight children were present (48 or 10.6%).

TABLE 7 CROSS-CORRELATION OF OTHER SELECTED SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENT ACTS BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN THE HOME (N=451)

Watch 'adult' video secretly		Never	Once to three times	four times or more	not applicable
		N %	n %	n %	n %
Number of children	one only	11 2.4	14 3.1	5 1.1	2 .4
	Two	14 3.1	22 4.8	11 2.4	1 .2
	Three to four	34 7.5	56 12.4	24 5.3	2 .4
	five to six	39 8.6	50 11.1	12 2.7	9 2.0
	Seven to eight	31 6.9	32 7.1	15 3.3	2 .4
	More than eight	12 2.7	24 5.3	7 1.6	2 .4
	not a single one: I am the only child	6 1.3	7 1.6	4 .9	3 .7
	Total	147 32.6	205 45.5	78 17.3	21 4.7
Evasion of taxi or bus fare					
Number of children	One only	22 4.9	9 2.0	0 .0	1 .2
	Two	28 6.2	17 3.8	2 .4	1 .2
	Three to six	137 30.4	75 16.6	11 2.43	3 .6
	Seven to eight	51 11.3	26 5.8	1 .2	2 .4
	More than eight	27 6.0	16 3.5	0 .0	2 .4

	Not a single one: I am the only child	17 3.8	2 .4	0 .0	1 .2
Total		282 62.5	145 32.2	14 3.1	10 2.2

Table continues.../51

Disobliged parents <sup>1</sup>					
Number of children	One only	14 3.1	12 2.7	5 1.1	1 .2
	Two	30 6.7	13 2.9	5 1.1	0 .0
	Three to six	112 24.8	100 22.17	9 2.0	5 1.1
	seven to eight	45 10.0	29 6.4	2 .4	4 .9
	More than eight	29 6.4	15 3.3	1 .2	0 .0
	Not a single one: I am the only child	9 2.0	10 2.2	1 .2	0 .0
Total		239 53.0	179 39.7	23 5.1	10 2.2
Pinched something small from a store worth less than R5.00					
Number of children	One only	16 3.5	12 2.6	3 .7	1 .2
	Two	24 5.3	31 6.9	3 .7	0 .0
	Three to six	126 27.9	76 16.85	14 3.1	10 2.2
	seven to eight	48 10.6	29 6.4	2 .4	1 .2
	More than eight	28 6.2	17 3.8	0 .0	0 .0
	Not a single one: I am the only child	13 2.9	6 1.3	0 .0	1 .2
Total		255 56.5	161 35.7	22 4.9	13 2.9

1) Chi-square=39.251;24df;p=.026.

Table 7 provides statistical information relating to cross-correlations between the following selected delinquent acts and the number of children in the home:

- a) Watched 'adults only' video secretly.

- b) Evasion of taxi or bus fare.
- c) Disobliged parents.
- d) Theft of an article worth less than R5.00.

The table reports high rates of non-involvement in three of the four deviant acts evasion of taxi or bus fares (n=282) (not significant), pinching something worth less than R5.00 (n=255) (not significant), and disobliging parents (n=239) (not significant) ( $p=.026$ ) while the secrete watching of ‘adult only’ videos (n=147) (not significant) shows the lowest frequency of non-involvement irrespective of the number of children in the family. Watching ‘adult only’ videos secretly on one to three occasions (205 or 45.5%) produced the highest rate of involvement of respondents in this type of delinquent act, irrespective of the number of children in the family. Disregarding parents on one to three occasions (179 or 39.7%), pinching articles worth less than R5.00 (161 or 35.7%) and evading taxi or bus fares (145 or 32.2%) also show fairly high levels of involvement by respondents. Likewise, secretly watching ‘adult only’ videos occurred one to three and four times or more among respondents who involved themselves in this kind of deviant act where there are three and four children in the home (80 or 17.7%) and to a lesser extent where there are five to six children in the family (62 or 13.74%). Similarly, disregarding parents/guardians also produced a problem among respondents who, one to three and four times or more (66 or 14.6%) violated this social norm while being part of families with three to four children. In summary this difference is significant at the .05 percent level. It could be postulated that watching ‘naughty videos’ and being disrespectful to parents/guardians on several occasions seems to be the most troublesome deviant acts practiced by some of the respondents.

#### **2.2.4 Parental relationship**

Barlow and Ferdinand (1992:157) maintain that strong parental relationships are capable of withstanding delinquency much better than in families where the parental relationship is weak. According to Regoli and Hewitt (1991:197), parents may influence their children by maintaining emotional closeness. Further than that, children who conforms to their parents 'wishes', usually stay out of trouble. Likewise, 'parental love' may reduce delinquency because it is something that children do not want to lose. It has also been envisaged that attachment to a positive role model is important because it functions as a 'psychological anchor' in the chain of conformity. Shaw, Keenan, and Vondra (Cf. 1994) indicate that early attachment and later parent-child and family relationships predict later externalising of behaviour problems. It has also been envisaged that parental attachment reflects aspects of parental management techniques and socialisation processes. However, a very different line of thinking says parents, sometimes have deviant impulses that they may act on. If this is true, then parents may pass on delinquent values and practices to their children. This transmission of values and behaviours may well be unconscious and in fact it may be contrary to the parents' wishes. Some researchers have argued that the affective quality of the parent-child relationship is crucial in the development of antisocial behaviour (Cf. Greenberg, Speeltz, and Dekleyn 1993). It has also been envisaged that toddlers in high risk environments with early insecure relationships are significantly more likely than children with secure relationships to have problems with peer relationships, mood, depression, and aggression in later childhood (Cf. Lyons-Ruth, Easterbrooks, Cibelli 1997; Cf. Shaw *et al.* 1996). It has also been indicated that the effect is stronger for boys than for girls (Cf. DeMulder & Radke-Yarrow 1991). Table 8 presents an indication of the type of children and parental relationship.

TABLE 8 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PARENTAL RELATIONSHIP (N=451)

Type of a person usually approached by the youngster when he or she is experiencing problem/s		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Mother	233	51.7	51.7	51.7
	Father	77	17.1	17.1	68.7
	Both biological parents	11	2.4	2.4	71.2
	grand mother/ father	23	5.1	5.1	76.3
	Other	107	23.7	23.7	100.0
	Total	451	100.0	100.0	
Attendance of church services		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	always (regularly)	125	27.7	27.7	27.7
	Sometimes	221	49.0	49.0	76.7
	Often	24	5.3	5.3	82.0
	Rarely	32	7.1	7.1	89.1
	Never	41	9.1	9.1	98.2
	not applicable	8	1.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	451	100.0	100.0	
Father's appraisal		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	always (regularly)	205	45.5	45.5	45.5
	Sometimes	136	30.2	30.2	75.6
	Often	15	3.3	3.3	78.9
	Never	45	10.0	10.0	88.9
	not applicable	50	11.1	11.1	100.0
	Total	451	100.0	100.0	
Mother's appraisal		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	always (regularly)	283	62.7	62.7	62.7
	Sometimes	109	24.2	24.2	86.9
	Often	12	2.7	2.7	89.6

Never	26	5.8	5.8	95.3
not applicable	21	4.7	4.7	100.0
Total	451	100.0	100.0	

$p \geq .05$

Table 8 shows that the majority of respondents (233 or 51.7%) have chosen to approach their mother when they encountered a need for advice with regard to school related problem, life experiences or developmental issues. Only 77 (17.1%) opted to approach their fathers. It is noteworthy to observe that 107 (23.7%) respondents have indicated that they rather preferred to consult ‘other’ people (e.g. church minister) or a grandmother or grandfather (23 or 5.1%).

Almost half of the respondents (221 or 49.0%) reported that they have only sometimes attended church, compared to 125 (27.7%) who indicated they have done so regularly (always). Altogether 283 (62.7%) of the respondents were praised by their mothers for having done ‘something good’ like having achieved good school achievements (or performances), while fathers to a much lesser extent (205 or 45.5%) have performed this task. This difference may be ascribed to the apparent absence of the father due to occupational demands, etc. Mothers are likely to spend more time at home or elsewhere with their children and, being an add-on, they are more predisposed to attending to and solving their children’s personal problems.

### **2.2.5 The family socio-economic status**

The family's socio-economic status is one of the strongest predictors of youth violence, with the effects of low socio-economic status tending to be more marked in communities characterised by high residential mobility and low levels of cohesion (Cf. Lipsey & Derzon 1998). In South Africa, high levels of poverty and unemployment are much more prevalent, a massive and ongoing urbanization process, may well be, associated with a breakdown in traditional kinship and family social support networks (Cf. Pelsler & De Kock 2000). In the absence of traditional social support networks, peer group influence has the potential for becoming an increasingly important frame of reference for the youth. Unfortunately, this frame of reference is likely to be associated with more extreme attitudes to a range of social behaviour, including violence (Foster 1991:441). Table 9 provides information about selected aspects surrounding the socio-economic status of the families of the respondents who participated in this study.

TABLE 9 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS (N=451)

Mother's employment status	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	158	35.0	35.0	35.0
No	276	61.2	61.2	96.2
not applicable	17	3.8	3.8	100.0
Total	451	100.0	100.0	
Father's employment status	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	200	44.3	44.3	44.3
No	199	44.1	44.1	88.5
not applicable	52	11.5	11.5	100.0
Total	451	100.0	100.0	
Number of children in the family	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid one only	32	7.1	7.1	7.1
Two	48	10.6	10.6	17.7
three to four	116	25.7	25.7	43.5
five to six	110	24.4	24.4	67.8
seven to eight	80	17.7	17.7	85.6

more than eight	45	10.0	10.0	95.6
not a single one: I am the only child	20	4.4	4.4	100.0
Total	451	100.0	100.0	

$p \geq .05$

Table 9 reveals that well over half of the respondents' mothers (276 or 61.2%) are economically inactive, while 158 (35.0%) are employed. Altogether 199 (44.1%) of the fathers of the respondents in question are unemployed and 200 (44.3%) are employed. The majority of families have three to four (116 or 25.7%) and five to six (110 or 24.4%) children to raise. So much as 80 (17.7%) families have to cope financially with the upbringing of seven to eight children.

### **2.3 PEER GROUPS AND DELINQUENCY**

Peer group pressure manifests itself in a school setting where children with different backgrounds are lumped together. These youngsters of probably the same age manifest their own culture, language, symbols and values distinctively, unlike those of younger children and adults (Regoli & Hewitt 1991:213). Adolescents have their own set of norms, values and expectations, just as adults have, and there is likely to be anomie, due to a conflict of ideas. Parents typically want to retain the same norms they were raised with as children. They are resistant to adapt to the new changes and they would rather want to slow down the change as much as they can, but by so doing they create conflict between themselves and their children. The major goal of the peer group is to maintain sovereignty or control over its turf; hence, that result in the need for developing a particular subset of rules and norms. In a nut-shell the concept sovereignty implies control over a physical territory established as 'gang turf'. Those who live within the boundaries of such territory and fall within a certain age category established by the group,

are candidates for group or gang membership or subjection to the power of the gang (Kratcoski & Kratcoski 1990:99).

Adolescents soon discover that the norms and values parents want to inculcate in them do not provide them with a sense of worth or accomplishment as youth. Thus, the adolescent begins to question parental norms and values. Peers who are experiencing the same problems begin to assume a crucial role in the socialisation process. They possess the power to make the adolescent feel worthwhile and important. They also have some questions about how to adapt to the anomie conditions of adolescence, how to feel more like a grown-up, worthwhile, etc. Wanting to be accepted and to feel worthwhile and more grown-up, many youngsters deviate from society's prevailing system of rules and values rather and engage in delinquent activities which infer status on an individual among the delinquent group (Regoli & Hewitt 1991:214).

It is important to be cognizant of the fact that it is not only the question of parental values and norms that may cause a child to deviate from the family institutions to the peer group. Children in some ways face oppression by parents from birth until the time they leave home as adults themselves. Children often find themselves occupying the bottom of the social and power ladder. They are consistently instructed to 'go find something to do', 'go play with your friends', 'go read a book', etc. Parents actually and unconsciously tell children to get out of their lives and create one of their own. So, children go out and play with their friends, and as they do, they realise that their playmates respect them and accord them the dignity, recognition, respect etc. that they are looking for, which parents had partly failed to provide. Like adults, children enjoy what it feels to be respected (Regoli & Hewitt 1991:214).

Parents are often also responsible for pushing their children into peer group relationships that they sometimes deplore. The irony of this process is that when children do begin to spend a greater amount of time with their friends, parents try to pull them back. At this point, parents are likely to complain that their children are spending too much time with their friends, never realising that this is exactly what they themselves prepared the children for. Furthermore, as a result of criminogenic elements that juveniles are exposed to within the family, groups will be formed. Actually the tendencies of juveniles to form groups appear to be a natural phenomenon that usually has a positive effect on the socialisation process (Regoli & Hewitt 1991:214-215).

#### **2.4 SCHOOL AND DELINQUENCY**

Barlow and Ferdinand (1992:161) claim that along with families and peer groups, the school also play a crucial role in as far as delinquency is concerned. Much of delinquency occurs in or around the school. Teenagers spend much of their waking hours at school, hence most of their unconventional activities are committed in or around the school setting.

Cloete and Stevens (1990:75) are adamant that a variety of factors, present in certain circumstances or at particular moments, may exert such a negative influence that it may lead a juvenile to crime because of a strong possibility that such youngsters may fall prey to it. Factors such as: prevailing cultural values, housing conditions and the physical environment, unhealthy family relations and/or conditions, lack of infrastructure necessary for personal development, unsatisfactory economical circumstances, factors relating to social transformation

and change, school related factors, especial the inability to achieve success at school or at other educational institutions, etc.

The US Task Force Report on Juvenile Delinquency (1967:51) exposed poor academic performance as a probable cause of involvement in delinquent acts (Siegel & Senna 1988:302-303). The US Task Force Report (Cf. 1967) further revealed that under-achievement in scholastic performance showed a direct link with delinquent behaviour. Jerse and Fakouri (1978:108-109) discovered that academic deficiency leading to early school leaving and ultimate antisocial or deviant behaviour shows a direct correlation with poor performance measured in terms of scores on standardised tests of basic skills, failure rates, teacher ratings and other academic measures. Similarly, researchers also proffered the possibility “...that [an] observed relationship between school failure and delinquency is actually the result of another underlying social problem” (e.g. a turbulent or confused family life at home).

According to Maree (2000:04) causes of crime in South African schools can be attributed to pupil involvement in gang activities, lack of transformation in schools, negative perceptions among black, coloured, and white learners; the presence of firearms and other weapons at school; the use of cannabis and other substances, etc.

Table 10 pays specific attention to the selected self-reported deviant acts (e.g. dagga smoking, alcohol abuse, etc.) usually committed by school pupils. These cross-correlations were executed within the context of the mothers’ employment status. Based on the statistical outcomes in Table 8, it has been postulated that mothers apparently play a more significant role in the socialisation of children,

than their fathers. For this reason, it has been regarded important to consider whether or not the mother's employment status may have exerted an influence on respondents' involvement in juvenile delinquency. Table 10 below concerns itself with the impact of parents employment status on the self-selected delinquent acts.

TABLE 10 CROSS-CORRELATION OF SELECTED SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENT ACTS, BY PARENTS' EMPLOYMENT STATUS (N=451)

Bullied other pupil's at school			Never	Once to three times	Four times or more	Not applicable	Total
Mother's employment status	Yes	Count	83	60	12	3	158
		% of Total	18.4%	13.3%	2.7%	.7%	35.0%
	No	Count	162	100	10	4	276
		% of Total	35.9%	22.2%	2.2%	.9%	61.2%
Total	Not applicable	Count	9	7	1	0	17
		% of Total	2.0%	1.6%	.2%	.0%	3.8%
	Total	Count	254	167	23	7	451
		% of Total	56.3%	37.0%	5.1%	1.6%	100.0%
Truanting			Never	Once to three times	four times or more	Not applicable	Total
Mother's employment status	Yes	Count	65	75	14	4	158
		% of Total	14.4%	16.6%	3.1%	.9%	35.0%
	No	Count	143	121	11	1	276
		% of Total	31.7%	26.8%	2.4%	.2%	61.2%
	Not applicable	Count	6	10	1	0	17
		% of Total	1.3%	2.2%	.2%	.0%	3.8%
Total	Count	214	206	26	5	451	
	% of Total	47.5%	45.7%	5.8%	1.1%	100.0%	
Beaten up another pupil in a fight			Never	Once to three times	Four times or more	Not applicable	Total
Mother's employment status	Yes	Count	64	73	18	3	158
		% of Total	14.2%	16.2%	4.0%	.7%	35.0%
	No	Count	160	101	10	5	276
		% of Total	35.5%	22.4%	2.2%	1.1%	61.2%

	Not applicable	Count	7	9	1	0	17
		% of Total	1.6%	2%	.2%	.0%	3.8%
Total		Count	231	183	29	8	451
		% of Total	51.2%	40.6%	6.4%	1.8%	100.0%

Table

continues.../62

Destroyed school property			Never	Once to three times	Four times or more	Not applicable	Total
School Grade	grade 12	Count	6	7	1	0	14
		% of Total	1.3%	1.6%	.2%	.0%	3.1%
	grade 11	Count	166	55	4	6	231
		% of Total	36.8%	12.2%	.9%	1.3%	51.2%
	grade 10	Count	127	70	2	7	206
		% of Total	28.2%	15.5%	.4%	1.6%	45.7%
Total		Count	299	132	7	13	451
		% of Total	66.3%	29.3%	1.6%	2.9%	100.0%
Destroyed or defaced another pupil's school books			Never	Once to three times	Four times or more	Not applicable	Total
School Grade	grade 12	Count	6	8	0	0	14
		% of Total	1.3%	1.8%	.0%	.0%	3.1%
	grade 11	Count	155	70	2	4	231
		% of Total	34.4%	15.5%	.4%	.9%	51.2%
	grade 10	Count	135	61	3	7	206
		% of Total	29.9%	13.5%	.7%	1.6%	45.7%
Total		Count	296	139	5	11	451
		% of Total	65.6%	30.8%	1.1%	2.4%	100.0%

$p \geq .05$

Table 10 reveals that well over half of the respondents' mothers (276 or 61.2%) are economically inactive, while 158 (35.0%) are employed. Altogether 199 (44.1%) of the fathers in question are unemployed and 200 (44.3%) are employed. The majority of families have three to four (116 or 25.7%) and five to six (110 or

24.4%) children to raise. So much as 80 (17.7%) families have to cope financially with the upbringing of seven to eight children.

It should be noted that mothers apparently play a more significant/pivotal role in the socialisation of their children than the fathers do (see Table 8). Against the background of this information Table 10 pays specific attention to the following selected self-reported deviant acts usually committed by school pupils in an attempt to ascertain whether or not the mothers' employment status may have exerted any influence on respondents' involvement in such juvenile (deviant) behaviour:

- Bullied other pupils at school.
- Truancy.
- Beaten up another pupil at school in a fight.
- Destroyed school property.
- Defaced another pupil's books.

The data obtained in Table 10 shows that 83 (18.4%) of the respondents whose mothers are employed, never bullied other school pupils compared to 162 (35.9%) whose mothers are unemployed or economical inactive. Sixty (13.3%) respondents with employed mothers bullied other pupils at school only one to three times, while 100 (22.2%) respondents of unemployed mother got involved in this kind of misbehaviour. A more or less similar pattern is being observed in the case of truancy (absenting him or her from school). Altogether 65 (14.4%) respondents with economically active mothers never stayed away from school compared to 143 (31.7%) whose mothers are not employed; a clear indication of motherly supervision. However, 121 (26.8%) of the respondents of mothers that are economically inactive have stayed one to three times away from school without any valid reason, compare to those (75 or 16.6%) whose mothers are employed

(The statistically results are approaching significance :  $p=.056$ ). Respondents' mothers (160 or 35.5%) who are not at work reported to never have beaten up another pupil at school, while only 64 (14.2%) whose mothers are employed indicated a similar response. Respondents' (101 or 22.4%) with unemployed mothers got more involved in this kind of activity, only once to three times compared to those who have mothers employed in the labour market. These differences are significant at .05 percent level ( $p=.008$ ).

Violence in South Africa schools has become a reality. The school, as an educational institution, plays an all important role in the upbringing (socialisation) of a child, and as a result, it should be able to provide safety and security on its campuses. Violence is counter productive to successful attainment of educational goals and objectives. In their survey into school bullying in twenty Western Cape Metropolitan schools, South Africa, Eliason and Frank (2000:1-4) observed that violence was endemic in both primary and secondary schools, possession of weapons in school has become a major problem, fist fighting or otherwise and vandalism (e.g. destruction of school property as well as defacing of other pupils' school books) were prominent in 95 percent of those schools who participated in the survey. Assault occurred on a regular basis (reported in 60% of the school) and gangsterism has been observed in 50 percent of the participating schools (Neser, Prinsloo & Ladikos 2005:1-5). Siegel and Senna (1988:311) refer to James Q Wilson's study that deals with school crime in particular. Involvement and participation by learners in school crime and/or other forms of disruptive behaviour are linked to the environment (community) in which the particular school is located; school crime does not exist in isolation from the crime rampant in that specific community. Hellman and Beaton (Cf. 1986) share this viewpoint. According Siegel and Senna (Cf. 1988), McDermott (Cf. 1983) put some interesting postulation forward about school crime and victims thereof:

- Crime and fear of crime in schools show the same characteristics of crime and fear of crime that occur in the surrounding community.
- Schools located in areas where crime was high experienced more crime than schools in safer environments. Fear of crime had also been lesser in schools in safer areas.
- Schools cannot be viewed as independent from the neighbourhood (community) in which it is situated. Being fearful of crime in those schools actually led such victims to be more fearful of crime in city parks, subways or streets.
- Perpetrators and victims of school crime cannot be separated in two groups, because many young offenders of school crime have been victims of delinquent or deviant acts themselves and may fear being victimised again.
- Violent and theft-related school crimes have ‘survival value’ and could be seen as ‘rational responses’ to peculiar situations such as taking revenge at a later stage. Striking back at a weaker learner (victim) could be emotionally satisfying through which the loss of valuables or even lost respect is regained.

In their study (N=1873) into the victims of school bullying (also labeled *peer victimization*), Naser *et al.* (2005:7-10) observed that 49.2 percent of the victims in Grade 10 suffered from being bullied once or twice a year (and 23.9 percent once or twice a month). Likewise, 51.8 percent of the Grade 11 school pupils were also victimised once or twice a year (and, to lesser extent, 20.3 percent once or twice a month). In 166 (36.8%) respondents in Grade 11 never destroyed school property as compared to 127 (28.2%) in Grade 10. However, Grade 10 respondents (70 or 15.5%) who did indeed destroyed other pupil’s school books, on one to three times, slightly outnumbered their colleagues in Grade 11. Similarly, 155 (34.4%) Grade 11’s never participated in the defacing (damaging) of other pupil’s school books, compared to 135 (29.9%) in Grade 10’s who also refrained from doing that.

Likewise, 70 (15.5%) Grade 11's had been slightly involved in this form of misbehaviour on one to three occasions than were the Grade 10's (61 or 13.5%). Nesor *et al.* (2005:53-54) provide three reasons for why learners would involve themselves in bullying other pupils:

- Showing how tough they are (63.0%).
- Did it for fun (54.6%).
- To get even (52.4%).

The frequency distribution of *who* the bullies really are in terms of population groups is as follows:

- Africans (Blacks) 50.9%.
- Coloureds 50.3%
- Indians 67.0%
- Whites 60.7%

Cloete and Stevens (1990:75) are adamant that a variety of factors, present in certain circumstances or at particular moments, may exert such a negative influence that it may lead a juvenile to crime because of a strong possibility that such youngster may fall prey to it. Factors such as: prevailing cultural values, housing conditions and physical environment, unhealthy family relations and/or conditions, lack of infrastructure necessary for personal development, unsatisfactory economical circumstances, factors relating to social transformation and change, school related factors, especially the inability to achieve success at school or at other educational institutions, etc.

The U.S. Task Force Report on Juvenile Delinquency (1967:51) exposed poor academic performance as a probable cause of involvement in delinquent acts (Siegel & Senna 1988:302-303). The U.S. Task Force Report (Cf. 1967) further

revealed that under-achievement in scholastic performance showed a direct link with delinquent behaviour. Jerse and Fakouri (1978:108-109) discovered that academic deficiency lead to early school leaving and ultimate antisocial or deviant behaviours shows a direct correlation with poor performance measured in terms of scores on standardised tests of basic skills, failure rates, teachers ratings and other academic measures. Similarly, researchers also proffered the possibility “...that [an] observed relationship between school failure and delinquency is actually the result of another underlying social problem” (e.g. a turbulent or confused family life at home).

#### **2.4.1 Learner failure and extracurricular activities**

The repeated failure of children at school can be seen as the most damaging experience. It tarnishes the child’s reputation among the peer group, undermines the child’s relationships at home, and weakens teacher’s confidence in the child. According to George (Cf. 2005) the Department of Education annual report in the Eastern Cape in 2005 reports that there were 328 000 high school pupils who were overage at the end of 2004 financial year. This vast number of overage pupils is attributed to the high repetition rate of about 40 percent in the secondary phase, which run from grade 8 up to 12. The social problems these pupils experience outside school also contributed to juvenile delinquency. The other factors that have a detrimental effect in the situation is the fact that most of the pupils in the Eastern Cape are from rural areas, where they are compelled to do other activities rather than going to school like herd livestock, for example. Some of the pupils are head of families for various social related problems; and such families may live in poverty. Poverty may be one of the contributing factors to juvenile misbehaviour

and crime as some of the learners will deem forced to go look for jobs at a very young age. However, these youngsters find it very difficult to find a job because employment opportunities are very much limited for those without qualifications and the legislation prohibit the employment of children (Barlow & Ferdinand 1992:161; Cf. George 2005).

Students who do well at school are popular with their peers, and participate in extracurricular activities probably consider school rules merely a minor annoyance. But students who fare poorly academically, are not popular, and feel that school does not offer much joy and consequently regard its rules as oppressive and intolerable. Furthermore, these students find school frustrating and develop hostility towards it, and often drift into trouble (Regoli & Hewitt 2006:348).

Kratcoski and Kratcoski (1990:151) assert that many children enter school come from homes and neighborhood environments that have predisposed them towards academic failure. These children may come from homes where the degree of environmental disorganisation is such that any sort of serious intellectual pursuit is nearly impossible. Overcrowded, noisy, substandard housing, lack of attention from parents, who are inexperienced with books, writing materials, exchange of ideas, conversation with adults etc., all these aspects may handicap a child and make it difficult for him or her to succeed at school. It is quite clear that control over such conditions lies outside the responsibility of the school, although they may contribute towards school failure.

It is evident that there are some school programs developed to assist handicapped children to overcome their problems. The blame should not be attributed only to the learners for example by the time of writing this chapter, it was indicated that there is a shortage of skilled teachers in South Africa and the Education Minister

Naledi Pandor had seen a duly need for developing a training programme that would in turn result in a 'well-structured' supply of teachers; so that the department may curtail the habit of employing foreign teachers. It has also been identified that some children often react to the situation of failing at school by rejecting their rejecters such as teachers and parents. They see school as dull and boring, they abandon any notion of continuing or undergoing school programs, they rather like to spend several evenings a week with their peers who have already dropout of school (Cf. George 2005; Polk & Richmond 1972:63).

#### **2.4.2 The school's failure in child socialisation**

The school provides a much more complex socialisation setting than the family does, since more varied forces interact and pull against each other. Hence, it is envisaged that school is the first location of socialisation away from the family unit where a child can be exposed to ideas at variance with those learned at home. Furthermore, the school provides fertile ground for the making of choices of behaviour and establishment of companionship without any intervention by and dependence on parents (Kratcoski & Kratcoski 1990:146).

Most American schools systems, as agents, of socialisation have been criticized for their apparent inability in many instances to meld the divergent elements presented to by the community, to serve as the location of peer culture formation, and to produce a socially acceptable citizen (Kratcoski & Kratcoski 1990:146).

It is evident that the enforcement of discipline is recognised as a pressing social interaction problem. Most of the post-democracy schools in South Africa are characterised by a lack of discipline. In fact, violence appears to be escalating in schools, aggravating the existing lack of discipline and impacting extremely negatively on learners (Buizedenhood & Joubert 2003:62).

Young black high school learners during the regime of apartheid in South Africa were a barometer of systematic marginalisation and powerlessness. Most schools were oppressive, but also became sites of a highly politicised struggle, a vehicle through which young people could assert their stake and role in society. By that it was seen as noble to be on the wrong side of the law. Violence was socially approved in the name of liberation. When some youngsters who had dropped out of school and returned to school during the transition to democracy, realized that there is no change that had taken place, they decide to go back home, to the street etc. As a result juvenile delinquency escalates in this country (Buizedenhood & Joubert 2003:145).

### **2.4.3 Teacher/ pupil relationship**

In the discussion of the school and delinquency the other aspects that need not to be disregarded is the extent of a sound relationship between a teacher and a pupil. In instances where a teacher is unable to communicate with the pupil properly, poor scholastic progress and deviant behaviour may develop. The relationship between the teacher and the child is plausible important in assisting the maladjusted children. It needs to be noted that the mutual relationship between the

pupil and the teacher depends on both of them by accepting each other (Cloete & Conradie 1983:55; Lawrence 1985:87).

It is evident more especial in South Africa and elsewhere that there is a freedom of choice for learners these days. This can be attributed to the open-education movement which has spawned flexible scheduling. Flexible scheduling gives students more free periods during which they have no classes to attend. Teachers who see students in the hallways may not know whether the students are legitimately unscheduled or are just skipping classes. The teacher who exercises strict authority may elicit resentment from pupils, because some pupils may regard his or her actions as provocative. Because of this not many teachers may want to confront pupils found hanging around campus instead of being in class. A social control theorist, Travis Hirschi (Cf. 1969) postulates that attachment to school includes attachment to significant others such as teachers, which provides constraints to deviant behaviour. When teachers surrender their control over learners, the school becomes a breeding ground for juvenile delinquency. As things are, students find it easier to get away with deviant behaviour, such as, drug use, violence, and vandalism (see Table 11). It has been further, argued that students today can choose not only their electives but also the teachers who will conduct their required classes. As a result teachers find themselves in a difficult situation: without wishing to sacrifice quality, they realise that they must get a large number of students to take and like their courses if they are to remain employed. Students like courses that are entertaining and easy. This situation generates a popularity contest among teachers in which one of the ways to win is to inflate grades. If one teacher inflates grades, the others are forced to do the same. As a result of such pressure, standards for students are relaxed and they become lazy and unmotivated. Compromised standards lead to poor quality of students coming out of the school system. Such may not make it or be considered

for tertiary education. Consequently they maybe involved in criminal activities (Cf. Coleman 1982; Cf. Graham 1988:30). The following table concerns itself with the relationship between teachers and the pupil's and the role that parents' employment status may play in delinquency.

TABLE 11 CROSS-CORRELATION OF SELECTED SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENT ACTS, BY PARENTS' EMPLOYMENT STATUS AND SCHOOL GRADE (N=451)

Scratched a teacher's motor car at school <sup>1)</sup>			Never	Once to three times	four times or more	Not applicable	Total
Mother's employment status	Yes	Count	89	52	15	2	158
		% of Total	19.7%	11.5%	3.3%	.4%	35.0%
	No	Count	181	85	5	5	276
		% of Total	40.1%	18.8%	1.1%	1.1%	61.2%
	Not applicable	Count	10	4	3	0	17
		% of Total	2.2%	.9%	.7%	.0%	3.8%
Total		Count	280	141	23	7	451
		% of Total	62.1%	31.3%	5.1%	1.6%	100.0%

Disregard of a teacher or other school official			never	Once	four times or more	not applicable	Total
Respondent's age group	under 16 – 17 years	Count	138	82	10	6	236
		% of Total	30.6%	18.2%	2.2%	1.3%	52.3%
	18 – 19 years	Count	91	42	4	1	138
		% of Total	20.1%	9.3%	.9%	.2%	30.6%
	20 – 21 years	Count	47	25	2	1	75
		% of Total	10.4%	5.5%	.4%	.2%	16.6%
	+21 years	Count	1	1	0	0	2
		% of Total	.2%	.2%	.0%	.0%	.4%
Total		Count	277	150	16	8	451
		% of Total	61.4%	33.3%	3.5%	1.8%	100.0%

<sup>1)</sup>Significant:  $\chi^2=20.997; 8df; p=.007$

Table 11 reports the results of a cross-correlation of data reflecting the status of the respondent relationships with their teacher. Believing that scratching a

teacher's motor vehicle does not point to a healthy pupil-teacher relationship, the researcher decided to link this possibility with the economical status of their mothers. On one to three occasions in the past year preceding this survey, did 85 (18.8%) of the respondents who come from families where their mothers are economically *inactive* indicated that they have not scratched a teachers motor vehicle, compared to 52 (11.5%) who did so. This appears to be significant ( $p=.007$ ).

According to *age categories*, Table 11 shows that the largest number of respondents (277 or 61.4%) had never disregarded a teacher or other school official during the past year preceding the survey. However, it transpires that 92 (20.4%) in the age under 16-17 years have disregarded a teacher or other school official, followed by 46 (10.2%) in the next age category, i.e. 18-20 years and 27 (6.0%) in the 20-21 age group. Adolescents in their puberty stage (1 or .2%) disregarded a teacher or other school official one to three times. The statistical results reveal that there is no significant difference ( $p=.658$ ).

## **2.5 DRUGS AND DELINQUENCY**

According to Bartollas (1997:328) it is evident that drug and alcohol abuse, along with juvenile delinquency, are the two of the most serious problems that adolescents are faced with. It has also been found that there is a quicker or easier spread of HIV/Aids within the population of drug users. The youngster who engaged themselves in the habit of substance abuse sometimes prefers substances that are not costly, like beer and marijuana. Crime can be committed as a result of the effect of drugs and also for the purpose of maintaining a drug habit. Barlow and Ferdinand (1992:97) suggest that drug abuse is often referred to as

‘victimless’ crime. This does not mean there is no one who is ever hurt but, rather, that participants consider themselves willingly involved and there is rarely anyone who claims to have been victimised.

Many theorists (Cf. Merton 1957; Cf. Jones 1960) continue to debate whether drugs causes delinquency, or delinquency leads to drug abuse, or some other factors precede both delinquency and the onset of drug use (Bartollas 1997:340). The longitudinal work with the National Youth Survey suggests that the use of alcohol and marijuana precedes serious offending. Other studies suggest that ‘conduct’ problems and impulsivity often precede not only the development of delinquency but also alcohol and drug abuse problems (Cf. Giancola & Parker 2001;). It has been indicated that youth with a diagnosis of conduct disorders are at an increased risk for both juvenile delinquency and substance use disorders and that the risk for both types of behaviour is mediated through genetic and psychosocial risk factors associated with early externalizing disorders (Cf. Biederman, Mick, Faraone, & Burbach 2001)

Dependency on drugs or alcohol is expensive and may drive people to crime if they have no other means of supporting their habit. It may also directly contribute to violent crime if taken in excess, especially if taken in a group context where there is a strong social pressure to conform to the group rules (Buizedenhood & Joubert 2003:56). To add to that, people under the influence of alcohol or drugs often behave in an irresponsible and reckless manner. Such behaviours may lead them to commit serious crimes. It has been pointed out that the use of drugs in itself does not necessarily initiate criminal careers. However, it may intensify and perpetuate them (Rhoca-Silva & Stahmer 1997:01).

There are theories which suggest that the bleak economic situation in the family has created a generation of youths and young adults who experience doubts, hopelessness, and uncertainty on an everyday basis. This hopelessness, position, has encouraged them to find ways to seek solace and relief from their pain. Drug and alcohol abuse had been seen as capable of immediately fixing their hopelessness though in the long run creates other problems (Cf. Rhoca-Silva & Stahmer 1997).

Barlow and Ferdinand (1992:103) postulates that if a child spends some time with peers whose attitudes and behaviour favour marijuana use, that child is more likely to use marijuana than a child who spends a lot of time with friends who frown on its use and are non-users themselves. It is concluded, therefore, that through association with other users, the child will also learn the techniques of marijuana use and the deviant values and attitudes that support it.

There are two basic pathways possible for substance abusing youths. Some maybe only substance abusers and are not involved in other delinquent activities. Those offenders may desist from substance abuse during their adolescence or may continue to use drugs as adults. Alternatively, substance abusing youths may also participate in other delinquent acts. These youths, too, may desist from one or both types of activity during adolescent or continue to be in one or both as adults. There is some evidence that drug addicts, like those with a history of delinquency and criminality, sometimes have a turning point, or change, when they walk away from drug use. Those who are deeply entrenched in the drug world as adolescents and continue on in their adult years find it particularly difficult to give up drugs. Those who are to stay straight, life typically must have had a religious experience or may have had an extremely positive experience in a therapeutic community for drug addicts (Bartollas 1997:344-345).

Thorton, Voigt and Doerner (1987:277) suggest that juveniles abuse drugs and alcohol for some important reasons. First, drugs are abused for the pleasurable effects attached to it. In a national drug abuse survey in the United States by Beschner and Friedman (Cf. 1979), adolescents have indicated in a self-report survey that when under the influence of drugs or intoxicated liquor, it was easier to make friends; they received the desired attention from their peers, it has been a good hobby and provided an opportunity just to be funny. In a discussion of the reason why South African youth would involve in the abuse of liquor during the radio program, *Monitor*, the following reasons surfaced:

- There is a perception that pleasure comes with the abuse of hard liquor or drugs.
- To be a youth simply means he or she has to experiment with liquor that is readily available.
- Parents who themselves abuse liquor set example to their children.
- Environmental factors also play a significant role (especially the neighbourhood).
- Lack of parental supervisions at occasions where alcohol is freely available, may lead to use by youth.
- Abusing alcohol provides an opportunity to draw attention to a youth.
- A lowering value system in society directly contributes to an increase in alcohol abuse among youth (SABC, Radio Sonder Grese, 17 April 2008).

Table 12 reveals the role drugs play in juvenile delinquency, cross-correlated with the number of children at home.

TABLE 12 DRUGS AND DELINQUENCY, BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN AT HOME (N=451)

Smoked dagga at school or elsewhere	Never		Once to three times		four times or more		not applicable
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Number of children the youngster is living with at home							
One only	18	4.0	9	2.0	3	.7	2
Two	28	6.2	14	3.1	5	1.1	1
three to four	68	15.1	36	8.0	9	2.0	3
Five to six	68	15.1	33	7.3	6	1.3	3
Seven to eight	53	11.8	23	5.1	2	.4	2
more than eight	29	6.4	14	3.4	0	.0	2
Not a single one: I am the only child	13	2.9	7	1.5	0	.0	0
Total	277	61.4	136	30.2	25	5.5	13

Table continues.../77

Drank beer, wine, or hard liquor while with friends <sup>1)</sup>	Never		Once to three times		four times or more		not applicable
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Number of children the youngster is living with at home							
One only	12	2.7	13	2.8	5	1.1	2
Two	20	4.4	20	4.4	6	1.3	2
three to four	51	11.3	48	10.6	17	3.8	0
Five to six	63	14.0	38	8.4	8	1.8	1
seven to eight	37	8.2	39	8.6	3	.7	1
more than eight	12		32		1		0

		2.7	7.1	.2	.0
	Not a single one: I am the only child	8	10	2	0
		1.8	2.2	.4	.0
Total		203	200	42	6
		45.0	44.3	9.3	1.3
		Never	Once to three times	four times or more	not applicable
Inhaled benzene, glue, petrol, or any other substance in order to get a 'kick'		n	n	n	n
		%	%	%	%
Number of children the youngster is living with at home	One only	22	8	1	1
		4.9	1.8	.2	.2
	Two	28	16	4	0
		6.2	3.5	.9	.0
	three to four	79	32	3	2
		17.5	7.1	.7	.4
	Five to six	66	40	4	0
		14.6	8.9	.9	.0
	seven to eight	49	29	2	0
		10.9	6.4	.4	.0
	more than eight	32	11	0	2
		7.1	2.4	.0	.4
	Not a single one: I am the only child	9	10	1	0
		2.0	2.2	.2	.0
Total		285	146	15	5
		63.2	32.4	3.3	1.1

Table continues.../78

		Never	Once to three times	four times or more	not applicable
Bought liquor without parents or guardian's permission		n	n	n	n
		%	%	%	%
Number of children the	One only	19	8	3	2
		4.2	1.8	.7	.4

youngster is living with at home					
Two	26 5.8	18 4.0	4 .9	0 .0	
three to four	63 14.0	47 10.4	5 1.1	1 .2	
Five to six	59 13.1	40 8.7	8 1.8	3 .7	
seven to eight	46 10.2	32 7.1	2 .4	0 .0	
more than eight	24 5.3	16 3.5	3 .7	0 .0	
Not a single one: I am the only child	9 2.0	10 2.2	1 .2	0 .0	
Total	246 54.5	173 38.4	26 5.8	6 1.3	
Sold or dealt in drugs with the aim of 'earning' money	Never n %	Once to three times n %	four times or more n %	not applicable n %	
Number of children the youngster is living with at home	One only 20 4.4	10 2.2	1 .2	1 .2	
Two	28 6.2	20 4.4	0 .0	0 .0	
three to four	74 16.4	32 7.1	9 2.0	1 .2	
Five to six	60 13.3	43 9.5	5 1.1	2 .4	
seven to eight	50 11.1	25 5.5	2 .4	3 .7	
more than eight	29 6.4	12 2.7	2 .4	2 .4	
Not a single one: I am the only child	12 6.4	7 1.5	1 .2	0 .0	
Total	273 60.5	149 33.0	20 4.4	9 2.0	

1) Significant:  $\chi^2=48.071; 24df; p=.002$ .

Table 12 reveals that respondents from families with three to four (68 or 15.1%), five to six (68 or 15.1%) and as much as seven to eight children (53 or 11.8%), never smoked dagga (*cannabis sativa*) at school. This figure rises to 277 (61.4%)

for the total sample. Only 36 (8.0%) respondents who are from families with three to four children smoked dagga one to three occasions during the twelve months preceding this study, followed by 33 (7.3%) from families with five to six children. This difference is not significant at the .05 percent level. Families with three to four (51 or 11.3%) and five to six children (63 or 14.0%) yielded respondents who never drank beer, wine or hard liquor while with friends in the past twelve months. In fact, altogether 203 (45.0%) respondents never got involved in such kind of deviant behaviour. However, as much as 48 (10.6%) and 38 (8.4%) in the same categories respectively, abused alcohol on one to three occasions. These differences are significant ( $p=.002$ ). Considering inhaling benzine, glue or any other related substances just to get a 'kick', the data shows that two third of the sample group never participated in such practices (285 or 63.2%), irrespective of the size of the family. Families with five to six children yielded 40 (8.9%) respondents who participated in kind of delinquent act, one to three times in the past year. No significant differences are observed in this category of delinquency.

Just over half of the respondents (246 or 54.4%) reported that they never bought liquor without their parents' or guardians' permission or knowledge. On the negative side, 173 (38.4%) respondents indicated they have done so on one to three occasions; especially respondents who are from families where there are three to four children in the home (47 or 10.4%) followed by the respondents who are from families with five to six children (40 or 8.7%). There are no significant differences in these scores.

Having dealt in drugs with the aim of 'earning' extra money never became part of the 273 (60.5%) respondents in the past twelve months preceding the survey; especially in homes with three to four children (74 or 16.4%). Although the

figures seem not to be significant, almost ten percent of the respondents from families where there are between five to six children got involved in this illegal practice one to three times.

In summary, it appears that families with more than three children often yielded respondents who became entangled in juvenile delinquent (deviant) acts. There are indications that almost or just over half of the respondents *never* involved themselves in the delinquent acts listed in the table.

TABLE 13 DRUGS AND DELINQUENCY, BY GENDER (N=451)

Smoked dagga at school or elsewhere			Never	Once	four times or more	not applicable	Total
Gender	Male	Count	113	56	12	7	188
		% of Total	25.1%	12.4%	2.7%	1.6%	41.7%
	Female	Count	164	80	13	6	263
		% of Total	36.4%	17.7%	2.9%	1.3%	58.3%
Total		Count	277	136	25	13	451
		% of Total	61.4%	30.1%	5.5%	2.9%	100.0%
Drank beer, wine or hard liquor while with friends <sup>1)</sup>			Never	Once	four times or more	not applicable	Total
Gender	Male	Count	69	89	27	3	188
		% of Total	15.3%	14.2%	6.0%	.7%	41.7%
	Female	Count	134	121	15	3	263
		% of Total	29.7%	18.0%	3.3%	.7%	58.3%
Total		Count	203	145	42	6	451
		% of Total	45.0%	46.5%	9.3%	1.3%	100.0%
Scratched a teacher's motor car at school			Never	once	four times or more	not applicable	Total
Gender	Male	Count	125	51	9	3	188
		% of Total	27.7%	11.3%	2.0%	.7%	41.7%
	Female	Count	155	90	14	4	263
		% of Total	34.4%	19.9%	3.1%	.9%	58.3%
Total		Count	280	141	23	7	451
		% of Total	62.1%	31.2%	5.1%	1.6%	100.0%

Table continues.../81

Inhaled benzene, glue, petrol, or any other substance in order to get a 'kick'			Never	once to three times	four times or more	not applicable	Total
Gender	Male	Count	119	57	10	2	188
		% of Total	26.4%	12.6%	2.2%	.4%	41.7%
	Female	Count	166	89	5	3	263
		% of Total	36.8%	19.7%	1.1%	.7%	58.3%
Total		Count	285	146	15	5	451
		% of Total	63.2%	32.3%	3.3%	1.1%	100.0%
Bought liquor without parents or guardian permission <sup>2)</sup>			Never	once to three times	four times or more	not applicable	Total
Gender	Male	Count	92	74	18	4	188
		% of Total	20.4%	16.4%	4.0%	.9%	41.7%
	Female	Count	154	99	8	2	263
		% of Total	34.1%	19.9%	1.8%	.4%	58.3%
Total		Count	246	173	26	6	451
		% of Total	54.5%	38.3%	5.8%	1.3%	100.0%
Sold or dealt in drugs with the aim of 'earning' money			Never	Once to three times	four times or more	not applicable	Total
Gender	Male	Count	112	60	9	5	188
		% of Total	24.8%	13.3%	2.0%	1.1%	41.7%
	Female	Count	161	87	11	4	263
		% of Total	35.7%	19.2%	2.4%	.9%	58.3%
Total		Count	273	147	20	9	451
		% of Total	60.5%	32.5%	4.4%	2.0%	100.0%

1) Significant:  $\chi^2=14.621; 4df; p=.006$ .

2) Significant:  $\chi^2=11.774; 4df; p=.019$ .

Whereas a cross-correlation of data in Table 12 reported the results between the *number of children in the family and juvenile delinquency*, Table 13 reports on the same dependent variable, cross-correlated with gender (male versus female). It is

encouraging to note that well over half of the respondents (277 or 61.4%) have indicated that they never smoked dagga (*marijuana*), compared to those (136 or 30.1%) who did so one to three occasions. However, 80 females (17.7%) reported fairly higher involvement in dagga smoking than the male respondents (56 or 12.4%) on one to three occasions in the past year. This difference is not significant at the .05 percent level. Altogether 203 (45.0%) respondents *never* bothered to drink beer, wine or any other hard liquor while with friends: females quite more (134 or 29.7%) than the males 69 (15.3%). Interesting enough, female respondents (121 or 18.0%) slightly outnumbered their male counterparts (89 or 14.2%) in the violation of this norm one to three occasions in the previous year. However, there were 27 (6.0%) male respondents who have indicated drinking beer or wine and even hard liquor while with friends on four or more occasions. This difference is significant ( $p=.006$ ).

Responses to scratching a teacher's motor vehicle at school indicates that well over half of the respondents (280 or 62.1%) never indulged themselves in this kind of behaviour: females (155 or 34.4%) slightly more than their male counterparts (125 or 27.7%). Of those who scratched a teacher's motor car on one to three occasions, females (19.9%) were fairly more 'guilt' of this kind of behaviour than males (11.3%). This difference is not significant at .05 percent. Inhaling benzine, glue, petrol or other substances one to three occasions to get a 'kick' found in favour with 146 (32.3%) of the respondents: 89 females (19.7%) compared to 12.6 percent males. Altogether 285 (63.2%) reported no involvement in this kind of delinquent act whatsoever. This difference is not significant at .05 percent level. Respondents appear to be slightly less interested in buying liquor without the permission or knowledge of the parents/guardians, apparently because of public exposure. Of those respondents who ventured one to three times along this delinquent domain, saw slightly more females (99 or 19.9%) secretly bought

liquor, compared to 74 (16.4%) male respondents, resulting in a significant difference ( $p=.019$ ). All in all, 246 (54.4%) never involved themselves in this kind of illegal activity; boys (20.4%) and girls 34.1%). Dealing in drugs (with the aim of earning extra money) has been also a popular form of juvenile misbehaviour. Altogether 273 (60.5%) of all the respondents *never* involved themselves in dealing with drugs: females (35.7%) compared to males (24.8%). Although slightly more female respondents (19.2%) participated between one to three times dealing with drugs than males (13.3%), females also did so four or more times (2.4%) while only 9 (2.0) male respondents were so involved. These differences are however, not significant at the .05 percent level.

Based on the data in Table 13, it could be postulated that female respondents were more apt to violate the social norms by involving them in the kinds of misbehaviour listed in that table, irrespective that over and over again they have indicated greater non involvement (percentage wise) in those delinquent acts. The mere fact that males were less involved in all those deviant acts could possible be ascribed to the fact that males are far less represented in the present study than females (see Table 2 for a demographic breakdown of such particulars).

TABLE 14 DRUGS AND DELINQUENCY, BY AREA OF RESIDENCE (N=451)

Smoked dagga at school or elsewhere			Never	Once to three times	four times or more	not applicable	Total
Area of residence	Mithatha	Count	90	49	22	12	167
		% of Total	20%	10.9%	4.9%	2.7%	37.0%
	Mqanduli	Count	140	72	3	7	222
		% of Total	31.0%	16%	.7%	1.6%	49.2%
	Other	Count	47	15	0	0	62
		% of Total	10.4%	3.3%	.0%	.0%	13.7%
Total		Count	277	136	25	13	451
		% of Total	61.4%	30.2%	5.5%	2.9%	100.0%

Table continues.../84

Drank of beer, wine or hard liquor while with friends <sup>1)</sup>			Never	Once to three times	Four times or more	not applicable	Total
Area of residence	Mthatha	Count	66	67	31	3	167
		% of Total	14.6%	14.9%	6.9%	.7%	37.0%
	Mqanduli	Count	103	108	9	2	222
		% of Total	22.8%	23.9%	2%	.4%	49.2%
	Other	Count	34	25	2	1	62
		% of Total	7.5%	5.5%	.4%	.2%	13.7%
Total		Count	203	200	42	6	451
		% of Total	45.0%	44.3%	9.3%	1.3%	100.0%
Inhaled benzine, glue, petrol, or any other substance in order to get a 'kick'			never	Once to three times	Four times or more	not applicable	Total
Area of residence	Mthatha	Count	96	58	11	2	167
		% of Total	21.3%	12.9%	2.4%	.4%	37.0%
	Mqanduli	Count	146	70	3	3	222
		% of Total	32.4%	15.5%	.7%	.7%	49.2%
	Other	Count	43	18	1	0	62
		% of Total	9.5%	4%	.2%	.0%	13.7%
Total		Count	285	136	15	5	451
		% of Total	63.2%	30.2%	3.3%	1.1%	100.0%
Bought liquor without parents permission <sup>2)</sup>			never	Once to three times	Four times or more	not applicable	Total
Area of residence	Mthatha	Count	76	71	18	2	167
		% of Total	16.9%	15.7%	4%	.4%	37.0%
	Mqanduli	Count	131	82	6	3	222
		% of Total	29%	18.2%	1.3%	.7%	49.2%
	Other	Count	39	20	2	1	62
		% of Total	8.6%	4.4%	.4%	.2%	13.7%
Total		Count	246	173	26	6	451
		% of Total	54.5%	38.4%	5.8%	1.3%	100.0%

Sold or traded in drugs with the aim 'earning' money			never	Once to three times	Four times or more	not applicable	Total
Area of residence	Mthatha	Count	93	60	12	2	167
		% of Total	20.6%	13.3%	2.7%	.4%	37.0%
	Mqanduli	Count	134	75	7	6	222
		% of Total	29.7%	16.6%	1.6%	1.3%	49.2%
	Other	Count	46	14	1	1	62
		% of Total	10.2%	3.1%	.2%	.2%	13.7%
Total		Count	273	149	20	9	451
		% of Total	60.5%	33%	4.4%	2.0%	100.0%

$p \geq .05$

As can be seen from Table 2 (Chapter 1), the independent variable *area (or place) of residence* initially consisted of the following places: Mthatha suburbs, Mthatha village and Mthatha townships. For purposes of statistical analyses, all these places were collapsed into single indicator: Mthatha (n=167). Similarly, Mqanduli town and Mqanduli village were collapsed into another indicator: Mqanduli (n=222). The third indicator of places of residence points to: Other areas (n=62).

According to this table (Table 14), 75 (16.6%) of the respondents who reside in Mqanduli indicated their involvement in the smoking of dagga one to three and four or more times in the past year or so, while 140 (31.0%) they *never* smoked dagga before. Compared to that, Mthatha respondents (71 or 15.7%) show slightly less involvement in this kind of delinquency. There were 90 (22.0%) of the latter respondents who *never* participated in this deviant act. The table further shows that some respondents admit having been drunk while with friends, slightly more respondents are residing in Mqanduli (189 or 41.9%) as compared to 98 (21.7%) to those from Mthatha who had reported their involvement in this kind of deviant act in one to three and four or more times. Considering the respondents who did not get involved in this kind of behaviour, the table shows that 103 (22.8%)

Mqanduli and 66 (14.6%) Mthatha respondents indicated they never abused alcohol in this way.

Altogether 73 (16.2%) respondents from Mqanduli and 69 (15.3%) from Mthatha reported the inhaling of intoxicating substances like benzine, glue or petrol to get 'high'. Likewise, 146 (32.4%) Mqanduli and 96 (21.3%) Mthatha reported their non-involvement in the sort of delinquent act. Eighty eight (19.5%) Mqanduli and 89 (19.7%) Mthatha respondents bought liquor in the past year on one to three and four or more times without the knowledge or permission of their parents or guardians. Similarly, 29.0 percent Mqanduli compared to 16.9 percent Mthatha respondents who have never associated themselves with this kind of delinquent act.

Trading in drugs to earn extra money has not been practiced by 134 (29.7%) Mqanduli respondents and 93 (20.6%) of those who reside in Mthatha. The table also denotes that 82 (18.2%) and 72 (16.0%) respondents respectively, participated in such misbehaviour one to three and four or more times in the past year. In summary, it appears that respondents residing in Mqanduli were slightly to fairly more involved in the juvenile acts listed in the table.

## **2.6 GANGS AND DELINQUENCY**

Barlow and Ferdinand (1992:86) assert that gangs originate in a variety of ways.

Teenagers cluster during adolescence to find answers to many new and urgent questions such as: How do their changing appearance and stature compare with that of others? What sense can they make of their new experience and discoveries? Which peers can they trust with their closest secrets without being ridiculed? Adolescent cliques regularly form on the basis of a need for mutual confirmation. They form and change in terms of adolescent whims. To add more to this discussion, Kratcoski and Kratcoski (1990:94) postulate that gangs develop from spontaneous play groups, when threats from youthful enemies lead them to protect their territory through mutual support. Groups that evolve into gangs develop a formalised structure with defined leadership status, division of labor, distinctive style of dress and well defined goals.

It is also important to note that not all gangs are posing a danger to the society, although they may put their members at risk of law breaking. Gang membership and gang related crimes are primarily a youth problem. Acquiring membership in a gang, especially at an early age, is strongly associated with future criminal activity. Many gangs exist for crime which is often committed to control the local drug market (Bezuidenhout & Joubert 2003:67).

Gang sometimes plays an important role in solving some of the problems that adolescents face in the impersonal competitive world. In the absence of better ways of resolving self-worth and status issues, they turn to violence and organise themselves in terms of their ability to intimidate and coerce one another. Where other more peaceful mechanisms are available; the youth are likely to be involved in such activities and may not get involved in criminal activities. (Barlow & Ferdinand 1992:88).

When these are unavailable, as for many lower or working class youngsters, they are left with little choice but to form their own clubs, if they want to think themselves as worthy individuals (Barlow & Ferdinand 1992:88). This is the reason Cloward and Ohlin (Cf. 1960) advance a view that delinquent behaviour is a search for solutions to the problem of adjustment that arises when lower class youths must face and recognize a discrepancy between their aspirations and the opportunities open to them for achieving their goals. Kratcoski & Kratcoski (1990:97) hold a similar view.

Although there may be many other contributing factors that may lead to delinquency and among most of the working class youngsters had to be blamed; though it is the environment, that some of the youngsters find themselves in that may be held responsible for the development of gangs. It has been envisaged that most of the time of the children from such a background are often unwilling to sit quietly in class, to listen dutifully to their teachers, and to do their homework regularly. Instead they are unruly and approach the learning experience reluctantly. They perform poorly at their schools work and earn their teachers and classmates scorn. They develop a poor reputation in the eyes of their classmates, and in turn, working class children cliques endorse their own values, which they think make more sense to them (Barlow & Ferdinand 1992:88).

## **2.7 THE IMPACT OF HIV/AIDS ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY**

An enormous amount of time, energy, and resources have gone into raising awareness about the developmental implication of the HIV/ Aids epidemic for the most severely affected regions in South Africa and the global community. Many effects of HIV/Aids are only beginning to be felt today and have yet to be

accurately measured. HIV/Aids are already increasingly undermining fragile families, communities, national economies and governance. It has also been envisaged that the wealth and assets of affected households are being reduced and families are breaking up. The demographic profiles of severely affected populations are being skewed by the deaths of exceptionally members of prime aged adults (Cf. Pharoah & Weiss 2005).

Further exploration of the impact of HIV/Aids on juvenile delinquency, could be discussed in the following two ways (Schönnteich 1999:01; Cheek 2000:05):

a) The illness and death of parents will leave children scarred and marginalised in ways that predispose them to delinquency and criminal behaviour. Furthermore, this observation positively correlates with poverty together with the emotional trauma associated with multiple HIV/Aids related losses and stigma; reduced levels of parental care, and the loss of positive role models. Growing up without parents, and being unsatisfactorily supervised by relatives and welfare organisations, could amount to a growing pool of orphans who will be at a greater risk of engaging in criminal activities.

b) In addition, the growing number of orphans will provide a ready recruitment pool for individuals because of the dearth of parental supervision; and organisations that wish to violently challenge the existing socio-political order; and use these youngsters as soldiers. It has also been envisaged that a swell of young people without family care and formal schooling may constitute an extra national population group vulnerable to co-optation into ethnic warfare. These uneducated, malnourished and purposeless children represent a 'potential army in search of a leader'. It has been envisaged that the HIV/Aids

epidemic will continue destroying the moral fabric and reduce security and stability in many communities.

There appears to be strong correlations between the dynamics triggered by the HIV/Aids epidemic and growing levels of crime. Factors like material need, social exclusion, unemployment, poor education, and family breakdown, may be held as the reasons why individuals can engage into unconventional behaviour. High levels of inequality are also closely linked with victimisation and may in fact be more consistently correlated with crime than poverty. The latter has been evident in South Africa (Pharoah & Weiss 2005:05).

Most countries in the Southern Africa region are in their third decade of the HIV/Aids epidemic and most of these countries have matured to the point that large numbers of people are already dying. Life expectancy is declining, with the US Census Bureau estimating that average life may have already halved in Botswana and Zimbabwe from an expected 70 years to 39 and 38 years respectively. The Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) alone, UNAIDS, UNICEF and USAIDS estimate that approximately seven million children have lost either one or both of their parents to Aids since 1990, and as many as two million have lost a parent at the turn of the millennium (Pharoah & Weiss 2005:06).

South Africa's increasingly youthful population, and the proliferation of the HIV/Aids pandemic, should be regarded as significant contributors to the crime rate over the next two decades. No amount of state spending on the criminal justice system will be able to counter this harsh reality; neither will draconian laws, better policing will make a difference. People in the coming

decades are likely to witness an increase in the crime rate, irrespective of the government response. In addition, it is true that the under-performing criminal justice system can not be held as the major cause of a high crime rate. Poorly trained police officers may fail to prevent crime; the decision by a criminal to commit crime does not lie with the police; this fact should not to be ignored (Cf. Schönteich 2005).

## **2.8 THE IMPACT OF UNEMPLOYMENT ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY**

Unemployment, but especial youth unemployment remains a problem; as result of an upsurge of the South African economy, despite the creation of 658 000 new jobs in 2005, the number of unemployment has still risen by 180 000 to 1.5 million. This is in part due to the fact that the number of people in the 15 to 24 years age group increased by 46 000 to 4,737 million by 2006 (Cf. Statistics S.A. 2006). In 2002, South Africa's official unemployment rate was 41 percent. A large portion of South Africa's unemployment can be attributed to open unemployment rather than workers finding self-employment in the informal sector. The high unemployment figure of this nature can be expected to have serious negative consequences for social stability and can propel some youngsters to engage in unconventional activities.

The problem of unemployment is not unique to South Africa. According to Okojie (2003:04); Africa compared to other regions of the world, has the largest segment of young people in its population, 36.7 percent, compared to 27.3 percent for the rest of the world in 2000, and at least one quota of the population is economically active.

It has also been found that there are countries which are predominantly Muslim oriented. In such countries girls marry early and withdraw from the labour force, thereby completely reducing returns to female education (Okojie 2003:04). Furthermore, Africa has obtained more formal education over the years. However, educational systems in Africa have witnessed declines in quality and infrastructure at all levels in the last decade. They are geared towards providing basic literacy, numeracy and industrial skills, and are yet ready to adjust to the changing demands for knowledge, skills and aptitudes required in the labour market. Youth unemployment in Africa is concentrated among those who have received some education, but who lack the industrial and other skills required in the labour market, making them unemployable and unattractive to employers who prefer skilled and experienced workers. Furthermore, educated youth prefer wage jobs in the formal sector and would like to remain unemployed until they get the type of job they prefer, which does have high wages (Cf. Chinguta 2002).

Youth unemployment in African countries such as South Africa has also promoted 'gangsterism'. Many youth now run criminal enterprises engaged in violence, armed robbery, car hijacking, illegal fuel sales, illegal importation of firearms etc., and have reached alarming levels. Those youth who decided to form gangs have not only developed their sub-culture, but also a 'career path' with a ladder of promotion, and status attainment where participants see a

horizon of ‘personal development’ (Cf. Chinguta 2000). In addition the dearth of employment or the high unemployment rate in Africa has contributed to increasing poverty. Furthermore, it has also been identified that girls of a schooling age are being encouraged to engage themselves in prostitution as a means of survival in several African towns and cities, more especial in South Africa, towns like Johannesburg, Durban, Cape Town, Mthatha, etc. It can also be attributed to the trafficking of women and girls across international borders to engage in prostitution (Cf. Taylor 2002).

## **2.9 SUMMARY**

Information in this chapter is indicative of various factors that may predispose a youngster consciously or unconsciously to misbehaviour. The family may be referred to as an ‘engine’ of the society which is duly charged with the duty of socialising children. Evidence has been presented that the family has partly failed to transform the child from an amoral creature who does not know social norms to an acceptable social being who knows and understands expected social roles. The dearth of socialisation by the family may be the result of breakdown due to divorce, death of one parent, desertion, prolonged absence due to work conditions, imprisonment, etc. This pathological family environment that is not conducive for shaping a law abiding citizen may predispose or propel youngsters to engage in various delinquent activities. However, it is important to note that there are also other circumstances found within the society that may lead a child into misbehaviour. For example peers group pressure that a child is exposed to within or around the school setting

such as: gangs which pursue goals that are directly related to those of many youngsters: togetherness, recognition, appreciation, security, freedom, and so forth.

Further, the data entertained in Tables 3 to 17 indicate involvement in the various delinquent acts. Although not very high in frequency, the data underline the early involvement in serious misdemeanours which cannot be ignored by parents and educational authorities.

## **2.10 CHAPTER REFERENCES**

Barlow, H.D. & Ferdinand, T.N. 1992. *Understanding delinquency*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers Inc.

Bartollas, C. 1997. *Juvenile delinquency*. Fourth Edition. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bennett, W. 1993. *The book of virtues*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Beschner, G.M. & Friedman, A.S. (Eds.). 1979. *Young drug abuse*. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.

Bezuidenhout, C. & Joubert, S. 2003. *Child and youth misbehaviour in South Africa: A holistic view*. Pretoria: Van Schaik's.

Biederman, J., Mick, E., Faraone, S.V., & Burbach, M. 2001. Patterns of remission and symptom decline in conduct disorder: A four year prospective study of an ADHD sample. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 40: 290-298.

Chaiken, M.R. 2000. Violent neighborhoods, violent kids. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin of the US Department of Justice*, March: 1-5.

Cheek, R. 2000. *A generation at risk: Security implications of the HIV/Aids crisis in Southern Africa*. Washington DC: National Defence University Press.

Chigunta, F. 2002. The socio-economic situation of youth in Africa: Problems, prospects and options. Paper presented at the Youth Employment Summit, Alexandria, Egypt, September.

Cloete, M.G.T. & Conradie, H. 1983. *Juvenile delinquency in school context*. Pretoria: HAUM.

Cloete, M.G.T. & Stevens, R. (Eds.) 1990. *Criminology*. Halfway House: Southern Books.

Cloward, R. & Ohlin, L. 1960. *Delinquency and opportunity*. New York: The Free Press.

Coleman, J. 1982. *High school achievement*. New York: Basic books.

Davidson, W.S. 1990. Diversion of juvenile offenders: An experimental comparison. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*: 55, 68-75.

DeMulder, E.K. & Radke-Yarrow, M.1991. Attachment with affectively ill and well mothers: Concurrent behavioural correlates. *Development & Psychopathology*: 3, 227-242.

Eliason, N. & Frank, C. 2000. Crime and violence in schools in transition: A survey of crime and violence in twenty schools in the Cape Metropole and beyond. Institute of Criminology: Social Justice Resource Project. Cape Town: University of Cape Town.

(Accessed on 29/05/2008 at <http://www.uct.ac.za/depts./publicat/crivial.html>).

Foster, G. 2004. Safety nets for children affected by HIV/Aids in Southern Africa. In: A generation at risk: HIV/Aids, vulnerable children and security in Southern Africa. Institute for Security Studies monograph series, No.109, ISS.

George, Z. 2005. Over-age pupils face daunting challenges. Daily Dispatch, October:17.

Giancola, P.R. & Parker, A.M. 2001. A six-year prospective study of pathways toward drug use in adolescent boys with and without a family history of substance use disorder. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 62: 166-178.

Glueck, S. & Glueck, E. 1950. *Unravelling juvenile delinquency*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Gottfredson, M. & Hirschi, T. 1994. *Substantive Positivism and the Idea of Crime*. CA: Stanford California Press.

Graham, J. 1988. School, descriptive behaviour and delinquency. *Home Office Research and Planning Unit Bulletin*, 26: 17-21.

Greenberg, M., Speletz, M., & Dekleyn, M. 1993. The role of attachment in the early development of disruptive behaviour problems. *Development and Psychopathology*, 5: 191-213.

Hawkins, J.D., Catalano, R.F. & Miller, J.Y. 1992. Risk and protective factors for alcohol and other drug problems in adolescence and early adulthood: Implications for substance abuse prevention. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112: 64-105.

Hellman, D. & Beaton, S. 1986. The patterns of violence in urban public schools: The influence of school and community. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 23:102-127.

Hirschi, T. 1969. *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Jerse, L.I. & Fakouri, M.E. 1978. *Juvenile delinquency and academic deficiency*, *Contemporary Education*, 49:108-109.

Kratcoski, P.C. & Kratcoski, L.D. 1990. *Juvenile delinquency*. Third Edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Lipsey, M.W. & Derzon, J.H. 1998. *Predictors of violent or serious delinquency in adolescence and early adulthood. A synthesis of longitudinal research*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lawrence, R. 1985. School performance: Containment theory and delinquent behaviour. *Youth and society*, 17(1):69-95.

Loeber, R. & Stouthammer-Loeber, M. 1986. Family factors as correlates and predictors of juvenile conduct problems and delinquency. In: *Crime and Justice*, 7, edited by Michael Tonry and Noval Morris. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lyons-Ruth, K., Easterbrooks, M.A., & Cibelli, C.E. 1997. Infant attachment strategies, infant mental lag, and maternal depressive symptoms: Predictors of internalising and externalising problems at age 7. *Developmental Psychology*, 33: 681-692.

Maree, K. 2000. What cannot be endured must be cured: Untying the Gordian knot of violence in South African schools. *Acta Criminologica*, 13(3): 1-13.

McDermott, J. 1983. Crime in the school and in the community: Offenders, victims and fearful youth. *Crime and Delinquency*, 29:270-283.

Neser, J.J., Prinsloo, J. & Ladikos, T. 2005. *An exploration of peer victimisation in public schools*. Institute of Criminological Science (ICS), Research Monograph, no. 1/2005, June. Pretoria: UNISA.

Okojie 2003. Employment creation for youth in Africa: The gender dimension. *Department of Economics and Statistics, University of Benin, Nigeria*: 1-17.

Patterson, G.R. 1982. *Coercive family process*. Eugen, O.R.: Castalia.

Patterson, G.R., Dishion, T.J. & Bank, L. 1984. Family interaction: A process model of deviance training. *Aggressive behaviour*, 10: 253-367.

Pelser, A. & De Kock, C. 2000. Violence in South Africa: a note on some trends in the 1990s. *Acta Criminologica*, 13(1): 80-94.

Pharoah, R. & Weiss, T. 2005. AIDS, Orphans, Crime, and Instability Exploring the Linkages. *Occasional paper*, 107: 1-16. Available at:

[www.iss.org.za/static/templates/tmpl\\_php?node\\_id=339&link\\_id=3](http://www.iss.org.za/static/templates/tmpl_php?node_id=339&link_id=3), Accessed on 10/6/2006.

Polk, K. & Richmond, F.L. 1972. *School and delinquency*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Quinsey, V.L., Skilling., T.A., Lalumiere, M.L. & Craig, W.M. 2004. *Juvenile delinquency: Understanding the origins of individual differences*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Regoli, R.M. & Hewitt, J.D. 2006. *Delinquency in society*. Sixth Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Regoli, R.M. & Hewitt, J.D. 1991. *Delinquency in society: A child centered approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Roberts, A.R. 1981. Stress and coping patterns among adolescent runaways. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 5(1):15-27.

Rocha-Silva, L. & Stahmer, I. 1997. Dangerous liaison: Alcohol, drugs and crime. *Crime and conflict*, 9:1-5.

Schönteich, M. 1999. AIDS and age: S.A's crime bomb, *AIDS Analysis Africa*, 10(2):1-4.

Shaw, D.S., Keenan, K. & Vondra, J.L. 1994. Developmental precursors of externalizing behaviour: Ages 1 to 3. *Developmental psychology*, 30: 355-364.

Shaw, D.S., Owens, E.B., Vondra, J.L., Keenan, K. & Winslow, E. 1996. Early risk factors and pathways in the development of disruptive behaviour problems. *Development and Psychopathology*, 8: 679-699.

Siegel, L.J. & Senna, J.J. 1988. *Juvenile delinquency: Theory, practice, and law*. Third Edition. New York: West.

South Africa. 2006. *Youth unemployment*. Pretoria: Statistics S. A. Pretoria: Department of Statistics.

South Africa Broadcasting Corporation (SABC). 2008. *Abuse of alcohol among youth*. Radio Sonder Grense (RSG) program, Monitor, 17 April (07h15).

Taylor, E. 2002. Trafficking in Women and Girls. A Paper prepared for the Expert Group Meeting, 18-22 November.

The U.S. Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency. 1967. *Juvenile delinquency and youth crime*. Washington, DC: USA Government Printing Office.

Thornton, W.E., Voigt, L. & Doerner, W.G. 1987. *Delinquency and justice*. New York: Random House.

Turner, R. & Peck, J. 2002. Long-distance dads: Restoring incarcerated fathers to their children. *Corrections Today*, 64(2): 72-75.

Wedge, P., Boswell, G. & Dissel, A. 2000. Violence in South Africa: Key factors in the background of young offenders. *Acta Criminologica*, 13 (2): 31-38.

Wyatt, J. & Carlo, G. 2002. What will my parents think? Relations among adolescents' expected parental reactions, prosocial moral reasoning, and prosocial and antisocial behaviour. *Journal of Adolescence Research*, 1: 646-666.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **THEORETICAL EXPLANATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY**

#### **3.1 INTRODUCTION**

Bezuidenhout and Joubert (2003:80) opine that a primary aim in the field of criminology is to explain the commission of crime and criminal behaviour. Such explanations attempt to address the question of why crime occurs and, based on these explanations, to predict the onset of criminal behavior (Barlow & Ferdinand 1992:13).

In an endeavor to explain youth misconduct, various theories have been developed (Bezuidenhout & Jourbert 2003:80). Some theories are called macro-theories, which are concerned with large-scale phenomena such as social change or the economic and political organization of the society. Other theories are called micro-theories, which focus on the ways in which individuals interact with others and with their immediate groups. To add more to that, generally theories are meant to explain a broad array of facts and are not restricted to time or place (Barlow & Ferdinand 1992:14). These authors also believe that as people move from situation to situation they are confronted with all sorts of messages, rules and explanations, some of which may not be obvious at all. This chapter will focus its attention on the following theories that have been developed to explain delinquency: Social disorganization; cultural transmission; social control; general strain and integrative theories.

### **3.2 SOCIAL DISORGANISATION THEORIES**

The social disorganisation approach has dominated sociological explanation of crime, with its origin in the Chicago school and work of Shaw and Mckay. This approach has emphasized the importance of social rules in the maintenance of social organization. It has actually directed its attention towards the problems encountered by groups, small geographical areas, and even the whole society where there is a breakdown or disturbance in the rules that guide social behaviour. In the actual sense of the word, social disorganization occurs when rules can no longer maintain the smooth functioning of the society (Vetter & Silverman 1986:297).

The generic assumption of social disorganization as an explanation of delinquency revolves around the notion that delinquency is primarily the result of a disturbance of institutional, community-based controls. It is postulated that individuals who live in such situation are not necessarily 'themselves' and they are personally disoriented. Furthermore, disorganisation of the community-based institution is often caused by rapid industrialisation, urbanization and immigration processes. There is also another assumption which claims that when community or society is disorganised that result into the development of criminal values and traditions (Shoemaker 1990:82).

Siegel (2001:192-193) postulate that social disorganisation theory pays more attention to the social environment and specifically, urban conditions that affect crime rate. Furthermore, these theories center around three variables: poverty, residential mobility and racial heterogeneity. These factors according to theories, generate social disorganisation, which, in turn contribute to crime. Squatter camps, for example, in South Africa display such indication of social disorganisation. Housing structures are dilapidated, many residents are unemployed, and single or no parent households occur partly due to HIV/Aids pandemic.

### **3.2.1 The work of Shaw & McKay**

Although the city of Chicago may not be compared to a rural area like the erstwhile former Transkei in the Eastern Cape, it should be appreciated that the social disorganisation theories explain the distribution of delinquency and the importance of family influence on the prevalence on this kind of deviant behaviour. The connection between social disorganisation and delinquency is associated with the writings of Shaw and McKay (Cf. 1969). Both these theorists

constructed the *concentric zone model* which, according to this schema, the city of Chicago is divided into five zones or circles (Vetter & Silverman 1986:300). In their investigation of relationship between delinquency and conditions of social disorganisation they found the highest concentration of delinquency in zone 1 and 2. They also discovered that delinquent rates declined in a *gradient pattern* from the center of the city towards zone five. In some areas the highest rate of delinquency can be attributed to high population, economic dependence and high rate of school truancy (Kratcoski & Kratcoski 1979:79).

They further discovered that delinquency remained high in specific areas of Chicago, despite the changes in ethnic and racial composition of the population. That discovery led them to conclude that delinquency producing factors are inherent in the nature of the community. Furthermore, Shaw and McKay (Cf. 1969) purport that the differences in areas where there is high rate of delinquency versus the areas of low rate of delinquencies that can on its own also be attributed to differences in norms, social values, and attitudes to which children are exposed. It has also been envisaged that in areas where there is low rate of delinquency there is uniform acceptance of conventional values, conformity to the law, education, and other related matters. In such areas formal association exerts pressure on children to keep them engaged in conventional activities (Vetter & Silverman 1986:42).

Shaw and McKay also discovered that children living in high delinquency areas are exposed to a wide variety of norms and standards of behaviour. In such areas there appears to be a competition between conventional standards and deviant values. Here it is evident that a youngster may be exposed to institutions such as the school and church which expose conventional values and at the same time come into contact with the group that had already engaged in unconventional or criminal activities.

Reid (1982:133-134) draws attention to very important correlations made by Shaw and McKay:

- a) Community characteristics and the nature and extent of juvenile delinquency confirmed a positive relationship between economic status of families; family mobility within the community, and the heterogeneity of families.
- b) Unemployment, poverty and heterogeneity of the family are likely to result in weak control which, in turn, may precipitate higher rates of delinquent acts.

### **3.2.1.1 Evaluation of Social Disorganisation Theory**

The contributions of Shaw and McKay (Cf. 1969) are not immune to criticism. Here are some of the flaws noted in this theory: it has overlooked the importance of the fact that the police are distributed unequally among different sectors of the city. That is, there is focused police patrolling in the central city areas than in suburban communities. It seems to ignore the fact that some people are not likely to report crime to the police. There is also evidence that the rates of delinquency among black people were very high only during the period of migration to urban settings, but once adjusted, they declined (Vetter & Silverman 1986:302; Shoemaker 1990:89; and Adler, Muller, & Laufer 1995:121).

### **3.3 CULTURAL TRANSMISSION THEORIES**

The proponents of these theories suggest that human behaviour, including delinquent behaviour, is flexible and not fixed. Behavioural inclinations change according to the circumstances or situations. Proponents of social learning theory

also opine that neither the delinquent, nor the society in which the individual live, is deviant or *bad*. Delinquency arises from the same general social conditions as does non-delinquent behaviour, and one person may ascribe to both kinds of behaviour at different times. Proponents of this theory are Edwin H. Sutherland, Walter Miller, and Matza and Sykes which will be briefly examined.

### **3.4 Differential association theory: E. H. Sutherland**

This theory was developed by Edwin H. Sutherland, from which he had shown some differences from earlier theories in a number of ways, some of which are given here below. He highlights the fact that social disorganisation and anomie theories to name few, did not properly explain the behaviour of individuals. His focus was not directed at an association among people, but rather revolved around a connection of ideas and behaviour (Netter 1984:239). He proposed specific statements (or principles), which form the major component of his theory (Shoemaker 1990:149; and Adler *et al.* 1995:124).

His propositions which define differential association, are as follows (Sutherland & Cressey 1974:75-76):

1. Criminal behaviour is learned, not inherited. To be precise, people do not commit crime because of inborn predispositions. Instead, they utilise previously acquired experiences in the commission of crime and delinquency.
2. Criminal behaviour is learned through interaction with other persons in a process of communication, which can be either verbal or non-verbal; direct or indirect.
3. The principal of the learning of criminal behaviour occurs within intimate personal groups. This statement allows for the influences of impersonal,

- mass media influences on behaviour, but it stresses the overwhelming importance of personal relationship on norms and actions.
4. When criminal behaviour is learned, the learning includes techniques of committing crime, which are sometimes very complicated or simple; and the specific direction of motives, drives, rationalization, and attitudes. Thus, the learning of criminal behaviour involves not only how the behaviour is committed, but also why it is to be done.
  5. The specific direction of motives and drives is learned from definitions of the legal codes as favourable or unfavorable; *definitions* in this statement, refer to attitudes toward the law. Here it is also recognized that attitudes are not consistently favorable or unfavorable but are most often mixed and conflicting for an individual.
  6. A person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favorable to violation of law. This statement represents the differential association principle- the 'heart' of the theory. It refers both to criminal and anti-criminal association and has to do with counteracting forces. When people become criminals they do so because of contacts with criminal patterns and also because of isolation from anti-criminal patterns.
  7. Differential association may vary in frequency, duration, priority, and intensity. These terms exhibit an effort to qualify the effect of definitions concerning the law or behaviour. Priority indicates that associations formed in early childhood may take precedence in influence over later association or, actually, to the power of influence one person or group may have over another.
  8. The process of learning criminal behaviour by association with criminal and anti-criminal patterns involves all of the mechanisms that are involved in any other learning. The learning of criminal behavior is complex and is not restricted to mere imitation. Criminal behavior may differ from

- non-criminal behavior, but the learning process through which the respective behaviours are acquired is the same.
9. While criminal behaviour is an expression of general needs and values, it is not explained by those needs and values, since non-criminal behaviour is an expression of the same needs and values. Theft and honest labor have the same goal-making money to obtain some measure of happiness and satisfaction in life. It is thus, important to take a note of the fact that the goals of delinquent and non-delinquents are often the same although means are different.

#### **3.4.1 Evaluation of the Differential Association Theory**

It is evident from various writings that the theory of Sutherland was never immune to criticism, although it has made a significant contribution towards the understanding of juvenile delinquency (Shoemaker 1990:155-161; Vetter & Silverman 1986: 340; Adler *et al.* 1995:125; Regoli & Hewitt 1991:94-95). There are for example, some of the sharpest attacks that focused on the contention that criminal behaviour is learned. The gist of the statement adds nothing new to the understanding of criminality, and that it downplays influences of individualistic factors. In a nutshell, differential association theory may serve a better explanation of why people do commit acts of delinquency rather than why they do not commit offences. Another criticism focuses on the time sequence that is proposed: which comes first, differential association or delinquency? Some criminologists believe delinquency occurs first; only later do delinquents select other delinquents as associates. Sutherland, though, insists that associates are chosen first, and then they socialize each other into becoming delinquents (Regoli & Hewitt 1991:95).

Another criticism of differential association theory is that it is too general and fail account for certain types of crime with unique features such as those committed under provocation or pressure circumstance. Despite the criticisms of Edwin Sutherland's theory, it offers a reasonable explanation of individual delinquency within an environmental context, although the numerous critical comments concerning its scope and logic can not be ignored (Vetter & Silverman 1986:340).

### **3.5 FOCAL CONCERNS THEORY: WALTER MILLER**

Walter Miller (Cf. 1958) is among those criminologists that have asserted that lower-class culture as a whole, stand more chances of being a breeding ground for delinquency than any other. Miller's account had focused on subcultures with lower-class areas which are seen as responsible for generating much criminality in urban areas.

According to Miller, delinquency is not a product of inter-generational poverty *per se*, but a distinct lower- class culture whose *focal concern* does not encourage conformity, but deviance. While the focal concerns of the middle-class culture on the one hand are achievements, delayed gratifications, and hard work; the focal concerns of the lower-class, on the other hand, are trouble, smartness, toughness, fate, and autonomy (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball 1995:50).

- **Trouble** involves run-ins with authority, police, bureaucratic personnel, or others. It also includes, for males problems associated with fighting or sexual activity accompanied by drinking; and for females complications associated with sexual activity.
- **Toughness** is characterised as a concern for physical prowess and strength, or so-called masculine traits.

- **Smartness** represents an ability to outwit someone through mental gymnastics.
- **Excitement** represents a heightened interest in the thrill, particularly experienced through alcohol, sex, gambling, etc.
- **Fate** includes the feeling that ones' future is out of his hands, beyond his control, not necessarily because of religious powers, but more because of the strong forces of destiny.
- Walter Miller's final concern is **autonomy** which represents a strong desire on the part of lower-class people to be independent of external controls.

FIGURE 1: WALTER MILLER AND LOWER-CLASS CULTURE

Lower-class culture	One-sex peer group	Participation by	Learning lower-	Adherence to
DELINQUENT		young males	class focal	these levels
BEHAVIOUR		in these groups	concerns	
			[toughness smartness	excitement
			fate autonomy]	

*Source: Vetter and Silverman (1986:326).*

According to Shoemaker (1990:137), the focal concerns of a lower-class culture relate to delinquency in two ways: Firstly, the absence of the father figure in the home setting results into delinquency. Due to the absence of the father, the adolescent deems himself or herself propelled to go out there on streets in search of this missing idol, which they can identify themselves with.

Secondly, lower-class gang members are not psychologically disturbed, instead they represent the most *able* male youngsters. They engaged in delinquent

behaviour during the course of the search for recognition which is not available in the home setting. This recognition the adolescent seeks can be provided by the gang (Shoemaker 1990:137).

### **3.5.1 Evaluation of Focal Concerns Theory**

According to Regoli and Hewitt (1991:88) there is a substantial amount of evidence claiming that the values of the lower-class gang delinquents are not endorsed by the majority of lower-class. Even serious repeat delinquents place a higher value on conventional accomplishments than they do on criminal ones.

Other theorists like Cloward and Ohlin (Cf.. 1960) have also challenged Miller's position on the grounds that his theory suggests a *cultural independence* between the lower-class and middle-class that might have not have existed during the time of the theory. Furthermore, Miller has been seen failing to adequately distinguish between lower-class norms in general and delinquent norms in particular. He has also been challenged for implying that the involvement of these boys in lower-class culture is so intense that any contacts with the agents of middle-class dominated institutions particularly the school, would have little or no impact on the reduction of their delinquent behavior. It is also extremely unlikely that these boys can spend ten or twelve years in school system which emphasis middle-class values and rewards behavior that is consistent with these values without being affected in some way (Regoli & Hewitt 1991: 89; Vetter & Silverman 1985:327-329).

### **3.6 DELINQUENCY AND DRIFT: SYKES AND MATZA**

In their *techniques of neutralization-theory* of delinquency, Sykes and Matza (Cf. 1957) basically subscribe to the same viewpoint as Edwin Sutherland (Cf. 1947) regarding the learning of delinquent behaviour. This view stresses the presence of values and neutralisation as well as techniques available for one to commit an offence at all. Circumstantial learning disclaimers (excuses) may be brought into play to place young people (youth) in a position to engage or *drift into misbehaviour* (deviant actions) that violate society's value system which they actually support and to which they usually subscribe. Juvenile delinquency becomes an *episodic* event and occurs at the moment when the young child feels that he or she is released from the moral constraints of the law. In other words, being involved in juvenile delinquent acts is seen to be 'acceptable behaviour' (i.e. they are not bound by all the formal provisions and prescriptions of the law). This observation is supported by anecdotal (short-term) evidence pointing to the fact that juvenile delinquents (Thornton, Voigt & Doerner 1982:146-148; Mqadi 1995:100; Brown, Tate, Vik, Haas, & Aarons 1996:304):

- do indeed show signs of guilt and shame.
- often select their targets (victims)
- avoid targets who are from the 'high society', i.e. those upholding the mainstream values of society, and
- search for targets with low value.

The original techniques of neutralisation proffered by Sykes and Matza (Cf. 1957) are (Regoli & Hewitt 1991:117):

- a) *Denial of responsibility*, which is exemplified by the excuse that *a lot of the trouble that youth engages in is not his or her own's fault*.
- b) *Denial of injury*, in which the juvenile does not deny the act but maintains that no one was really physically hurt or economically harmed.

- c) *Denial of a victim*, in which the harm of injury caused by the act is felt to be deserved because the victim deserved it, such as stealing from a *crooked* store owner.
- d) *Condemnation of the condemners*, which involves a view of disapproving others as hypocrites and hidden deviants, a view which sometimes becomes cynical of authority figures, such as the police, and school officials.
- e) *Appeal to higher loyalties*, which argues that the immediate demands of the group take precedence over community or societal values and rules; and that these group demands sometimes call for commission of delinquent acts.

Techniques of neutralisation prepare the youth for juvenile delinquency. In actual sense, these techniques lessen the effectiveness of both internal and external social controls, thereby freeing the juvenile to deviate. In a nutshell, youths can be delinquent without being committed to delinquency if they believe that the circumstances are exceptional (Regoli & Hewitt 1991:117; Brown *et al.* 1996:305-308).

These techniques of neutralisation are therefore nothing more than rationalizations and attitudes that are favourable for the violation of the law. According to this theory, juvenile delinquents violate the norms of society whenever circumstances are present to provide them with excuses for engaging in deviant acts. Delinquents also infringe regulations e.g. school regulations, engage in violent behaviour, e.g. different forms of school bullying, fist fights, etc., abuse of alcohol and drugs, theft, malicious damage of property, and readily justify their behaviour (Mqadi 1995:103; Brown *et al.* 1996:305-307).

### **3.6.1 Evaluation of Delinquency and Drift Theory**

Although Sykes and Matza (Cf. 1957) have made a plausible contribution towards the understanding of juvenile delinquency, their theory has also been criticized. They had expounded that delinquency will decline as adolescents approach adulthood. This assumption seems to ignore the fact that this decline may be associated with the effects of official intervention and treatment efforts on the part of society in an effort to *reform* delinquents. It is true that gang members tend to disassociate from the gang as adulthood approaches. In other words delinquency, gang membership or otherwise does decline with advanced age status, through marriage, employment, or perhaps general maturation (Cf. Mcord, Mcord, & Zola 1959; Cf. Briar & Piliavin 1965; Shoemaker 1990:165).

Matza's conceptualization of the delinquent adolescent portrays a rather free-floating individual who is being buffeted about by diverse influences. In the true sense of the word, this assumption is appealing though it seems to allow far too much individual freedom of choice without suggesting a rationale for explaining those choices which are made by the individual (Shoemaker 1990:166).

### **3.7 SOCIAL CONTROL THEORIES**

The ideas of the control theory can be traced as far back as the nineteenth century and early twentieth century. All the social control theorists agree on one fundamental point: human beings must be held in check or somehow

controlled (socialised), if delinquent tendencies are to be repressed. They further generally agree that delinquency is the result of a deficiency in something, the absence of a working control mechanism. Early versions of social control theory includes those of *personal and social control*, proffered by Albert Reiss (Cf. 1951), F Ivan Nye's *family focused theory of social control* (Cf. 1958), T. Hirsch's *social bond theory* (Cf. 1969), and Walter Reckless's *containment theory* (1961). These theories will be briefly highlighted (Shoemaker 1990:172; Lilly, Cullen, & Ball 1995:75).

Social control focuses primarily on the socialization aspect of the young, and it assumes that a tendency towards committing crime or delinquency acts, are constantly present in society. Social control theories also accept that, if left uncontrolled, people (also juvenile delinquents) will strive towards satisfying their own needs and interests, except those prevailing in society. Social (or informal) control becomes necessary to facilitate conformity among members of society to the prevailing norms and values (Brown, *et al.* 1996:302).

### **3.7.1 THEORY OF PERSONAL AND SOCIAL CONTROL: REISS**

Reiss (Cf. 1951) propounded that delinquency results when there is an absence of internalised norms and rules governing behaviour in conformity with the norms of the social system to which legal penalties are attached. Reiss further asserts that a breakdown in previously established controls, and or relative absence of or conflict in social rules or techniques for enforcing such behavior in the social group of which he is a member may also result in delinquency. Reiss (Cf. 1951) maintains that conformity might result either from the

individual's acceptance of rules and roles or from a mere submission to them. This theory stresses the following (Lilly *et al.* 1995:81):

- a) Mature ego ideals or non-delinquent social roles, that is internalized controls of social groups governing behavior in conformity with non-delinquent group expectations.
- b) Appropriate and flexible rationale controls over behavior, which permits conscious guidance of action in accordance with non-delinquent group expectations.

Social control focuses its attention on the acceptance of or submission to the authority of the family institution and the reinforcement of existing personal controls. Considered from the standpoint of the group, it is clear that the theory focuses on the nature and strength of the norms of the society and the effectiveness of the state rules. In this theory, it is important to remember that Reiss's goal was to develop a prediction instrument. He was not seeking to explain what caused delinquency as such, but to pin down those factors that have to occur before any such causes may be expected to produce their effects. Reiss (Cf. 1951) also maintains that there is *social control over the child's behaviour when the family milieu is structured so that the child identifies with his or her family members and the accepted norms.*

On the other hand, acceptance of or submission to such social control may decline if the family fails to meet the needs of its members and provide for members' needs. He also propounded that control might be lost when the family exercises either "over- control or under-control' of the child's behaviour (Lilly *et al.* 1995:81).

### **3.7.2 FAMILY FOCUSED THEORY OF SOCIAL CONTROL: NYE'S VIEWPOINT**

In summary, it appears that the *family* has an important role to play in preventing youth from getting involved in the juvenile delinquency. The family is a major source of informal social control and young children are expected to identify with parental non-criminal roles (Thorton *et al.* 1982:145). This view takes the cognizance of the fact that the peer group may exert a controlling influence on adolescents when they engage in either legitimate or illegitimate activities. Reiss (Cf. 1951) also observes that, because the peer group has an influence on behaviour conformity, deviant peer groups may serve to weaken existing conforming controls in society (Mqadi 1995:105).

In this theory, Nye (Cf. 1958) makes it clear that in their early years' children have no concept of right or wrong and therefore break rules quite often. Even after they have learned some rules, they may continue to break them because deviant behaviour is a quick and easy way to get what one wants. In general, Nye believes that delinquency is natural; conformity, on the other hand is not all natural; it must be explicitly taught and encouraged by parents (Regoli & Hewitt 1991:114; Lilly *et al.* 1995:83).

Furthermore, social control theory focuses on adolescents, and considers the family to be the most important agent of informal social control. Because this primary group represents society and as such it is capable of generating direct or indirect, internalised, and informal control through alternative means of

need satisfaction in this theory (Regoli & Hewitt 1991:114; Lilly *et al.* 1995:83):

- *Internal control* refers to a process whereby a child will conform to and accept the norms and rules of society as if it were his or her own. Every society relies upon this occurrence as the primary form of social control. It is actually an ideal form of control because it goes with the child everywhere and costs nothing because it is inculcated in the minds of the young-one through the process of socialization.
- *Direct control* is considered to be imposed on an individual by external forces such as parents, teachers and the police through direct restraints accompanied by punishment for violation of rules.

Affection or rejection from parents can play an important role in the lives of young children, especially as far as the control of juvenile delinquency is concerned (Cf. Nye 1958). Indirect control will be a successful undertaking if an affectionate relationship exists between the conforming child and his or her parents. Where this kind of relationship is lacking, indirect control is not likely to take place. Children's attitudes towards parents vary in terms of a continuum ranging from complete acceptance to complete rejection (Mqadi 1995:107). Development of a parent-child relationship may occur as follows (Nye 1958:07):

- (a) *Complete acceptance* occurs when such relationship changes from dependency to a complete affectionate and more independent status. A parent is more likely to be viewed as an experienced friend.

(b) *Partial rejection* occurs when the child frees him or herself from their parents without developing active hatred. Nye (1958:07) concludes: “Neither does he or she have affection or respect, nor positive or negative feelings; strikes a balance, thus forming an indifferent or somewhat ambivalent relationship”.

(c) *Complete rejection* develops when the adolescent develops an active dislike of the parent.

- *Indirect control* is exercised through a person’s affection for parents and other conventional figures. The child does not wish to lose the affection of a loved parent or other authority figures and rather conforms to what is expected of him or her.

Finally, a social system that made available various means of achieving satisfaction rather than demanding that everyone pursue exactly the same goal in exactly the same manner, was held to exert social control by *delivering the goods* in such a variety of legitimate ways then the temptations to non-conformity was reduced (Regoli & Hewitt 1991:114).

### **3.7.3 CONTAINMENT THEORY: WALTER RECKLESS**

In his *Containment Theory*, Walter Reckless (Cf. 1961) analysed the relationship between *personal* and *social controls*. His theory advocates that every individual has (Adler *et al.* 1995:169):

- (a) A containing external structure, and
- (b) A protective internal structure

Both structures act as defense and protection mechanisms for the individual against falling into the 'trap' of, or pressures and pulls towards juvenile delinquency (Adler *et al.* 1995:169). Another assumption is that people are conceptualised as being composed of several layers of drives, pressures, pulls, and insulators or buffers. All these forces affect the individual simultaneously, and they come from both within and outside the person. According to Lilly *et al.* (1995:85) Walter Reckless did not purport to offer a theory of crime causation. Instead he suggested that a variety of factors, including biophysical forces, psychological pressures, and social condition such as poverty might *push* a person towards crime or delinquency, and other factors such as illegitimate opportunities may *pull* one toward misbehaviour.

Reckless identified four types of pressures and containments (Shoemaker 1990:177):

1. Outer, or social, pressures and pulls.
2. External containment.
3. Inner containment; and
4. Inner pushes, that is organic or psychological forces.

He conceptualises these four factors as circles, or layers emanating from the self. External pressures include adverse living conditions such as poverty, unemployment, minority group status, and discrimination. Outer 'pulls' consists of bad companions, deviant prestige figures, juvenile gangs, and the mass media. Internal pushes include a variable host of faults and problems, such as tensions and frustrations, aggression, need for immediate gratification, rebelliousness, feelings of inadequacy, etc. With all of these 'pushes' and 'pulls' operating on juveniles, it is a wonder that they do not all become delinquent and remain that way. Society, however, offers various external or outer constraints on lawbreaking behavior.

Two other aspects of external control containment are the structure of roles and expectations in society and a sense of acceptance and belonging relative to a group or society.

Reckless also mentions three other types of inner containment, namely: goal orientation, frustration, tolerance, and norm commitment and retention of two general types of containment, inner and outer containment namely. He clearly feels that inner containment is more important for the control of delinquency (Shoemaker 1990:176-178).

#### **3.7.4 THE SOCIAL BOND THEORY: TRAVIS HIRSCHI**

Travis Hirschi (Cf. 1969) could perhaps be regarded as the most productive and successful exponent of social control theory. However, he does not appear to be the most prominent voice in regard to the relationship between social control and juvenile delinquency (Adler *et al.* 1995:161).

As far back as 1957, Jackson Toby thought that the term *individual commitment* would be the most “...powerful determining force for the social control of behaviour” (Adler *et al.* 1995:161). That observation or finding has been substantially supported by Scott Brair and Irving Piliavin (Cf. 1965) who both jibe that *commitment* and *conformity* by a child through: (a) his or her (positive) relationships with adult authority figures (e.g. parents, school teachers, church ministers, etc.), (b) with friends, and (c) a Christian “...belief in God”, (c) affection for those peers who display conformist behaviour in social life and who assert a positive influence (through example and interaction) on other young people, (d) occupational aspirations (i.e. to acknowledge the investment in one’s

own future and the ultimate process of self-actualisation, (e) attachment to parents (i.e. acknowledging the power of parental discipline), (f) a desire to achieve the highest degree of success at school and, lastly, (g) fear of material deprivations and punishments associated with arrest, would counter juvenile delinquency. *Individual motivation* (a desire to nurture valuables, etc.) plays an equally important role in the process of control. Hirschi distinguished himself from Toby, in the sense that he was not so much interested in what sources causes a juvenile to engage in deviant acts, than “...*why people do not commit such acts*” (Adler *et al.* 1995:162-162), simply because social control theory explains conformity and adherence to rules and prescriptions; *not deviant acts*.

Hirschi's *social bond* theory is, therefore, not geared towards determining 'why children commit crime' Hirschi's approaches the issue of juvenile delinquency from a different angle by means of trying to establish why conformists (i.e. those people who acknowledge and adhere to the formal rules and prescriptions and act accordingly as law-abiding citizens) *do not violate the law or engage in minor transgressions*. According to Travis Hirschi, people “...do not break laws to the extent that they have internalised law abiding norms or developed social bonds... humans, like other animals will violate rules if those rules have not been socially indoctrinated (inculcated through a proper socialization process) as part of moral code” in them (Brown *et al.* 1996:309). Hirschi (Cf. 1969), quoted by these authors, explains this event by referring to a chicken that gets corn from the neighbour's barnyard: the chicken knows nothing about moral law ('thou shall not steal'); it instinctively eats the corn irrespective of whether it knows who the owner of the corn is. There is no real motivation to commit a crime. Hirschi (Cf. 1969) maintains that weakened or broken social bonds will lead to a decline in conformity and eventually surrender to deviant impulses. The weaker the one (ties with parents or the social order), the stronger the other one (juvenile delinquency).

Social bonds will not reduce the motivation to commit crime, but only reduce the probability to become susceptible to such motivations.

#### **3.7.4.1 Elements of social bonding**

Hirschi (Cf. 1969) identifies four different elements of social bonding (Adler *et al.* 1995:162-163; Bartollas 2000:149-150; Brown, Tate, Vik, Haas, & Aarons 1996:309-311; Maguire, Morgan, & Reiner 2000:350-353):

- *Attachment*, which includes attachment to (a) parents, (b) school, and (c) peers. Hirschi opines that a child who has formed a significant attachment to a parent is unlikely to participate in deviant acts out of fear of damaging the relationship with his or her parent(s). The strength between a child and his or her parents depends on the depth and quality of the interaction between the two entities. This bond is strengthened through: (i) the amount of time the child spends with his or her parents, (ii) the intimacy of communication between them, i.e. between parent and the child. *Sensitivity* to the opinions of others (e.g. teachers) forms the gist of the matter as far as this element of bonding (attachment) is concerned, especially as it relates to the *essence of internalisation (learning) of norms (laws and regulations) and to the conscience or superego*. To the extent that an individual cares about what others think of him or her, he or she is controlled. Hirschi empirically tested the *opinions of an adolescent about conventional others* (teachers) through the following variables (Adler *et al.* 1995:162):

“Do you care what teachers think of you?”

- (a) I care a lot.
- (b) I care some.
- (c) I do not care much.

The inability to function well in school: academic incompetence leads to poor school performance which, in turn, leads to a dislike of administrators. This chain of events may lead to juvenile delinquency. On the other hand, attachment to school is facilitated through a youngster's appreciation for his or her school as well as the education system itself, perceptions of how he or she is received by teachers and peers and, lastly, the level of achievement in class. Attachment to parents and peers usually dominates attachment to peers and thus indicates the best predictors of conformity.

- *Commitment* is based on the assumption that people (also youngsters) are *rational*, they will contemplate the consequences of actions before acting. An individual is committed to the degree that he or she is willing to invest time, energy, and himself or herself to conventional activities, such as educational goals, property, or reputation, and other valued conditions which discourage delinquent behaviour. Hirschi contends that if juveniles are committed to conventional values and activities, they develop a stake in conformity and will refrain from delinquent behaviour.
- *Involvement* this is another element which had also played a part toward the achievement of society goals that are social conventional orders. This element focuses attention on the types of activities that occupy the individual's day, and assumes that individuals that engage in conventional activities may be too busy to find time to pursue deviant behaviour. In a society there are structures such as schools for example which have extra curricular activities such as school plays, clubs, athletic events, etc. Involvement in any or all of these structures may curtail an individual from engaging in delinquent

activities. Hirschi contends that a person involved in conventional activities is tied to appointments, deadlines, working hours, plans, and the like. Directed or motivated by all these involvements a person may not have time to for engaging in delinquent acts.

- *Belief* Hirschi's control theory postulates that, although people have been socialized into a common set of beliefs- respect for the law and social norms, delinquency is likely to develop due to their ineffectiveness of such beliefs if they happen to be ineffective.

#### **3.7.4.2 The evaluation of the Social Bond Theory**

According to Bartollas (2000:154), Travis Hirschi's theory has provided valuable insights into delinquent behaviour. It has considered the importance of the intra-family relationship as the one that can contribute towards shaping the youngster to conformity. However, this theory has been criticised for its neglect of the origin of social bonds and their varying strengths. Control theory asserts that deviant behaviour is a consequence of weak bonds with the conventional order. To attribute behaviour, either deviance or conformity, to the strength of social bonds is only a partial answer. If social bonds are responsible for the behaviour, the obvious concern is to understand those bonds. If, as Hirschi claims, there is variation in the strength of bonds, it becomes essential to account for such differences (Maguire *et al.* 2000:354).

### **3.8 GENERAL STRAIN THEORIES**

Strain theories have much in common with theories of conformity. They assume, first of all, that children are committed to conventional behaviour and that under normal circumstances, they mature into adulthood with little difficulty. However, the fundamental issue is ‘how’ are conventional children who are initially committed to prevailing traditional values, transformed into deviant children? Strain theories take theories of conformity a step further by attempting to explain the sources of deviant behaviour in nominally conformist children (Barlow & Ferdinand 1992:212).

These theories maintain that norms are violated to alleviate the strain that accompanies failure. They further view community as structured in a manner that some juveniles are *denied* any opportunity to fulfill the ideals of the community.

It is plausible important to note that these theories share something common with conflict theories. Both these theories assume that a child, at first, is committed to conventional and conforming behaviour. However, the conforming behaviour is eroded by a persistent inability to win the community’s approval. Even so, these two sets of theories differ in the way they account for the juvenile’s anomie and subsequent behaviour. From the standpoint of the strain theory, the juvenile’s failure to meet society expectations is largely a moral failure. He or she has failed to live up to the community’s standards and his or her esteem has suffered a bitter blow. He or she sees themselves as morally at fault and personally responsible. Their subsequent deviance powerfully reflects both a sense of moral degradation and diffuse anger at his group-based humiliation (Barlow & Ferdinand 1992:212). Emile Durkheim stimulated the strain tradition by explaining crime and other deviant behaviour. Robert Merton, for instance, revised Durkheim’s theory in an

endeavour to provide the contemporary understanding of strain theory. Theorists such as Cloward, Ohlin, and Albert Cohen, whose theories will be examined here, had extended the concept under discussion (Brown, Esbensen, & Geis 2001:285; and Vetter & Silverman 1986:310).

### **3.8.1 SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND ANOMIE: ROBERT KING MERTON**

According to Vetter and Silverman (1986:311) Merton's aim was to discover how the social structure exerts definite pressure on certain persons in society to engage in non-conformity rather than conforming to accepted conduct. He further postulates that all societies have a cultural system that denotes socially approved *values* and *goals*, and there are acceptable norms or institutionalised *means* for achieving these goals. However, he points out that these regulatory norms do not necessarily represent the most direct or efficient method of achieving these objectives. There are many ways which specific individuals would find far more efficient for securing these desired objectives including among them like fraud, theft, and violence, but these methods of achieving the goals are considered outside the realm of accepted behaviour. Merton also postulates that the legitimate means for obtaining wealth are unequal distributed throughout the class structure. Members of the upper-class have greater access to education, important interpersonal contacts that will enhance their opportunities, and socialization that prepares them for competition in the search for wealth status on the one hand. On the other hand members of the lower-class experience greater stress or strain in their attempts to make money legitimately. That is also why they are found in disproportionate numbers among the criminal population and other deviant groups (Brown *et al.* 2001:290-291; Vetter & Silverman 1986:311-312). Merton goes on to point out that when society is in a state of anomie (i.e. lack of norms or normlessness) , several reactions, or *modes of adaptations*, besides innovation are

available to individuals for them to survive in an economically competitive environment. These forms of adaptation are: conformity ritualism, retreatism, rebellion, and innovation. It is also important to note that the particular course of action that a person takes may vary as he or she moves from one situation in society to another. These categories, therefore, represent role behaviour plays in specific types of situations, not specific personality types. Here, Merton is not suggesting that people can be classified according to these five modes of adaptation but rather that they choose one of these courses of action depending upon the situation and their position in the society structure. Merton's five modes of adaptation will be briefly exposed as follows (Brown *et al.* 2001:292; Regoli & Hewitt 1991:102; Vetter & Silverman 1986:313):

- *Conformity* means accepting the cultural goals and the institutional means. This is the most common response, even in anomic societies.
- *Ritualism* involves accepting the institutional means but rejecting the cultural goals. Ritualists are not usually considered deviant; instead, they scale down their aspirations and abide almost compulsively by institutional norms.
- *Innovation* is probably the most common form of adaptation to structural stress induced by the inability to legitimately achieve cultural goals. Innovators aspire to attain conventional goals but use illegal means to succeed because they do not perceive themselves as having legitimate opportunities.
- *Retreatism* involves rejecting both the cultural goal of getting ahead and the approved means. Their dropout status is characterized by things like drug dependency, homelessness etc. Retreatists for the most part engage in crimes that have no victims except, of course, themselves.

- The final mode of adaptation is *rebellion*, this occurs when a person rejects the goals and the acceptable means of achieving those goals in society. Unlike retreatists, the rebels substitute a new set of values and norms and discard the ones in existence and acceptable in society.

### **3.8.1.1 Applicability of Merton's theory to the present study**

Robert King Merton's theory (Cf. 1968) has been created or devised to explain *anomic conditions* experienced by individuals in everyday, social life. To show how people who experience anomie would adapt to demands of social life, i.e. how they would accept or reject the goals or the 'legal' means of achieving a state of conformity instead of getting involved in crime, Merton entertains five *modes of adaptation* in this regard. However, the question is: 'How would school pupils, who are bound to adhere to school discipline, adapt to the rules and regulations that are calculated to prevent them from getting involved in juvenile delinquency?'

By its nature, *conformity behaviour* entails the ideal mode of adaptation to the normative parameters of school governance because it facilitates acceptance of the goals of the school discipline to ensure ultimate success in future life: "...*conformists* are of little concern" (Adler *et al.* 1995:252). *Innovation* would allow pupils to aspire to attain success in school context through acceptance of discipline, etc., but would tend to reject the means thereto and rather substitute it with their own 'code of conduct' or their 'own schemes'. *Ritualism* implies accepting both the goals and the means in equal proportions set for a successful school career, just to stay out of trouble. *Retreatism* would signal rejection of both the ideal of attaining an honest, successful school career and conformism. Pupils in this category would rather resort to dropping-out from school, perhaps as a result of total involvement in drug or alcohol abuse. Lastly, and perhaps the most

important mode of adaptation, is to be found in *rebellion*. Pupils in this category totally reject the prevailing goals and means necessary to ensure a successful school career but, at the same time substitute both with their own orientations. Involvement in various forms of juvenile delinquency and school violence, including school bullying (peer victimization), described by Nesser, Prinsloo, & Ladikos (Cf. 2005), signals a lack of conformity and thus a criminal career instead of successful school career.

FIGURE 2 SCHEMATIC PRESENTATION OF ROBERT KING MERTON'S ADAPTATION TO ANOMIC CONDITIONS

---

MODES OF ADAPTATION	CULTURAL GOALS	INSTITUTIONALISED MEANS
Conformity	Accept	Accept
Innovation	Accept	Reject
Ritualism	Reject	Accept
Retreatism	Reject	Reject
Rebellion	Reject prevailing goals and means and substitute new ones	

---

Source: Regoli and Hewitt 2006:185

### **3.8.1.2 Evaluation of the Social-Structure and Anomie Theory**

Merton is criticised for presenting an incomplete explanation juvenile delinquency. He does not say how the distribution of goals and means originally come about. He had also paid insufficient attention to the connection between anomie and delinquent behavior (Regoli & Hewitt 1991:103). Furthermore, Merton's assumption are questioned when he pointed out that in modern complex, industrial societies there are sets of universally accepted cultural goals. In these types of societies people are members of a variety of different groups and as a result, consensus on specific goals is likely to vary among different segments of

the population. The theory assumes the universal acceptance of money as means to achieve the expected goals, for example education, but these goals are not equally valued among all segments of the population. Despite, these criticisms, it is important to recognize the contribution and value of Merton's theory. It must be credited for providing a base for theories of Albert Cohen, and Cloward and Ohlin which will also be discussed in this piece of work (Vetter & Silverman 1986:317).

### **3.8.2 LOWER-CLASS CULTURE THEORY: ALBERT COHEN**

Albert Cohen (Barlow & Ferdinand 1992:204) postulates that working class youths are faced with status frustration in the middle-class schools. In such a situation they react by rejecting middle-class values and endorsing their own which opposite to that of upper class. If the middle-class endorses moderation, balance and decorum; the frustrated and rejected working class kids will endorse spontaneity and vulgarity. In other words Cohen believed that the middle-class life style is held in high esteem and desired by members of all social classes. However, when youth realizes that they cannot achieve the approved middle-class goals, they deviate to delinquent behaviour as a reaction to their failures (Kratcoski & Kratcoski 1990:96).

It is evident around the world or globe that all juveniles are expected to behave in a manner that has been approved by the middle-class. According to Shoemaker (1990:118) the working or lower-class youth find themselves being measured by the middle-class standards in a school setting. However, the latter submissions were not to create dire problems, if everyone in each society generally accepted middle-class values.

It is being envisaged that Cohen was careful to specify that not all working or lower- class boys caught in this predicament begin to engage in delinquent behaviour. Thus, some lower-class youth adopt a “college boy way of life”. In the actual sense of the word they decide to enter middle-class society. While others choose a ‘stable-corner boy response’; the boys who adapt in this way make the best of their current situations and accept the limitations imposed them. Lastly, other working class boys choose a third alternative that is the delinquent sub-cultural response; which in this response they reject middle class standards and adopt a completely opposite value system (Vetter & Silverman 1986:318).

### **3.8.3 THEORY OF DIFFERENTIAL OPPORTUNITY-STRUCTURE: CLOWARD AND OHLIN**

Cloward and Ohlin (Cf. 1960) suggested that lower-class male delinquents are goal-oriented beings; who are able to rationally assess their economic situation and to plan for their future accordingly. Furthermore, they also propounded that the *opportunity* to commit illegal acts is distributed evenly throughout society, just as opportunities are to engage in conformist behaviour. Essentially, Cloward and Ohlin argued that lower-class gang delinquency occurs in their criminal, drug-oriented or retreatist (Schoemaker 1990:125-126; Regoli and Hewitt 1991:107).

The first kind of delinquent subculture is appropriately called the criminal subculture. This type of delinquent subculture emerges when there is a presence of organised, adult criminal activity in a lower-class neighborhood. There are illegitimate opportunities to become reasonably wealthy because the community has (Regoli & Hewitt 1991:107):

- adult role models (successful adult criminals).

- integration of age levels, so younger people learn from the older people how to commit offences and how to handle themselves when they get caught.
- co-operation between offenders and supposedly legitimate people in the community such as lawyers, prosecutors, politicians etc.
- control of delinquency by adult criminals, who make them decrease unnecessary violence in favour of strictly money-making offences.

The second type of delinquent subculture involves *conflict*, where violence will be predominant. Here, the violence is not characterized as stemming primarily from psychopathic personalities or from reaction formation. The emergence of violence can be attributed to the absence of a stable system of social control which can be induced by either adult criminal or conventional adult models. Adolescents use violence as a means of obtaining some kind of status and success not because non-violent, theft oriented avenues of success are not available to them. Because they are there is no integration of different age levels, because older offenders have no impressive knowledge to pass on to younger ones. In addition, there is little cooperation between offenders and legitimate members of the community because people like lawyers and politicians do not stand to gain by assisting adult criminals who are object failures. Also, on the other hand, adult criminals have neither the ability nor the inclination to make delinquents reduce their violent activities. The dearth of legitimate and illegitimate opportunities frustrate some other boys and they easily turn to violence (Regoli & Hewitt 1991:107).

The third type of delinquent subculture is called *retreatist*. Those juveniles who subscribe to this type are described as ‘double failures’ in the sense that they can not succeed in either conventional or criminal world and they turn either to

alcohol or drug abuse. It is important to note that not all double failures are members of retreatist or subculture. Some scale down their aspirations and become 'corner boys' as Cohen once suggested. The response portrayed by the boys to the situation is being guided by their associations and circumstances that they are exposed to. Schrang (Cf. 1971) explains in his critique of differential opportunity theory that Cloward and Ohlin have been criticized for their failure to define key concepts such as 'double failure, perception of opportunity, elimination of guilt, and denial of legitimacy' in terms that permit them to be tested empirically or relating to existing research. They are also criticized for their failure to clearly and specifically describe the point at which a collectivity becomes a gang (Vetter & Silverman 1986:324).

According to Shoemaker (1990:133); Vetter and Silverman (1986:324); Short and Strodbeck (Cf. 1965) indicate in their research that juveniles engage in a wide variety of delinquent and non-delinquent activities. The gang behaviour is envisaged as versatile rather than specialized, and that specialization, when it occurs, tends to be limited to cliques that forms within gangs; for example 'semi professional theft' such as burglary, auto striping, shop-lifting etc. Short and Strodbeck (Cf. 1965) also suggest that sometimes that there may be a 'parent delinquent sub-culture' which characterizes all gangs in general. Cloward and Ohlin have been criticized for propounding a theory which is class-oriented. If their theory can be accepted as is, how can middle-class delinquency be explained and, at least among school pupil in and around Mthatha in South Africa? Anyway, despite the shortcomings, of this theory, it is important to note that it has identified some of the reasons why lower-class youngster may become alienated and eventually land up in the "rough" that is delinquency.

### **3.9 INTEGRATIVE THEORIES**

In many writings, it has been evident that one theory can not be used to explain all delinquency, or even certain types of delinquency. In the recent decades there have been attempts to integrate two or more theories to produce a certainly clear explanation of juvenile delinquency. Each explanation has its own strengths and weaknesses, and some theories are, overall, more persuasive than others.

Integration of theories includes the total spectrum of traditional theoretical developments that underlies their value as the foundation for the explanation of criminal behavior (Shoemaker 1990:293; Bezuidenhood & Joubert 2003:104). The following discussion will examine the integrated theories which were developed to explain juvenile delinquency or youth misconduct viz:

- Integrated social disorganization theories.
- Integrated control theories.

#### **3.9.1 INTEGRATED SOCIAL DISORGANISATION AND ANOMIE THEORY**

According to Shoemaker (1990:295) both theories (social disorganisation and anomie) held a view that delinquency, and deviant behavior in general, is a product or a factor that exist outside of the individual.

Currently, that idea does no longer carry that power it used to have during the time it was proposed. Both these theories offer an explanation; that delinquency address the issue of large numbers of juveniles committing offenses, often in group contexts and in accordance with their position in the community.

These theories emphasize the fact that juvenile delinquency can be attributed to society disorganization not to the individual. In other words, it can be attributed to the environmental circumstances, rather than to the individual him/herself.

### **3.9.2 INTEGRATED CONTROL THEORIES**

Control theories maintain that youngsters will gravitate to nonconformist behaviour in the absence of barriers. Brown *et al* (Cf. 2001) indicate that children develop varying levels of attachment to parents, teachers, and other conventional adults. Levels and strengths of attachments are related to the child's involvement in and commitment to conventional activities such as school, church, athletics etc. This early socialization process determines, to a large degree, the extent to which the child will be integrated into society. Reckless's containment theory stresses positive self- concept as the most important insulator against pressures toward delinquency. His theory receives some support from literature though the control perspective which has tended to evolve toward the social bond as an explanation of delinquency. These integrated control theories are of the view that juvenile misbehavior rest with weak attachments and commitments. Despite the optimism associated with social control theory, it can not answer some important questions that must be addressed if a more complete understanding of delinquency is to be developed. The questions about how commitments and attachments are produced: and what factors may destroy those social bonds that have been created are asked. What determines the association that one has to choose from, with the framework of physical environment and whether juveniles are more likely to be pulled into delinquent activity or pushed from conventional attachments and commitments are other questions that are asked in this regard. Some answers to these questions may not come within, but are maybe found outside the scope of the theory (Shoemaker 1990:299-300).

### **3.10 SUMMARY**

This chapter has examined correlation of social disorganization theories with the topic under study. These theories portray crime as a product of deficiencies in the social structure, such as poverty, unemployment etc. They focus on the lower-class as the source of crime, because they view crime as the lower-class problem.

Cultural transmission theories are unique, in that they view the primary cause of delinquency as lying with the individual, but not within him. They acknowledge the importance of social factors in the decision to commit delinquency.

The social control theories do not emphasise on *why* people commit delinquency, rather they are concerned more about those factors which can make an individual continue abiding or conforming to the societal values.

The strain theories consider society as structured in such a way that the lower-class members will not have equal opportunities to the legitimate means for achieving the specified goals of the society. Thus such members react differently to various situations. Some try to accept the prevailing rules but somewhere fail and drift to delinquency, while others reject them at all angles of their life and end up creating their own instead.

Because none of those theories can adequately explain delinquency this study subscribes to the position that calls for integration of few or several of them. This as a matter of fairness seems to be the trend among investigators of this social phenomenon in recent years.

### **3.11 CHAPTER REFERENCES**

Adler, F., Mueller, G.O. & Laufer, W.S. 1995. *Criminology*. Second Edition. New York: McGraw- Hill.

Barlow, H.D. & Ferdinand, T.N. 1992. *Understanding Delinquency*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

Bartollas, C. 2000. *Juvenile Delinquency*. Fifth Edition. Needham Heights: Pearson Education Company.

Bezuidenhout, C. & Joubert, S. 2003. *Child and youth misbehaviour in South Africa: A holistic view*. Pretoria: Van Schaik's.

Briar, S. & Piliavin, I. 1965. Delinquency, Situational Inducements, and Commitments to Conformity. *Social Problems*, 13:41.

Brown, S.A., Tate, S.R., Vik, P.V., Haas, A.L. & Aarons, G.A. 1996. Modeling of alcohol use mediates the effects of family history of alcoholism on adolescent alcohol expectancies. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*, 7:20-27.

Brown, S.E., Esbensen, F.A. & Geis, G. 2001. *Criminology: Explaining crime and its context*. Fourth Edition. Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson.

Cohen, A. 1955. *Delinquent boys*. New York: The Free Press.

Cloward, R. & Ohlin, L. 1960. *Delinquency and opportunity*. New York: The Free Press.

- Hirschi, T. 1969. *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kratcoski, P.C. & Kratcoski, L.D. 1979. *Juvenile Delinquency*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Kratcoski, P.C. & Kratcoski, L.D. 1990. *Juvenile Delinquency*. Third Edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Lilly, J.R., Cullen, F.T. & Ball, R.A. 1995. *Criminological Theory: Context and Consequences*. Second Edition. London: Sage.
- Maguire, M., Morgan, R. & Reiner, R. 2000. *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*. Third Edition. Oxford University: Oxford University Press.
- Matza, D. 1964. *Delinquency and drift*. New York: Free Press.
- McCord, W., McCord, J., & Zola, I.K. 1959. *Origins of crime*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Merton, R. K. 1968. *Social theory and social structure*. New York: Macmillan.
- Miller, W. 1958. Lower-class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency. *Journal of Social Issues*: 14:5-19.
- Mqadi, L.P. 1995. *Juvenile delinquency among secondary school children with reference to the influence of the family: A socio-criminological study*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Kwadlangezwa: University of Zululand.

Nesser, J.J., Prinsloo, J. & Ladikos, A. 2005. *An exploration of peer victimization in public schools*. ISC Monograph 1/2005. Pretoria: Institute for Criminological Sciences.

Netter, G. 1984. *Explaining crime and its context*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nye, F.I. 1958. *Family relationships and delinquent behaviour*. New York: Wiley.

Reckless, W. 1961. *A new theory of delinquency and crime*. New York: The Free press.

Regoli, R.M. & Hewitt, J.D. 1991. *Delinquency in Society: A child centered approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Reid, S.T. 1982. *Crime and criminology*. Third Edition. New York: Holt, Reinhart & Winston.

Reiss, A. 1951. The social integration of queers and peers. *Social Problems*, 9(2):112-119.

Schrag, C. *Crime and justice: American style*. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Mental Health.

Schur, E.M. 1973. *Radical non-intervention*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall

Shaw C. & McKay, H. 1969. *Juvenile delinquency in urban areas*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Shoemaker, D.J. 1990. *Theories of Delinquency: An Examination of Explanations of Delinquent Behaviour*. Second Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Short, J.F., & Strodtbeck, F.L. 1965. *Group process and gang delinquency*. Chicago: Chicago University press.

Siegel, L.J. 2001. *Criminology: Theories, patterns and typologies*. Seventh Edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Sutherland, E.H. & Cressey, D. 1974. *Criminology*. Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Sutherland, E. H. 1947. *Principles of criminology*. Fourth Edition. Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Sykes, G. & Matza, D. 1957. *Techniques of neutralization*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Thornton, W.E., Voigt, L. & Doerner, W.G. 1982. *Delinquency and justice*. Second Edition. New York: Random House.

Vetter, H.J. & Silverman, I.J. 1986. *Criminology and Crime: An introduction*. New York: Harper & Row.

Vold, G.B., Bernard, T.J. & Snipes, J.B. 1998. *Theoretical Criminology*. Fourth Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **THE CONTROL AND PREVENTION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY**

#### **4.1 INTRODUCTION**

In this chapter the causes or risk factors underlying juvenile delinquency (see chapter 2) are being discussed. Factors that cause crime and also juvenile delinquency cannot be disaggregated for the purpose of preventative interventions (Quinsey, Skilling, Lalumiere & Craig 2004:137; Thornbery, Huizinga, & Loeber 1995:232). This chapter also focuses on the following three levels of prevention in juvenile delinquency that can play a pivotal role when intervention is being called for (Cf. Caplan 1964; Cf. Mrazek & Haggerty 1994; Bezuidenhout & Joubert 2003:137):

- Primary or universal prevention, which targets all children in a geographical setting, without any further selection criteria relating to being at risk of engaging in juvenile delinquency. At this level the following are emphasised:
  - prevention of child abuse;
  - child neglect;
  - Adequate socialisation of a child before he/she is available to circles outside the family setting; etc.
  
- Secondary or targeted selective prevention, which attempts to prevent antisocial behaviour in those children who likely to be delinquent e.g. children who are aggressive at a young age; and

- Tertiary or indicated prevention, which attempts to prevent further antisocial behaviour.

## **4.2 PRIMARY CRIME PREVENTION**

There is a general agreement in existing literature on the subject that primary prevention could be the most effective approach for reducing future antisocial behaviour (Cf. Leitenberg 1987). The point of departure, here, relates to the steps that are taken to prevent misbehaviour and crime before it occurs. In a nutshell, primary prevention is proactive in nature and extent (Buizedenhout & Joubert 2003:141). In this section the following aspects will be discussed:

- The family as primary socialising agent.
- The role of the police and government.
- The role of the community in primary crime prevention.

### **4.2.1 The family as a primary socialising agent**

In this and many others the family is envisaged as the ‘first world’ that the child encounters before being exposed to society at large. Both parents and other family members are considered as the socialised individuals that will take the responsibility of socialising the amoral creature, the child so that he or she may be helped to become fit in society and live a law-abiding life expected of him by society. Through the process of socialisation, the personalities, values, and beliefs of the society are initially shaped and implemented into the child. Parents and other elder family members also serve as role models; transmitting educational values and providing environments in which children can safely develop a sense of autonomy (Cf. Elkin & Handel 1984). Also important is the fact that the family is not an isolated group; it exists within a larger social and cultural context and

reflects the family's particular class, ethnic, racial, religious, political, and regional characteristics. Therefore, the child's socialisation is somewhat selective, depending on the background and contextual experiences of his or her family (Caulhoun, Light, & Keller 1997:133). Due to socio-economic factors the South African family is often fragmented. The reasons for this, with specific reference to the family as a social structure, are the following (Morei 2002:07; Schurink 1994:48):

- Many households survive with multiple caregivers.
- Relationships are maintained across long distances.
- High divorce and remarriage rates often result in a multiplicity of female headed families and/or step family (see Chapter 2).
- Low socio-economic and/or social factors lead the typical South African family to be unable to function as an adequate support system to the growing child.

In this study like any other, the world is viewed as imperfect. As a consequence of this imperfect situation, many families fail miserably at achieving one or more of their socialisation goals. In many instances, families unfortunately transmit values that promote violence or criminality and indirectly and unconsciously undermine the development of positive self-concepts among their members. In most instances families fail to inculcate moral values in the minds of their members (Hirschi 1995:128). In an effort to make an intervention in this regard, emphasis should be placed on preventive policies which will facilitate the successful socialisation and integration of all children and young persons in society. It is further envisaged that every society should place a high priority on the needs and well-being of the family and all its members. Where a stable and balanced family environment is lacking and when community efforts to assist parents in this regard have failed and the extended family cannot fulfill this role, alternative placements, including foster care and adoption should be considered (Cf. The Riyadh Guidelines 1990).

In an endeavour to build a complete social well-being, the other most critical aspect of socialisation is the development of moral values in the minds of children. It must be noted that the decline in social values contributes to youth misconduct which is notable observed in the present youth. It should be noted that the youth who have developed higher levels of pro-social moral reasoning, such as operating according to empathetic motives and internalising values, they tend to behave in a manner which benefits others and society at large. In addition, youngsters who live their lives according to the expectations of society are less likely to engage in aggressive behaviour and delinquency. When one compares the latter submissions, children who have not adhered to the general agreed and accepted the norms and values of society as they grow up, mostly misbehave and engage in unconventional activities, such as vandalism, disrespect for property and the elderly, etc. It is against this background that it is envisaged that any opportunity to teach children positive values must be utilised (Wilson & Howell 1995:40; Bennett & Flavin 1993:11; Wyatt & Carlo 2002:646). Another proactive but effective strategy for preventing youth misconduct would be to offer programs aimed at reinforcing and internalising positive individual traits such as (Liese 2002:16):

- discipline
- trustworthiness
- self-respect
- responsibility
- life skills training, etc.

#### **4.2.2 The role of the police in primary crime prevention**

Research conducted by the Home Office in London reveals that uniform foot patrols are not an effective form of crime prevention (Crawford & Krebs 1998:42). In an effort to devise various strategies for crime prevention, the South African Police Service (SAPS) is currently in a process of fundamental transformation to move away from a traditional policing style which subscribed to foot patrol by police officers in uniform to a community police style. In this case, the emphasis has been on improving the responsibility and accountability of the police officers to a Constitutional Bill of Human Rights and the community it serves. Furthermore, in community policing, the police reach out to become part of the community it serves. It endeavours to make the composition of the police organisation representative of the community. The most important objectives of community policing are as follows (Schmallegger 1994:98):

- Joint efforts to prevent and control crime.
- Reducing public fear of crime.
- Developing strong social bonds between the police and the community.
- Raising public satisfaction with services rendered by the police.
- Promoting police accountability to the community.
- Community involvement at all levels of police decision making.

Taking the following positive outcomes into consideration, the future of community policing as a philosophy and a new style of policing may look promising to achieve (Adler, Mueller & Laufer 1996:96):

- Visible reduction of public fear of crime.
- The restoration of a feeling of resident control over the fate of a neighbourhood.

- Improve police-community relations.
- Realisation by the community that problem-solving in cooperation with the police is a viable option.

In a nutshell, good relationship between the police and the community is an integral part of crime prevention if it is to be successful. However, in order for the community policing to succeed, it has to be emphasised that youth need to be involved on its planning. This is based on the belief that youth do not trust the police and are not with the same mind with the idea of ‘partnership policing’ (Van Rooyen 1994:21). To add to this, there are incisive questions being asked about community policing (Schmallegger 1996:97):

- How will this philosophy and new techniques or programs be implemented within the existing (traditional policing style) of police structures of this 13 years-old democracy of South Africa?
- Is the police subculture ready and prepared to accept the new role without becoming demoralised and forfeiting effectiveness?
- Are members of the public prepared to accept greater involvement of the police in their communities, neighbourhoods and personal lives?

What this review shows is that despite the various attempts to reintegrate crime prevention into mainstream policing within a community context, a number of structural and organizational tensions concerning the legitimacy and effectiveness of policing strategies still remain unresolved (Crawford & Krebs 1998:45).

### **4.2.3 The role of the community in the primary crime prevention**

There is a lack of resources in many South African societies for the prevention of juvenile delinquency. Apart from this another challenge is facing communities: to convince the public and politicians that a universal approach is required in this regard. Thus, it has been envisaged that primary crime prevention may have a greater impact on the prevention of juvenile delinquency and be more palatable to society as a whole, when implemented in a more global context of prevention (Cf. Lorion, Tolan, & Whaler 1987).

The United Nations identified the following guidelines for the prevention of juvenile delinquency by the community (Cf. The Riyadh Guidelines 1990):

- Community based services and programmes which respond to the special needs, problems, interests and concerns of young persons and which offer appropriate counseling and guidance to young persons and their families should be developed or strengthened wherever they exist.
- A wide range of community-based support measures for young persons, including community development centers, recreational facilities and services to respond to the special problems of children should be provided for or strengthened wherever they exist.
- Special facilities should be set up to provide adequate shelter for younger persons who are no longer able to live at home or who do not have homes to live in.
- Youth organisations should be created at the local level and be given full participatory status in the management of community affairs. These organisations should encourage youth to organise collective and voluntary projects, particularly projects aimed at helping young persons in need of assistance.

The South African government has developed a crime prevention strategy which can be viewed as an important move in addressing the promotion of community values and education with the emphasis on the following basic premises (Cf. National Crime Prevention Strategy 1996):

- Inform the community about how the criminal justice system functions.
- Promote community values and norms that reject crime and violence.
- Teach non-violent solutions to conflict to the community.
- Make the community aware of the steps they can take to reduce the risk of victimisation.

### **4.3 SECONDARY CRIME PREVENTION**

Secondary preventive intervention targets individuals by measuring risk factors that are specifically related to delinquency in order to identify a selected group of individuals; in particular, the most persistent future delinquents. In a nutshell, in secondary prevention programs, the focus should be on the early identification of potential offenders and suggesting an intervention before the behaviour turns into delinquency. The point of departure is to solve the problem before it gets out of hand. Because problems which remain unaddressed may complicate any further attempt to prevent juvenile misconduct in future (Cf. Leitenberg 1987).

#### **4.3.1 The school in the secondary prevention of juvenile delinquency**

The school is the principal institution that has the contact with the child outside home context for a vast number of years. To be specific, most of the adolescent years are spent within the school environment. The following functions of the school may positively impact on the prevention of juvenile delinquency (Cf. Venter 1995; Schurink 1994:54):

- To teach the child values and attitudes that are fundamentally different from his or her own.
- To teach the child how to get on with societal needs.
- The school setting is where children with behavioural problems are identified and supported.
- The school provides a curriculum that offers all pupils the opportunity to develop their knowledge, skills and awareness that will equip them for adult life. In addition, the school should plan, develop and implement extra-curricular activities of interest to the young persons, in co-operation with community groups. Special assistance should be extended to children who find it difficult to comply with attendance codes and decide to 'drop-out' (Cf. The Riyadh Guidelines 1990). Table 14 is curious about the objection of disciplinary measures when cross-correlated by age, school grade and marital status of parents.

#### **4.3.1.1 The interaction between the family and the school**

It is certain that the school as an institution alone cannot counteract the ill-effects of the home such as fear and anxiety, lack of love and sympathy, emotional and personality problems, bad friends and social adjustment. The school may be blamed for childrens' misbehaviour; more often than not, the root causes of such behaviour may be traced back to the family. Therefore, it is necessary for a meaningful collaboration between home and school in the shaping of the character of a child. Even though the school can compensate for some inadequacies of poor home conditions and environments it cannot fully replace the child's home (Young 1972:127). Table 15 provides information on the extent to which respondents have objected to parental discipline during the twelve months preceding the present inquiry in terms of age, school grades and parental marital status.

TABLE 15 CROSS-CORRELATION OF OBJECTION OF DISCIPLINARY MEASURES, BY AGE, SCHOOL GRADES AND MARITAL STATUS OF PARENTS

			Never	Once to four times	Five times or more	Not applicable	Total
Respondent's age group <sup>1)</sup>	under 16 -17 years	Count	41	132	55	8	236
		% of Total	9.1%	29.3%	12.2%	1.8%	52.4%
	18 – 19 years	Count	30	76	18	14	138
		% of Total	6.7%	16.9%	4.0%	3.1%	30.6%
	20 – 21 years	Count	12	53	7	3	75
		% of Total	2.7%	11.8%	1.6%	.7%	16.6%
	+21 years	Count	0	2	0	0	2
		% of Total	.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.4%
	Total	Count	83	263	80	25	451
		% of Total	18.4%	58.3 %	17.7%	5.5%	100.0%
			Never	Once to four times	Five times or more	Not applicable	Total
School Grade	Grade 12	Count	3	8	2	1	14
		% of Total	.7%	1.8%	.4%	.2%	3.1%
	Grade 11	Count	46	131	40	14	231
		% of Total	10.2%	29.0%	8.9%	3.1%	51.2%
	Grade 10	Count	34	124	38	10	206
		% of Total	7.5%	27.5%	8.4%	2.2%	45.7%
Total	Count	83	263	80	25	451	
	% of Total	18.4%	58.3%	17.7%	5.5%	100.0%	
			Never	Once to four times	Five times or more	Not applicable	Total
Marital status of parents	married	Count	51	175	45	17	288
		% of Total	11.3%	38.8%	10.0%	3.8%	63.9%
	Never married	Count	13	44	18	2	77
		% of Total	2.9%	10.0%	4.0%	.4%	17.1%
	mother deceased	Count	3	7	3	1	14
		% of Total	.7%	1.6%	.7%	.2%	3.1%
	Father deceased	Count	3	16	6	1	26
		% of Total	.7%	3.4%	1.3%	.2%	5.8%
	Both parents deceased	Count	5	5	1	2	13
		% of Total	1.1%	1.1%	.2%	.4%	2.9%
	divorced or separated ( but both are still alive)	Count	8	15	7	2	32
		% of Total	1.8%	3.3%	1.6%	.4%	7.1%
	Other	Count	0	1	0	0	1
		% of Total	.0%	.2%	.0%	.0%	.2%
	Total	Count	83	263	80	25	451
		% of Total	18.4%	39.0%	17.7%	5.5%	100.0%

1)Significant: $\chi^2=43.763;28df;p=.029$ .

According to *age categories*, Table 15 shows the largest number of respondents (236 or 52.3%) objected once to four times during the past year against the disciplinary measures by either their parents or significant people like step parents or guardians. When the different age categories are examined, it transpires that 132 ((29.3%) in the age under 16-17 years have ‘protested’ against such discipline, followed by 76 (16.9%) in the next age category, i.e. 18-20 years and 53 (11.8%) in the 20-21 age group. Adolescents in their puberty stage (55 or 12.2%) rebelled five or more times against such disciplinary measures. Only 83 (18.4%) respondents have indicated they have never questioned their parents’ or persons’ disciplinary steps taken against them.

Considering *school grades*, it becomes clear that Grade 11 respondents (171 or 37.9%) were more apt to object to parental discipline, followed closely by Grade 10 respondents (162 or 35.9%). Only 0.7 percent of the Grade 12 pupils who participated in the study never objected to such discipline, while only 10 (2.2%) did so.

As could be expected, complete families, i.e. where both parents, were still at the helm of the family, produced greater objection to parental discipline by their children showing that such parents still manage to steer their families in ‘calm waters’. No less than 175 (38.8%) respondents from such families objected once to four times to parental discipline, while 45 (10.0%) did so four times or more. Altogether 51 (11.3%) indicated that they never objected to parental discipline. In cases where the parents never got married, altogether 62 (13.7%) protested against parental discipline. Incomplete families (i.e. where either the father or the mother is deceased), produced altogether 32 (7.1%) of the respondents objecting to parental discipline. There are no observed significant differences.

Judging from the data contained in Table 15 it becomes clear that married couples seem to apply strict discipline, resulting in almost half of the respondents rebelling against such disciplinary measures; an indication that they are indeed exposed to precipitating deviant behaviour. The mere fact that just over ten percent of the respondents never objected to such discipline confirms this assumption.

It is also important to note that the school takes over from where the family has left off in character building of a child. It does not have any intention of changing the base which was formed by the family, though it has a role in shaping the child's character development (Bloch & Flynn 1966:198).

Furthermore, the school is expected to reflect the philosophy of life of the people it serves; their norms, values, and parental expectations of good law-abiding behaviour. These expectations can be achieved when there is a positive relationship between the school and the family. Hence, Brewer, Hawkins, Catalane, & Necherman (1995:70) propounded that by bringing the family and the school together, these two entities can have a positive, and more mutual influence on each other and more so on the child. Furthermore, when parents are more involved in the school administrative activities and the school is more transparent it may, in return, create a psychological feeling that the community has adopted the ownership of the school. This conviction will go a long way in the possible impact these two institutions will have on the learners' behaviour as members of the community.

In addition, cooperation between the family and the school can be of enormous benefit to every learner and especially the youth at risk (Brewer, Hawkins, Catalane, & Necherman 1995:70; Mazibuko 1994:40-41; Schurink 1994:51).

#### **4.3.1.2 Factors within the school setting that contribute to delinquency**

The following are factors within the school setting which contribute to the youth misconduct:

*Tracking-* According to Regoli & Hewitt (2006:349) tracking can be singled out as a cause of delinquency. In this education practice students are grouped into curricular categories, such as, general, vocational, business, agricultural, etc. The philosophy of tracking is to make classes as academically homogenous as possible. Students who achieve at the same level could work at the same pace, proceeding rapidly and uniformly through the material under supervision of the teacher. Students who were slower would not hold up high-ability students and lower-ability students could receive specialized instruction that might make it possible for them to catch up with their peer later on. It is true that students do have different academic abilities, the negative side of tracking is that it might be used as the form of discrimination. In addition the labels the students are assigned are important because they may turn out to be irreversible. Furthermore, Pink (1994:233) postulates that an immense amount of time is spent by the school to define a competent youth in terms of his or her academic achievement, conformation to the rules of the school and respect for adults, and that youth who demonstrate academic and behavioural problems are often considered incompetent or unsuccessful. The most important impact or effect that may not be ignored is that tracking send different signals to educators, learners, and also parents. The teacher might expect less from incompetent or unsuccessful learners. The end result of the situation, the learner will lose self-worth, commitment will be very low and a sense of belonging, which often results in youth misconduct.

The above reveals and discusses situations that often result in child frustration, more especial because the school has the following demands (Block & Flynn 1966:199):

- Achievement of scholastic standards like making good grades;
- Fluency in market related language;
- Studying with the aim of going to university only;
- Abandonment of certain ‘unapproved’ values, especial of low-class.

Children who are frustrated at school have serious records of irregular attendance (see Table 16) scholastic backwardness and school antipathy. In addition the frustrating situation evokes aggressiveness (Cf. Ahlstrom & Havighurst 1971).

TABLE 16 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENT ACTS (N=451)

Truanting		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	214	47.5	47.5	47.5
	Once	141	31.3	31.3	78.7
	two or three times	65	14.4	14.4	93.1
	Four times or more	26	5.8	5.8	98.9
	not applicable	5	1.1	1.1	100.0
	Total	451	100.0	100.0	
Beaten up another pupil in a fight		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	231	51.2	51.2	51.2
	Once	122	27.1	27.1	78.3
	two or three times	61	13.5	13.5	91.8
	Four times or more	29	6.4	6.4	98.2
	not applicable	8	1.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	451	100.0	100.0	

$p \geq .05$

Table 16 portrays the extent of data pertaining to the following two juvenile activities associated with school attendance:

- a) Staying away from school without a valid reason (variable 47),  
and
- b) Having beaten another pupil in a school fight (variable 48).

In the case of *truancy*, the data clearly indicates that 141 (31.3%) of the respondents stayed away once from school without a valid reason; 65 (14.4%) ‘absconded’ between two or three times and 26 (5.8%) did so four times or more. It is, however, encouraging to note that 214 (47.5%) never stayed away from school without a valid reason.

While 231 (51.2%) of the respondents never got involved in a ‘school fight’ (beaten up another pupil), almost one third (122 or 27.1%) have been involved in this kind of deviant behaviour activity at school once before (during the past twelve months preceding this survey). Altogether 61 (13.5%) and 29 (6.4%) got beaten up another pupil at school twice or more even four or more times respectively. There are no observed significant differences.

#### **4.3.1.3 The Reproduction of the social class**

Regoli and Hewitt (2006:352) postulate that most schools are envisaged to reproduce the social class structure of society to the benefit of the economic elite. It is general knowledge that the school consists of pupils who come from various backgrounds. Pupils who come from low-socio economic background are mostly educated to fill low paying jobs that do not require much independent thinking and decision making. The reverse is true to the middle-class children; their schools socialize them to be bosses, creative and critical thinkers.

The above depicted idea was scientifically tested in a high school situated in an industrial area of England. In that study it was revealed that the working-class

students resented both middle-class (ear'oles) students and the school authority. For them the school was out of touch with the real world and had little to offer in preparation for the life they would enter as adults (Cf. Willis 1979). In South Africa where the above mentioned situation is evident an intervention in a form of support and assistance need to be called for. It is also important to consider the fact that such an intervention will enable children to use the education programmes to their own advantage. This could include the remedial education for children from previously disadvantages communities, which could decrease high school dropout rates, as well as counseling, treatment, and rehabilitation for children who depend on drugs (Bezuidenhout & Joubert 2003:150).

#### **4.3.1.4 Inadequate Curriculum**

A curriculum is generally known as a document or a documented programme that is followed by the school in teaching pupils. The following are some defects in the curriculum that may lead to delinquency (Cf. Robberste 1951; Cf. Vedder 1963; Cf. Jacobs 1988):

- Little differentiation for individual needs of pupils.
- Abstract curriculum which is remote from social reality.
- Middle-class based curriculum.
- Poor, irrelevant instructions, outdated educational material and the presenting of material that does not prepare students for the labour market.

To counteract the above mentioned situation, the South African government, through its Department of Education, initiated the following programs or strategies with the motive of preventing juvenile delinquency (Brewer, Hawkins, Catalane, & Necherman 1995:74; Schurink 1994:50):

- Structural changes, such as a reduction in class size in order to ensure individual attention; currently most schools are still overcrowded.
- Pre-school education, such as literacy programs, which can play a major role in addressing school related educational problems later on.
- Adjusted curricular in order for academic material to be relevant and match student skills levels.
- Improved career and school guidance, where children are not only informed about potential career possibilities, but also aspects such interpersonal relationships, sexual relationships, HIV/Aids and substance abuse.

#### **4.3.1.5 The Teacher's Role in Juvenile Delinquency**

There may be teachers who are incompetent and maladjusted or who may not be able to assist a problem child but rather contribute to possible deviant behaviour. Furthermore, the incompetent educator has no interest in his or her work. He or she dislikes children, and can simple not proactively identify the delinquent symptoms in a child (Cf. Stullken 1953).

In some schools it appears that there is evidence of mutual relationship between the educator and the learner. Thus, the relationship between the educator and the learner has been envisaged to be plausibly important because it puts the educator in a good position of being accepted and trusted by the learner. In addition, when the learner experiences problems, he or she can find it easy to approach the educator, who might be in a position to assist children who encounter some problems (Cf. Stullken 1953).

Various educators tend to overemphasise scholastic and intellectual achievements instead of educating the child as a 'whole' in preparation for future social life. This in turn, serves as a stimulus to deviant behaviour for those who have little

hope of achieving the status attached to intellectual achievements. It may also be true that teachers also place more emphasis on the industrious and well-adjusted pupils than on uninterested and deviant children (Cf. Kratcoski & Kratcoski 1979).

TABLE 17 CROSS-CORRELATION OF SELECTED SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENT ACTS, BY AGE, AREA OF RESIDENCE AND SCHOOL GRADES

Made marks or wrote mean things on school desk			Never	Once to three times	four times or more	Not applicable	Total
Area of residence	Mthatha	Count	77	76	11	3	167
		% of Total	17%	16.9%	2.4%	.7%	37.0%
	Mqanduli	Count	82	124	9	7	222
		% of Total	18.2%	27.5%	2%	1.6%	49.2%
	Other	Count	30	30	1	1	62
		% of Total	6.7%	6.7%	.2%	.2%	13.7%
Total		Count	189	230	21	11	451
		% of Total	41.9%	51%	4.7%	2.4%	100.0%
Disregard a teacher or other school official <sup>1)</sup>			Never	Once to three times	four times or more	Not applicable	Total
Area of residence	Mthatha	Count	89	64	13	1	167
		% of Total	17.7%	14.2%	2.9%	.2%	37.0%
	Mqanduli	Count	143	71	3	5	222
		% of Total	31.7%	15.7%	.7%	1.1%	49.2%
	Other	Count	45	15	0	2	62
		% of Total	10.0%	3.3%	.0%	.4%	13.7%
Total		Count	277	111	16	8	451
		% of Total	61.4%	24.6%	3.5%	1.8%	100.0%
Made marks or wrote mean things on school desk			Never	Once to three times	four times or more	Not applicable	Total
Respondent's age group	under 16 – 17 years	Count	103	114	15	4	236
		% of Total	22.8%	25.3%	3.3%	.9%	52.3%
	18 – 19 years	Count	52	80	3	3	138
		% of Total	11.5%	17.7%	.7%	.7%	30.6%
	20 – 21 years	Count	32	36	3	4	75
		% of Total	7.0%	7.9%	.7%	.9%	16.6%
	+21 years	Count	2	0	0	0	2
		% of Total	.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%
Total		Count	189	230	21	11	451
		% of Total	41.9%	50.9%	4.7%	2.4%	100.0%

Table continues.../160

Disregard of a teacher or other school official			Never	Once to three times	four times or more	Not applicable	Total	
Respondent's age group	under 16 – 17 years	Count	138	82	10	6	236	
		% of Total	30.6%	18.2%	2.2%	1.3%	52.3%	
	18 – 19 years	Count	91	42	4	1	138	
		% of Total	20.1%	9.3%	.9%	.2%	30.6%	
	20 – 21 years	Count	47	25	2	1	75	
		% of Total	10.4%	5.5%	.4%	.2%	16.6%	
+21 years	Count	1	1	0	0	2		
	% of Total	.2%	.2%	.0%	.0%	.4%		
Total			Count	277	150	16	8	451
			% of Total	61.4%	33.3%	3.5%	1.8%	100.0%
Made marks or wrote mean things on school desk			never	Once to three times	four times or more	Not applicable	Total	
School Grade	grade 12	Count	7	5	2	0	14	
		% of Total	1.6%	1.1%	.4%	.0%	3.1%	
	grade 11	Count	93	124	9	5	231	
		% of Total	20.6%	27.5%	2.0%	1.1%	51.2%	
	grade 10	Count	89	101	10	6	206	
		% of Total	19.7%	22.4%	2.2%	1.3%	45.7%	
Total			Count	189	230	21	11	451
			% of Total	41.9%	51.0%	4.7%	2.4%	100.0%
Disregard of a teacher or other school official			never	Once to three times	four times or more	Not applicable	Total	
School Grade	grade 12	Count	10	2	2	0	14	
		% of Total	2.2%	.4%	.4%	.0%	3.1%	
	grade 11	Count	147	76	7	1	231	
		% of Total	32.6%	16.9%	1.6%	.2%	51.2%	
	grade 10	Count	120	72	7	7	206	
		% of Total	26.6%	16.0%	1.6%	1.6%	45.7%	
Total			Count	277	150	16	8	451
			% of Total	61.4%	33.3%	3.5%	1.8%	100.0%

1) Significant:  $\chi^2=39,885; 20df; p=.005$ .

Table 17 reports the results obtained from a cross-correlation between selected independent variable (area of residence, age categories, and school grades) and the following dependent variables:

- a) 'made marks or wrote mean things (words) on school desks' (variable 36), and
- b) 'disregarded a teacher or other school official' (variable 37).

In terms of *place of residence*, Mqanduli respondents (learners) reported a higher incidence of writing 'mean things' or making marks on school desks (124 or 27.5%) one to three times during the past twelve months, compared to Mthatha respondents (76 or 16.9%). Likewise, respondents from Mqanduli also reported slightly higher figures for having disobeyed a teacher or other official (71 or 15.7%) one to three times in the past twelve months, compared to Mthatha respondents (64 or 14.2%). Altogether 159 (35.3%) and 232 (51.4%) respondents for both places of residence did not involve themselves in any of the two activities respectively. These differences are significant ( $p=.005$ ).

As far as *age categories* are concerned, it transpires that 114 (25.3%) of the respondents under 16-17 years, followed by 80 (17.7%) in the 18-19 years category have written mean things in the past twelve months on school desks. Considering disobeying a teacher or other school official, it becomes clear that the figures for this type of deviant behaviour are lower than that of writing mean things on school desks. Only 82 (18.2%) of the 16-17 years old respondents reported participation in disobeying a teacher or other school official during the past twelve months, while those in the next age category, 18-19 years, were far less 'guilty' of this type of misbehaviour (42 or 9.3%). The figures for *non-participation* in these two types of deviant activities, show a lower frequency in respect of disobeying a teacher or other school official (229 or 50.8%) over the past year among the two age categories, compared to writing mean things or making marks on school desks (155 or 34.4%) (The differences are not significant).

In terms of *school grades*, it appears from Table 16 that in both types of deviant acts (measured over the past year), Grade 11 respondents reported the highest involvement in writing mean things on school desks (124 or 27.5%) and disobeying a teacher or other official (76 or 16.9%). These figures are closely followed by that reported by Grade 10 respondents: writing mean things on school desks (101 or 22.4%) and disobeying a teacher or other school official (72 or 16.0%). In both cases (deviant acts), Grade 12 respondents reported the lowest involvement in these two activities. There is also an indication that Grade 10 and 11 respondents were far less involved in disobeying a teacher (267 or 59.2%) than writing mean things on school desks (182 or 40.4%). It would appear from the data contained in Table 16, that age and school grade are better predictors of respondents' involvement in the two juvenile activities than is the case with respondents' place of residence. In summary, it could be postulated that Mqanduli respondents in the lower age groups and those in grade 10 and 11 have had greater involvement in the two selected deviant activities (The differences are not significant).

#### **4.4 TERTIARY CRIME PREVENTION**

Crime prevention on tertiary level implies rehabilitative treatment, outside or inside an institution, after a person has been found guilty of an offence. It actual focuses on the offender with the objective of preventing further criminal behaviour. The purpose is to prevent recidivism among those who have already relapsed into crime. The emphasis is on the way in which the individual deals with the consequences of crime, as well as treatment to prevent a recurrence of such criminal behaviour. It has been established that among other types of prevention the following major limitations can be distinguished (Andrews *et. al.* 1990):

- Firstly, it can only focus on the very small group of individuals who have been caught by the authorities, thereby leaving out a much larger group of juveniles who engage in an important number of antisocial behaviour.
- Secondly, currently available interventions are less likely to succeed when targeting individuals who have been involved in delinquency for a long time.

This section will put more emphasis on the diversion programmes; which were initiated by National Institute for Crime and the Reintegration of Offenders (NICRO) in early 1990s. The other part that will be covered in this section will *inter-alia* include the discussions of the motives or objectives of punishment which may be clarified as: retribution, incapacitation, deterrence, and rehabilitation.

Juvenile diversion started in the United States round about 1967 when the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice (LEAA) launched a re-evaluation of the criminal justice system in that country and made some far-reaching recommendations to improve it; *inter alia* that young offenders should only be admitted to the criminal justice system as the last way out. LEAA further recommended that alternative adjudication be instituted for juvenile offenders (Whitehead & Lab 1990:306; Zondi 2002:39-40).

The complex nature and composition of the South African criminal justice system in itself created a trapdoor for juveniles who collided with it, because such juvenile become the victims of that system. With its retributive inclinations, juvenile offenders had no option but to face the full consequences of the deviant behaviour: police investigation, arrest, detention, formal charge in criminal court, court of hearing (trial), sentence (if found guilty), prison sentence or otherwise, etc. Instead of given opportunity to repair the damage they have caused through restorative justice efforts or made the accountable for their offending behaviour,

juvenile offenders start to feel self-pity and possibly the need for revenge. They started to blame the justice system for having prosecuted them without paying due attention to possible social problems they might be experiencing. The detention of young people during the 1980s caused the national and international outcry. Youngsters who have violated the ordinary criminal code were also detained. It had been alleged that those children were treated inhumanely, especially in the absence of a proper juvenile justice system (Juvenile Justice for South Africa 1994:3; Zondi 2002:41).

In 1992, NICRO introduced juvenile diversion programs to the South African courts following a campaign in which it was joined by other Non-Government Organisations (NGOs): “Justice for the Children; no child should be cage”. The main idea with the introduction of diversion programs should be found in the desire to create alternative ways of dealing with juveniles who transgressed the legal code, outside a criminal court. To this day, NICRO remains the primary provider of diversion programs, although provincial Department of Social Development is also rendering such programs (Sloth-Nielsen & Muntigh 1999-2000:16; Zondi 2002:41).

#### **4.4.1 Diversion of young offenders in South Africa**

Diversion can be defined as the channeling of *prima facie* cases away from the criminal justice system with or without any conditions. Conditions can range from a simple caution or referral to the welfare system, to participation in particular programs and/or reparation or restitution (South African Law Commission 2000:87). Diversion has to be considered as the first option, as it prevents the child from obtaining a criminal record and in that process prevents the consequent stigmatization and labeling associated with child offenders (Liese 2002:2).

#### **4.4.1.1 The current position of diversion in South Africa**

The National Director of Public Prosecution has issued a policy directive on diversion, outlining the procedure to be followed and the criteria to be considered by prosecutors in criminal matters where diversion is applicable. Furthermore, diversion is considered to be a more preferable manner of disposing of some criminal matters rather than the mere withdrawal of cases since offenders have to take responsibility for their actions. There are various matters where diversion should not be considered or where caution should not be exercised; like in incidences where an offender is charged with rape, murder, robbery with aggravating circumstances or other serious offences. The following are the guidelines to assist prosecutors in determining whether or not an offender qualifies for diversion include that he or she should have (Collopy, Daffne, Krige, Matzke, Pickett, Sibeko, Boshoko, & Mulea 2001:12):

- Have a fixed address.
- Acknowledge liability for the offence, in other words accept responsibility for his or her actions and show remorse.
- Be prepared to participate in the diversion programme.
- He or she must be a minor, that means between the ages of 12 to 18 years and have a parent or guardian who is prepared to take responsibility for the juvenile's attendance of the court proceedings.

The following aspects need not to be ignored as they have a vital role to play in the progress of diversion in South Africa (Badenhorst & Conradie 2004:117):

- There are other instances whereby, for example, a juvenile offender partly meets all the selection criteria but does not have a parent or guardian who is willing or able to take responsibility for the juvenile. That is more evident in the case of street children, who

have no fixed address. In such situation the policy directive seem not to offer any alternative.

- Furthermore, the offender has to acknowledge liability for the offence before he or she can be considered for diversion. It is not clear whether this acknowledgement may be used against the offender in court. In addition according to the National Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act 108 of 1996 section 35 (1) (a); section 35 (3) (h) everyone who is allegedly committing an offence has the right to remain silent and every accused person has a right to a fair trial, which include among many others the right to be presumed innocent, and not to testify during the proceedings. The above deliberations may very well contravene the rights of the juvenile offender, who has to accept responsibility for the offence. It has also been found that diversion programs rely on children sparing time, so that they may commit to the learning of new way of life. Therefore, that means children who participate in the diversion programme will have to forfeit something that is very precious, namely the leisure time. To add more to that, leisure time has been viewed as having a direct influence in determining behaviour and adjustment in the community. It also does actual contribute to the sound development of personality (Bezuidenhout & Joubert 2003:154).

#### **4.4.1.2 The goals of diversion in South Africa**

The Child Care Act (Act 74 of 1983) provide the following purposes of juvenile diversion (Zondi 2002:42):

- “...encouraged the child to be accountable for the harm caused;

- meet the particular needs for the individual child;
- promote the reintegration of child to the family and community;
- provide an opportunity to those affected by the harm to express their views on its impact on them;
- encourage the rendering to the victim of some symbolic benefit or the delivery of some object as compensation for the harm;
- promote reconciliation between the child and the person or persons or community affected by the harm caused;
- prevent stigmatising the child and prevent adverse consequences flowing from being subject to the criminal justice system; and
- prevent the child from having a criminal record (Child Justice Bill 2002, Section 43).

#### **4.4.1.3 Diversion programmes that are implemented in South Africa**

The following are some of the diversion programs that are available in S.A. which were initiated by NICRO in the early 1990s (Cf. Muntingh 2001):

- Youth Empowerment Scheme (YES)- this is a life skills programme which is spread over eight weeks, where one session per week mostly during afternoon is scheduled. Normally the programme accommodates a group of 15 to 25 children. The parents or guardian are being called upon to attend both the first and the last session, so as to support or encourage the progress of the juvenile offender in the programme. The programme makes use of interactive and experiential learning techniques to assist children in acquiring important life skills. Among the themes covered in the programme include:
  - crime and the law;
  - parent- child relationships;

- self-esteem
- conflict resolution; and
- responsible decision making

Children may be referred to the programme as a pre-trial diversion or as a postponed or deferred sentence. Furthermore, educators, and social workers, may institute the programme and other people involved in the education of children may be included as well.

- Pre-trial Community Service (PTCS): In this intervention, instead of proceeding with prosecution, the child has to perform a number of hours of community service at non-profit organization. A NICRO worker, in consultation with the public prosecutor determines the requisite number of hours and then monitors the child's progress, and report to the prosecutor. On average, a child performs between 20 to 120 hours of community service, which is spread over a period of 6 to 8 weeks. This programme is considered in petty offences or victimless offences, for example possession of dagga, fire arm. In addition it is important to note that there is age restriction of 15 years for community services, in terms of section 297(1) of the Criminal Procedure Act 51 of 1977. In a nutshell juvenile who are younger than 15 years do not participate in the programme.
- Victim Offender Mediation (VOM): In this programme both the victim and the child offender are brought together, under the facilitation of the of special trained NICRO mediator. The purpose of the meeting is to work out a mutually acceptable agreement with the aim of restoring the balance while holding the child accountable for his or her behaviour. Once an agreement is reached, this is reported to the prosecutor, who decides whether or not to withdraw the criminal case.

- Family Group Conference (FGC): This is a restorative justice intervention very similar to the VOM, the distinction between the two programmes lies on the involvement of the families of both the victim and the young offender in the mediation process. In addition a great emphasis is placed on the prevention of recidivism and all FGCs have to put in place plans that will prevent further offending. The offender his or her family, the victim and his or her family discuss the offence, why it was committed and what can be done to restore the situation. It is envisaged that this interaction will help the young offender to understand the impact of his or her actions and the process inspires healing for all the parties concerned.
- The Journey: This is multi-component programme which is scheduled for children considered as 'high risk offender'. The programme normally accommodates a group of 10 to 15 children or participants. The participants are repeat offenders and have dropped-out of school with one or more previous conviction. Furthermore, the programme incorporates life-skills adventure training, vocational-skills training and education a wilderness component based on rites of passage theory, which is facilitated by a non-governmental organization called EDUCO.
- South African Youth Sex Offender Project (SAYSToP): The programme is being managed by NICRO, University of Western Cape; Institute of Criminology (University of Cape Town); the Community Law Centre; and the Eastern Cape. This programme consists of ten sessions, scheduled for two hours per week. It is aimed at young sexual offenders in the age group of 12 to 18 years. Children accused of crimes such as violent sexual assault or gang rape would not be accepted in this programme.

#### **4.4.1.4 The evaluation of diversion programmes in South Africa**

It is evident that NICRO is charged with the duty of preventing the juvenile misconduct in South Africa at tertiary crime prevention level; as it remains the primary provider of diversion programme. In early 1990s during its initiation it had a mission of spreading the diversion programmes in the whole of South Africa (all nine provinces); which was accomplished in 2000. In a period of two years (2001-2002) NICRO facilitated a total of 16 211 diversion programmes, which its provincial breakdown is as follows (Cf. Muntingh 2001):

- Gauteng- 4112;
- Western Cape- 2 865;
- KwaZulu-Natal- 2 626;
- Eastern Cape- 2 196;
- Northern Cape- 1 725
- North West- 963
- Free State- 822
- Mpumalanga- 598; and
- Limpompo- 304

In a study conducted by Muntingh (1998:8) on behalf of NICRO in which a group of 640 children participated in different diversion programmes. The following emerged in the study:

- Diversion programme participants are children between 15 to 17 years old, first-time male offenders, charged with property related crimes, and residing with their parents and in the second to third year of secondary schooling;
- The commitment of the children to the diversion programme was very high (75%);

- In the first 12 months after participating in the diversion programme, only 6,7% of the children re-offended.

The diversion programmes which is being rendered in South Africa seem to have huge benefits for both young offenders and the society at large. It is evident that children avoid detention in police custody where they often come into contact with gangs and hardened criminals. They (children) also avoid the negative effects of a criminal record, which can stigmatise them for life and decrease their chances of obtaining employment. Furthermore, court time is saved because prosecutors usually withdraw cases from the court roll on condition that young offenders comply with the requirements of diversion programs (Cf. Sloth-Nielsen & Mathiti 2001). The researcher is of the view that it will be a faulty deduction to argue that the above judgement can be generalized as the diversion programmes have not been implemented in all communities, in particular the previously disadvantaged communities. For example not all municipalities in the O.R. Tambo District Municipality have implement the diversion programmes.

#### **4.4.2 THE PURPOSE OF PUNISHMENT**

In the tertiary prevention phase of juvenile misconduct it has been emphasised that young offenders need to be channeled away from the criminal justice system. Furthermore, attention has also been drawn to guidelines which assist prosecutors in determining which offenders qualify to be placed under diversion and which ones do not meet the minimum requirements/standards, and may not qualify (Scott 1990:101-102).

However, although it has been viewed necessary to channel away the youth in conflict with the law from the criminal justice system; the fact remains that there are children who commit serious offences therefore under those circumstances

their cases need to be dealt with through the criminal justice system. Thus, it is cognizant to be conversant with the South African criminal justice process which is actual divided into two parts (Scott 1990:101-102) :

- the question of guilt or innocence.
- the question of appropriate sentence should the accused be convicted.

According to Bezuidenhout and Joubert (2003:157), the court proceedings should be conducted in a manner that respects the dignity and rights of the young person within an atmosphere of understanding of their backgrounds and they should be allowed to participate in the proceedings. Because crimes (committed by young offenders) are increasingly becoming more violent and are happening at an earlier age, it should be appreciated that the public will call for tougher hand on crime with heavier penalties and longer goal sentences are being encouraged (Cf. Du Plessis 2006).

According to the researcher's assumptions, many magistrates in sentencing courts can easily find themselves confused when it comes to the use of the discretion when dealing with the young offenders. The ideal is that no child should ever be caged, though in practice there will always be cases that are serious enough to warrant imprisonment as the only appropriate punishment. According to the Criminal Law Amendment Act 105 of 1997, the court is not obliged to impose the minimum sentence on a child who at time of the commission of the offence was 16 or 17 years old unless the State satisfies the Court that the circumstance justify the imposition of such sentence. At the current moment a sentence of imprisonment may not be imposed unless (Cf. S v Jan Hendrik Brandt 2004; Child Justice Bill 2002:30):

- the child was over the age of 14 years at the time of commission of the offence, and

- substantial and compelling reasons exist for imposing a sentence of imprisonment, which may include conviction of a serious offence or a previous failure to respond to alternative sentences, including sentences with a residential element.

In instances when suitable punishment is being considered, the effect of the provision of the Criminal Law Amendment Act 105 of 1997 automatically gives the sentencing court the discretion that it acquires under section 51(3)(a). The court follows the substantial and compelling formula which finds no application of punishment to offenders between 16 and 18 years. A court is therefore generally free to apply the usual sentencing criteria in deciding on an appropriate sentence for child between the ages of 16 and 18 years (*S v Jan Hendrik Brandt* 2004).

On deciding about the appropriate sentence the two basic questions have to be answered as well, namely (Flew 1954:83-104):

- what is the purpose of imposing punishment in a case in question?
- in what way should the punishment be implemented in order to pass a suitable and effective sentence?

The first question centers on the purpose to be achieved by imposing punishment; while the second question addresses the way in which punishment should be implemented in order to achieve the predetermined purpose and thus a suitable sentence. The objectives or aims of imposing punishment are of great value since they seriously affect the process of consideration. The purpose the court wishes to achieve by sentencing will not only affect the whole process leading up to sentencing, but will also play a specific part in answering the second question, namely what punishment will be appropriate? It is also important to take a note of the fact that punishment may be justified by a rational motivation, namely: retribution, rehabilitation, incapacitation and deterrence (Burchell & Hunt 1970:67).

#### **4.4.2.1 Retribution**

There is certain amount of confusion about the concept retribution since different authors attach a different meaning to the word. Some do not make any distinction between revenge and retribution; they actually use the words as synonyms. For example, Sykes (Cf. 1968) typifies retribution as a channeled revenge. While Reid (Cf. 1976) on the other hand does not make any distinction between revenge and retribution to him it is one and the same as 'vendetta'. According to Burchell and Hunt (1970:67) other authorities do distinguish between the two principles, on two grounds such as:

- in the first place, the suffering that forms part of punishment is, in the case of retribution passed by a third party, the state and not by the injured party himself as in the case of revenge.
- a second distinction rests on the spirit in which punishment is imposed. Although punishment is exacted by the human agency, it must be seen as impersonal in that the person who exacts it, must take no personal pleasure in the punishment. Kriegler (1993:650) points out that the sentencing officer must not arouse (give) the impression of temper, anger or excitement in punishing the offender.

The state takes the responsibility of punishing the criminal with the idea or aim of psychologically satisfying the community's. There are also counter arguments against the view that the state is trying to prevent the public from taking law into its own hands. It has also been stated that retribution essentially amounts to paying back the criminal by way of punishment for the committed wrong. Furthermore, retribution is related to the restoration of a disturbed balance in the society. In essence, this boils down to that the legal balance in society which is disturbed as soon as a crime is committed. This is the reason that punishing the criminal for the

offence is deemed to be the only to restore the legal balance. In actual sense of the word retribution in punishment is an attempt to introduce harmony and order where there was chaos (Cf. Burchell & Hunt 1970; Conklin 1995:474; Brown, Tate, Vik, Haas, & Aarons 1996:47; Regoli & Hewitt 1996:513).

Moreover, through retribution in the form of a morally justified punishment, society (the community) displays its disapproval of crime and offenders are thus educated because they learn what behaviour is unacceptable. In a nutshell he or she is being taught what is being expected in every responsible agent in the community (Burchell & Hunt 1970; Van der Merwe 1996:3-11).

#### **4.4.2.2 Deterrence**

The basis of crime prevention through deterrence can be traced back to the principles of the classical school of thought in criminology; in particular '*hedonism*'. Hedonism sometimes referred to as the 'pleasure seeking' and 'pain avoiding principle', means men [human beings] are by nature fun loving. In other words people will direct their actions in a way that will bring them joy or pleasure and avoid anything that will bring them pain. Thus, this principle sees criminals as deriving pleasure from their crime. To counter-balance that, criminals have to be punished, since punishment is painful (Tierney 1996:48).

People may be deterred from crime by the existence and operation of punishment that has been justified as an objective of punishment. The potential criminals takes the disagreeable results or consequences of the crime into account and refrain from committing crime. Punishment has also a general deterrence action its mere existence deters the potential criminals. Some people have boundless faith in punishment as a deterrent whereas others question or deny its values. According to the latter submission, the mere existence of people who commit crimes, despite the

threat of punishment that on its own serves as a proof that it does not deter. Scientifically, the latter submissions are a faulty deduction and unjustified generalization. Yes, it is true that some other people are not deterred by the possibility of punishment, but there is no ground to deduce or generalize from this assumption that there is no one deterred by punishment (Burchell & Hunt 1970; Brown *et. al.* 1996:45; Conklin 1995:44).

The case for the deterrent value of punishment rests on the following suppositions (Cf., Burchell & Hunt 1970):

- people think before they act; that is a fair assumption that normal rational people always weigh up the disadvantages of crime against the throwbacks of punishment .
- the second assumption is that the disadvantages of punishment always outweigh the advantages of crime. That is not always true, since the deterrent value of punishment depends on the person's circumstances.

It has also been envisaged that deterrence implies an optimal preventive effect of punishment with reference to people who restrain themselves completely from crime. However, it is also argued that the motivation for law-abiding behaviour or restrain from crime need not necessarily be ascribed to the existence or threat of punishment. It could also be because people have strong moral convictions and conform to societal and legal rules (Conklin 1995:443).

#### **4.4.2.3 Protection of the society or incapacitation**

Glick (1995:463) describes 'incapacitation as an aim of punishment to separate offenders from the community as to reduce the opportunity for further crime'. While on the hand some criminologists not only emphasise the reduction of

opportunities by isolation, but also refer to the elimination of the offender's capacity to commit crime within the community (Brown *et. al.* 1996:46). According to Burchell and Hunt (Cf. 1970) experience has shown that each community has religious norms based on its religious ideas. Whatever those are, they seem to form the basis of a community. These principles are expanded into a more varied and comprehensive system of ethical norms. Society uses a series of enforcement or sanctions including punishment, to compel transgressors to obey the code and in this way the community protects itself. During the period that the criminal is removed from the society crime is prevented, and the community enjoys protection. It is much more important for people to be moved to abide by the code of their own 'free will' for this affords permanent protection to the society. That means punishment in itself has limited protection value. This is the reason optimum protection against crime is viewed to be rehabilitation of the criminal.

#### **4.4.2.4 Rehabilitation or reformation of the offender**

In imposing a sentence, society and the victim of the crime in question are considered; but due regard need also to be paid to the criminal. This is because he or she is a person; a fellow man and invaluable part of society. In the past, too much emphasis was placed on the crime and too little on the criminal with his environmental and personality problems (Cf. Burchell & Hunt 1970).

This shift in emphasis from crime to the criminal paved the way for the development of rehabilitation as the aim of punishment. In rehabilitation, the consideration is to change offenders' disposition, attitude to life and observable behaviour and to provide support in the case of imprisonment so that they adjust to the community in a socially accepted way after release (Cf. Burchell & Hunt 1970). In other words, this implies that he or she must himself or herself realise

that his or her behaviour was wrong. Once the criminal has realised that his or her behaviour has been wrong, he or she will try to change. This striving or process does not of course imply that he or she may not relapse into crime. Seen in this light, rehabilitation is possible only if or when the offender accepts the principles of comparison in regard to his punishment:- that punishment is deserved. Once he or she accepts that he or she has done wrong punishment can help to transform him or her (Cf. Burchell & Hunt 1970).

#### **4.5 SUMMARY**

In this chapter crime prevention was introduced and essentially discussed as a social problem where everyone in the society has an important role to play towards achieving its set goals. It has to be noted that it was not the intention of this chapter to discuss all the strategies that may be implemented in various communities, to addresses crime prevention; its main purpose was to tackle strategies pertaining to the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

Primary crime prevention has been depicted as the ideal objective in so far as securing the elimination of the risk factors, which can sometimes propel a youngster to deviate into delinquency. Thus, primary crime prevention has been introduced to be proactive because it focuses its attention on putting up an environment that is conducive for everyone to live or function in society. This chapter highlights the fact that the family plays a very important role in socialising children to be law-abiding citizens. This chapter further suggests that if that is done, crime is by and large prevented.

Secondary crime prevention has been identified and discussed as an approach used for the identification of those youngsters who are at risk and also the risk factors that may lead deviation to crime. This approach had advocated the complexity of

the role played by the school in as far as the prevention of juvenile delinquency; though the school is not mainly charged with such a duty.

Tertiary crime prevention is the least satisfactory approach; conversely and constitute the main business of the non-governmental organizations and the criminal justice system in particular the Department of Correctional Services.

On the other hand NGOs try to channel away the young offender from the criminal justice process. While on the other hand those who committed serious offences and do not meet the minimum requirement standards set up for participation in the diversion programmes are dealt within prison (incapacitation, rehabilitation etc.).

#### **4.6 CHAPTER REFERENCES**

Adler, F. M., Mueller, G.O. & Laufer, W., 1996. *Criminal justice: the core*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ahlstrom, W.M. Havighurst, & R.J 1971. *Juvenile delinquency*. Sanfransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Andrews, D.A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R.D., Bonta,J., Gendreau, P. & Cullen, F.T. 1990. *Does correctional treatment work? A clinical relevant and psychological investigation*. American Association: New York.

Badenhorst, C. & Conradie, H. 2004. Diversion: The present and proposed future provisions. *Acta criminological*, 17 (2).

Bennet, R.R., & Flavin, J.M. 1993. Determinants of fear of crime: The effects of cultural setting. *Justice quarterly*, (11): 357-381.

Bezuidenhout, C. & Joubert, S. 2003. *Child and youth misbehaviour in South Africa: A holistic view*. Pretoria: Van Schaik's.

Bloch, H.A. & Flynn, F.T. 1966. *Delinquency: The juvenile offender in America today*. New York: Random House.

Brewer, D.D., Hawkins, J.D., Catalane, R.F. & Necherman, J.J. 1995. In: Howell, J.C., Hawkins, J.D., & Wilson, J.J. (Eds.). *A sourcebook: serious, violent and chronic juvenile offenders* (pp. 61-141). London: Sage.

Brown, S.A., Tate, S.R., Vik, P.V., Haas, A.L. & Aarons, G.A. 1996. Modeling of alcohol use mediates the effects of family history of alcoholism on adolescent alcohol expectancies. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*, 7:20-27.

Burchell, E.M. & Hunt, M.A. 1970. *South African Criminal Law & Procedure*. Kenwyn: Juta.

Caplan, G. 1964. *Principles of preventive psychiatry*. New York: Basic Books.

Caulhoun, C., Light, D. & Keller, S. 1997. *Sociology*. Seventh Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Collopy, A., Daffne, B., Krige, R., Matzke, E., Pickett, G., Sibeko, P., Boshoko, Y. & Mulea, P. 2001. *Handy hints manual for prosecutors*. Pretoria: NDPP.

Conklin, J. 1995. *Criminology*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Crawford, C.B. & Krebs, D.L. (Eds.). 1998. *Handbook of evolutionary psychology: Ideas, issues, and applicants*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbamn.

Du Plessis, A. 2006. *Entertain*. Cape Town: Human & Rousseau.

Elkin, M. & Handel, C. 1984. *Families and the influence*. New York: NY Norton.

Flew, A. 1954. The justification of punishment, *Philosophy*, 29:291-307. In: Jim Marsh. University of Auckland: University Press.

Glick, L. 1995. *Criminology*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Havighurst, R.J. 1971. *Developmental tasks and education*. New York: D. McKay Co.

Hirschi, T. 1995. The family. In: *Crime and Delinquency*. (Eds.). James Q. Wilson and Joan Petersilia. San Fransisco: ICS Press.

Jacobs, J.J. 1988. *Community programmes for prevention of crime*. In Naude, CM.B. & Stevens, R. (Eds.). *Crime Prevention Strategies*. Pretoria: Haum.

Juvenile Justice for South Africa. 1994. *Proposals for policy and legislative change*. Cape Town: Allies Printers.

Kriegler, J. 1993. *Hiemstra: Suid-Afrikaanse Strafproses*. Durban: Butterworths.

Kratcoski, P.C. & Kratcoski, L.D. 1979. *Juvenile delinquency*. Englewood-Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Leiternberg, H. 1987. *Primary prevention of delinquency*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Liese, J. 2002. *From Policy to implementation*. Paper delivered at the Youth Hope Conference, Crime Prevention Center, Council for Scientific and Industrial Research. Pretoria, 3 October.

Lorion, R.P., Tolan P.H. & Whaler, R.G. 1987. Prevention. In Quay, H.C. (Ed.) *Handbook of juvenile delinquency*. New York: Wiley.

Mazibuko, F. 1994. Primary prevention and the school. In Glanz (Ed.), *Preventing juvenile offending in South Africa*. Workshop proceedings, (pp. 39-41). Pretoria: Human Science Research Council.

Morei, N. 2002. Courts starts to see household diversity. *Children first: A journal on issues affecting children and their careers*, 6 (45): 7-10.

Mrazek, P.J. & Haggerty, R.J. 1994. *Reducing the risks for mental disorders: Frontiers for preventive intervention research*. Washington, DC: National Academic Press.

Muntingh, L.M. 2001. The mechanics of diversion. *Child Law Manual for Prosecutors*: Justice College & NDPP.

National Crime Prevention Strategy of 1996. Pretoria: Department of Safety and Security. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Pink, W.T. 1994. *Effective staff development for school change*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Quinsey, V.L., Skilling, T.A., Lalunier, M.L., & Craig, W.M. 2004. *Juvenile delinquency: understanding the origins of individual differences*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Regoli, R.M. & Hewitt, J.D. 2006. *Delinquency in society*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Regoli, R.M. & Hewitt, J.D. 1996. *Delinquency in society: A child centered approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Reid, S.T. 1976. *Crime and criminology*. Illinois: Dryden.

Robberste, P.M. 1951. *’n Sielkundig-kliniese ontleding van die persoonlikheidsstruktuur van ’n groep sosiaal-aangepaste groep en sosiaal-wanaangepaste kinders van 10-13 jaar*. Pretoria: Unisa.

S v Jan Brandt 2004 Case number :513/03.

Schmallegger, F. 1994. *Criminal justice: A brief introduction*. Englewood Cliffs: New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Schurink, E. 1994. *Support networks: Forming attachments between family, school and community*. In: L. Glanz (Ed.), *Preventing juvenile offending in South Africa: Workshop proceedings* (pp. 47-55). Pretoria: Human Science Research Council.

Scott, S. 1990. *Werkboek vir Inleiding tot die Reg*. Pretoria: Digma.

Sloth-Nielsen, J. & Mathithi, V. 2001. Final Report to the Open Society Foundation. September 2001 to September 2002; Child Justice Project Diversion Database.

Sloth-Nielsen, J. & Muntingh, L.M. 1999-2000. *Juvenile Justice Review*, n.d. Unpublished Document.

South Africa. 2002. Child Justice Bill. Pretoria: Government Printer.

South African Law Commission (SALC). 2000. *Project 106. Juvenile Justice Report*.

South Africa, Republic of. 1983. *Child Care Act, no.74 of 1983*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

South Africa. 1996. *The National Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

South Africa. 1997. Criminal Law Amendment Act (no. 105 of 1997). Pretoria: Government Printer.

Stullken, E.H. 1953. The schools and the delinquency problem. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 43:5.

Sykes, G. 1968. *Criminology*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Thornbery, T., Huizinga, D., & Loeber, R. 1995. *The prevention of serious delinquency and violence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Tiernery, J. 1996. *Criminology: theory and context*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

United Nations Guidelines for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency (the Riyadh Guidelines). 1990. Available at [http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/h\\_comp47.htm](http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/h_comp47.htm) Accessed on 11/3/2006.

Van der Merwe, D. 1996. *Sentencing*. Cape Town: Juta.

- Van Rooyen, H.J.N. 1994. *Community Policing*. Pretoria: Promedia.
- Vedder, C.B. 1963. *Juvenile offenders*. Springfield, III: Thomas.
- Venter, H.J. 1995. *Jeugmisdaad: 'n Handleiding vir studente in die kriminologie*. Pretoria: Craft Press.
- Whitehead, T.J. & Lab, S.P. 1990. *Juvenile justice: An introduction*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing.
- Willis. P. 1979. *Learning to labour*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Wilson, J.Q. 1995. Crime and public policy. In: *Crime*, edited by James Q. & Joan Petersilia, 489-507. San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies Press.
- Wilson, J.J. & Howell, J.C. 1995. In: J.O. Howell, R.Krisberg, J.D. Hawkins, & J.J. Wilson (Eds), *Serious violent and chronic juvenile offenders*. London: Sage.
- Wyatt, J. & Carlo, G. 2002. What will my parents think? Relations among adolescents expected parental reactions, pro-social moral reasoning; pro-social and antisocial behaviours, *A Journal of Adolescents Research*, 17:646-666.
- Young, P.V. 1972. *Scientific social surveys and research*. Fifth Edition. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Zondi, C.Z. 2002. Juvenile diversion. Unpublished Master's dissertation. KwaDlangezwa: University of Zululand.

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **5.1 INTRODUCTION**

Many scholars are much more concerned about the element of reliability and validity of self-reported data as well as measures being used in the analysis. It is mostly important to indicate that the study come from non probability sample with sampling of high risk groups (Africans and lower class youth), and when conducting a study according to Hindelang, Hirschi, and Weis (Cf. 1979) there is not always a great concern about the representativeness of the sample.

The procedure for asking questions on delinquency, a questionnaire was employed which probed the respondents about their involvement or participation in the identified behaviours during the past twelve months preceding the study. According to Short (Cf. 1990) a time window of twelve months seems to be too long. However, the researcher felt that a twelve months period would assist in minimizing respondents' responses and expedite the progress of the study.

Despite the large numbers of delinquent behaviours, the police only uncover the tip of the iceberg of crime and delinquency in South Africa. This is because the vast majority of offences committed by juveniles remain hidden, the so-called 'dark figure' of crime. However, crime has been envisaged to remain hidden for various reasons, which further distort the true picture of crime figures that is drawn from official sources (Cf. Barlow 1990):

- Crime was unsuccessful, that it was not important enough or that nothing could be done about it.
- In most cases, crime is seen as a private or personal matter.

- People feel that police will not assist them in their quest for justice.

To further perplex the issue of the picture of crime, police officials have a part to play. To be specific the police officer indeed have the last word on which offences get into their official record books. The public in general depends on the grace of the police who decide to report an event as a crime eligible for the official record. That decision is mostly indicated to be inevitable even if the offence occurs in their presence and the offender is caught red-handed. Some offences are simply dismissed as ‘unfounded’, that means the police regarded the incident as non-criminal or at least could not verify that an offence had occurred (Barlow & Ferdinand 1992:19).

Results are reported for the list of common activities or ‘offences’, or some of which school pupils usually engage in to reflect a ‘teenage culture’ which will be measured against the following predictor variable: i) gender, age, race, and grade; ii) family situation; and iii) parental control and discipline.

## **5.2 ACHIEVEMENT OF AIMS**

For the purpose of proper description and analysis of data, the researcher has formulated four aims for this social enquiry (see Chapter 1, paragraph 1.3). For the purpose of convenience, these aims will be repeated here and tested:

**Aim 1:** *To ascertain, through cross-correlation of data, whether significant differences exist between predictor variables age, area of residence, and school grade and self-reported delinquency.* Considering Aim 1, it becomes clear that the analysis of data rests on the description of self-reported juvenile delinquent acts contained in Table 15 and 17 which reveals results that are not significant. However, there are some self-selected delinquent acts which demonstrate some

significant differences. Judging from the indicated tables, it could be stated with certainty that Aim 1 has been achieved, both descriptively and statistically.

**Aim 2:** *To explore and identify significant differences between variables relating to respondents' family situation and self-reported delinquency.* This aim has been adequately addressed in Table 6, 7, 10, and 12. The latter tables were concerned about the impact of the number of children at home, and parental employment status in relation to delinquent behaviour. The results partly turned to be significant at some other issues.

**Aim3:** *To ascertain whether significant differences exist between male and female respondents relating to the exercising of parental control and discipline and self-reported delinquency.* It is certain to attest that Table 7 demonstrates significant differences when the self-selected delinquent act (objection to parental disciplinary measures) is cross-correlated by the number of children at home. Judging by the results revealed in the table it is adequately proper to declare that parents may eventually give up (abandon) attempts to impose control over children for the sake of peace.

**Aim 4:** *To establish statistical variations between gender and a typology of delinquent acts, based on self-reported data.* Table 13 devotes its attention to statistical differences between male and female respondents regarding certain self-selected delinquent acts. The results of the effort illustrate that there is a statistical gap in this regard between female and male respondents. Altogether, it has been confirmed that there are no significant differences.

### **5.3 HYPOTHESIS TESTING**

The findings in regard to hypothesis testing are as follows:

#### **Null-hypothesis 1(a):**

Respondents do not differ significantly in terms of independent variables and self-reported delinquency. According to the analysis of responses there are no significant differences between the answers of *almost* all the independent variables as illustrated in Tables 11, 13, 15, and 17. However, it is striking to note that significant differences are being reported for gender ( $p=.006$ ), age ( $p=.029$ ), and area of residence ( $p=.005$ ) – see Tables 13, 15, and 17 respectively. This hypothesis is, therefore, partially accepted.

#### **Null-hypothesis 1(b):**

Respondents' involvement in self-reported delinquency, do not increase significantly with *age* and *school grade*. The data analysis revealed significant differences regarding age in Table 15 ( $p=.029$ ). However, a different trend manifests with regard to school grade as no significant differences emerge in Table 17 ( $p=.435$ ). This hypothesis is also partially accepted.

#### **Null-hypothesis 2 (a):**

There are no significant differences between respondents' *family situation* and self-reported delinquency. Statistically no significant differences are being observed between independent and dependent variables ( $p=.541$ ) relating to the theft of property worth less than R10.00 (Table 6). It appears that there are also no statistical differences in the data reported in Table 7 ( $p=.026$ ). The data also

provide answers (that are not significant,  $p \geq .05$ ) which emerge in Table 10 regarding bullying of other pupil's at school. However, there are results that approach significance ( $p = .056$ ) in terms of truanting. Noticeably, there are significant responses (Table 11) regarding the beating-up of another pupil in a school fight ( $p = .007$ ). As far as Table 12 is concerned, no significant differences surfaced from the cross-correlated data regarding smoking of dagga ( $p = .674$ ), inhaling of benzine ( $p = .249$ ), buying of liquor with parents' permission ( $p = .598$ ), dealing in and selling of drugs ( $p = .724$ ). Strikingly, a significant difference ( $p = .002$ ) is being observed regarding the drinking of beer, wine, and hard liquor while with friends. Basically, there appears to be a relationship between *family relations* and self-reported delinquency. Subsequently, this hypothesis is also partially accepted.

**Null-hypothesis 2(b):**

No significant differences are observable when self-reported delinquency between respondents from broken homes, are compared with those from intact (complete) families (Aim 2; vars. 9-10' 23-48). In terms of school grades ( $p = .683$ ) and marital status of parents ( $p = .596$ ) there are no observable significant differences. Only in terms of age groups, did the data produce a significant difference ( $p = .029$ ). This being the case, the researcher partially accepts this hypothesis.

**Null-hypothesis 2(c):**

There are no significant differences in self-reported delinquency between respondents whose fathers are economically active (employed), compared to those whose fathers are economically inactive (unemployed) (Aim 2; vars. 9, 10, 23-48). Table 11 demonstrates response differences that are not significant at the .05 percentage level, especially as far as the evasion of a taxi or bus fares are

concerned ( $p=.747$ ). A similar response emerged in terms of spreading bad stories about other pupils at school. This hypothesis is accepted.

**Null-hypothesis 2(d):**

There are no significant differences in self-reported delinquency between respondents whose mothers are economically active (employed), compared to those whose mothers are economically inactive (unemployed) (Aim 2; vars. 9, 10, 23-48). Differences in responses regarding the scratching of teacher's motor car in Table 11 proved to be significant ( $p=.007$ ) in this regard and consequently, this hypothesis is not accepted.

**Null-hypothesis 3(a):**

No significant differences are recorded when self-reported Delinquency is cross-correlated in terms of independent variables and parental control (Aim 3; vars. 1-8; 14-17). The statistical results revealed in Table 15 proved to be significant ( $p=.029$ ) regarding age categories, cross-correlated with objection of parental discipline. However, in terms of school grades, statistical results are not significant ( $p=.683$ ) in regard to the same deviant behaviour. The hypothesis is partially accepted.

**Null-hypothesis 3(b):**

Respondents' involvement in delinquent acts does not significantly decrease when cross-correlated with *family discipline* (Aim 3; vars. 18-22; 23-48). It is being observed in Table 7 that there were remarkable significant differences ( $p=.026$ ) regarding the resistant to parental discipline. This hypothesis is not accepted.

#### **Null-hypothesis 4:**

No statistical differences are observable between male and female involvement in self-reported delinquency (Aim 4; vars. 1; 23-48). A noteworthy observation is that the respondents (according to gender) differ in their responses regarding the self-selected delinquent acts as illustrated in Table 13. Altogether, the following delinquent acts did not produced any significant differences at the .05 percentage level: involvement in dagga smoking, scratching of teachers' motor car and dealing with drugs. However, the following results display significant differences: drinking of beer, wine, and even hard liquor while with friends ( $p=.006$ ) and buying of liquor without the permission of parents ( $p=.019$ ). The hypothesis is partially accepted.

### **5.4 FINDINGS**

#### **5.4.1 Family situation**

The family profile of the parents of respondents seems to be portraying the general picture of the society at large, in particular African families. Table 3 depicts that the majority of respondents coming from intact families, although this does not mean that such families are immune to juvenile delinquency. Most families are characterised by massive unemployment which can be another factor why children will be propelled to venture into the streets to fend for themselves as parents may not be capable of providing enough for the survival of the family (Table 9, 10, and 12). The present government on the other side is striving to address the imbalances of the distribution of scarce resources by providing children and foster care grants both to children whose parents are economical inactive and may have passed away as a result of HIV/Aids or other diseases. The respondents in the study admitted that they are

being abandoned by their parents, as there is a lack of discipline within the family setting. In addition, the only parent that they can rely on is the mother as she is the only one to approach when they encounter social, personal or academic problems (see Table 8). These youngsters had chosen sides as they bonded with their mothers who are usually closest to them when they need help and appraisal, while it is not always the case when it comes to their fathers. Furthermore, this is not foreign to African families as traditional custom empowers the mother to assume responsibility of the rearing of the children while fathers are working a distance from home. Among other things, those conditions make fathers to be absent from their children's lives. This situation may result into children's lives becoming void if there is no one to take the responsibility of the father (like the mother for example). In Table 12 depicted that the size of the family should not be forgotten as it is found to play a plausible role in juvenile delinquency; like in a family of five to six children, it is more possible to find youngsters engaging in offences like stealing, watching video's reserved for adults only, etc. (see Table 7).

#### **5.4.2 School and delinquency**

It has also been discovered that the school as the extension of the family does not always provide fertile ground for the proper socialisation of the young one, because some schools are characterised by no bond existing between teachers and pupils, lack of discipline, high rate of academic failure, etc. Children react differently to stimuli; some may play truant, vandalise school property, scratch teachers' motor cars, etc. To exacerbate the situation, it appears that no adequate legislation exist to prevent children from leaving school at an early age (see Chapter 4). Inadequate qualifications or skills may cause them to find it more difficult to compete for scarce jobs in the labour market. Truanting from school creates or intensifies the aversive nature of some youths'

relationships with their parents (Cf. Agnew 1985). Consequently, that will result into delinquency as the only alternative way out. It is not only the children who must be blamed for truanting, 'Education' in the country is a serious problem; institutions of higher learning continue to produce graduates which are either overqualified or under-qualified in relation to available posts in the labour market. It is also found that large numbers of teachers are resigning for greener pastures, more especially abroad, as they are not kept materially or otherwise. All the negative factors impacting on sound education (irresponsible teachers, sub-standard teaching, truanting, etc.) have irreversible effect on the child at school (see Chapter 4).

#### **5.4.3 Use of illegal substances by school pupil**

It is astounding to find a large number of female respondents started experimenting in drugs, benzine, hard liquor and also other types of substances. To exacerbate the situation, they do not only experiment with drugs like dagga, but they also deal or sell this kind of stuff with the main aim of earning extra money. These activities are illegal and as a result they may end up being arrested. When a school pupil is in conflict with the law, the Constitution tends to guarantee his or her rights. It does not matter how heinous is the offence children are treated leniently, with greater care, and dignity. Among the Acts which are being used to deal with these youngsters in conflict with the law is the Child Care Act (Act 74 of 1983) and Child Justice Bill (Cf. 2002) which affords them the right not to be detained among hardened criminals and to be kept in places of safety (The Star 2008:5). There are also many available opportunities to divert young offenders out of the legal system and send them back to their same communities where they have committed the offences without removing the root causes of delinquent behaviour (see Chapter 4). When comparing boys and girls, the sample indicates that a higher

proportion of boys when compared to girls committed nearly all the selected juvenile activities (see Table 12).

#### **5.4.4 Prevention of juvenile delinquency**

The issue of juvenile delinquency in the Mthatha District of Education necessitates a partnership between community members and relevant government agencies. The most prominent government departments which involved in the problem of juvenile delinquency are Safety and Security department (S.A.P.S.), schools, the business community, non-Government Organisations (NGOs,) and also the community at large. Prevention of juvenile delinquency can never be successful without the partnership among those agencies as they will play a significant role in dealing with the issue in question.

The family is the primary agent of socialisation as indicated in Chapter 2 and is fundamental in fulfilling the emotional and physical needs of children by nurturing its individual identity. Members of society are collectively responsible for shaping the character of the child as it is not only certain members of the family who assume such responsibility, specifically a mother. Angelli (Cf. 1986:89) opines that if one member or more members of a family are functioning inharmoniously, the equilibrium and functioning of such family is in jeopardy. Such dysfunctions will certainly result in children feeling frustrated and find home as not a 'good haven' for them and therefore rather prefer to run away and engage in delinquent behaviour. More emphasis must not be placed only on the family as there are other powerful agencies like the school which must assume its role of working hand in hand with the family and actually takes it further (see Chapter 2).

## **5.5 CONCLUSION**

In general, the understanding of crime and more particularly juvenile delinquency is best known when informed by a theory or theories that address that particular aspect (see Chapter 3). There are theories which focus on the individual personality (cultural transmission theories), which can be implemented to explain the nature and extent of juvenile delinquency which continues to be rife in South Africa. While there are some which attribute the causes of juvenile delinquency to the social milieu which the individual happens to find himself or herself in and exposed to (social disorganization theories).

In generic terms, most families are considered to be disorganised, and under such circumstances the existing rules can not be properly implemented to maintain informal social control. Most families are incomplete which means that children are virtually left to themselves and to have less or no one to take the responsibility for their upbringing. The notion that the absence of the so-called intact family is more detrimental to the child than is the case with complete families appears to be a statistical fact (Table 8), because the child may end up not having the so-called father figure to emulate. It is therefore appropriate to conclude that children who come from incomplete families are more vulnerable to negative influences than is otherwise the case with children from complete families. In other words this issue of families that are not intact may easily lapse into juvenile delinquency and become a prominent predictor of deviant behaviour. In rural societies, it is evident that, due to family disorganization, some children leave their homes to invade urban areas. This type of migration seems to be justified in terms of better living standards and conditions which are believed to be more available in the urban areas. The process of urbanisation goes hand in hand with detachment and the loss of norms and societal values as they come across other peers with different backgrounds who might share the same problems and end up forming groups or

gangs. It is irregular, not procedural and unjustified or simple a faulty deduction to conclude that it is only the youngsters from incomplete families who opt for urbanisation or forming up with gang life as it is well known that those who come from intact families may also be attracted to the life (see Chapter 2).

It is also important to note that not all delinquent juveniles come from deviant families although their societies might have been disorganised. Through the process of association with others they come across in the street, school, play grounds, etc. they happen to become acquainted with delinquent behaviour. There are juveniles who will take an effort to teach others the skills of committing juvenile activities and devote further efforts to convince them to stay in the delinquent side of life (Cf. Sutherland's theory). In most cases delinquent children are made by others or some adults to believe that they need to express their own needs, values, and norms and reflect their deviant culture.

Most delinquent children know that their behaviour is not accepted in the larger society hence, they attribute their acts to circumstances beyond their control (Cf. Matza & Sykes's theory). In other words, they do not blame themselves for their delinquent behaviour but rather attribute their predicament to other factors in the society for example unemployment, lack of housing, lack of running water, etc.

When society attempts to repress juvenile delinquency they may find out that many people in society are amoral. There is a dearth of norms which are adequately internalised by children (Cf. Robert King Merton's theory). Although that is true, there are some families who make successful interventions. It is also important to note that internalising the acceptable norms of the society will form a positive base for law-abiding citizenship in the near future. The acceptance of the societal norms by the youth depends on the relationship or bonds formulated between children and their parents. Youngsters need to be socialised so that they

can successfully replace their preceding generation. Judging by the prevailing rates of juvenile delinquency, it may be relevant to conclude that juveniles are committed to delinquent behaviour however, such a submission has not yet been theoretical tested or empirically researched.

It is a fact that there is a lack of resources or means of survival in many societies. Today's youth seem to be unable to wait for the right time in their lives of attaining their goals, but would rather opt for short cuts (misconduct).

Parental approaches to socialisation also warrant blame, especially when it comes to the juvenile delinquency. Mostly, many parents are guilty of neglecting their children to fend on their own. Inconsistent ways of parenting or disciplining their children e.g. by spoiling them may cause children to disregard or disrespect other people or agencies called upon to exert formal discipline in society. As a result of this it is therefore scientific enough to say children are not properly shaped to face the challenges of life.

When the youngsters leave for school over a twelve year period and almost eight hours a day; they meet other youngsters of their age or older than themselves who come from various backgrounds. While confronted with an immense difference in values they find themselves propelled to make crucial choices, such as, friends, etc. The friends that they choose, may have a negative influence, normally getting involved in juvenile delinquency. Some of the youngsters are introduced to new norms and values which may be in conflict with those that they are familiar with at home. It is therefore, highly evident that many youngsters who spend most of their time, associating themselves with a deviant culture and end up not progressing academically as has been expected.

-

## **5.6 RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that:

### **5.6.1 Research**

More research and more especially empirical research should be conducted in the rural areas of South Africa to uncover the nature and extent of hidden causes of juvenile delinquency, more especially among female delinquents.

### **5.6.2 Education**

Education is a powerful tool which can be used to reach all segments of the population by teaching parents the disciplinary skills and more particularly how to keep families intact. Church leaders should play a more significant leading role in such ventures. Parents should be empowered about the functioning of the criminal justice system, disciplinary measures and the likes. To add more parents' knowledge of school education procedures, particularly the functions of school boards, partnerships in education will be an added advantage to the relationship between children and teachers. Furthermore, school teachers should be empowered on how to identify children who show signs of being susceptible to juvenile delinquency.

### **5.6.3 Juvenile justice system**

The juvenile justice system should be upgraded to such an extent that would be able to successfully deal with juvenile delinquency. Legislation should be made which will ensure compulsory education for all children. \_

## **5.7 CHAPTER REFERENCES**

Agnew, R.. 1985. A revised theory of delinquency. *Social Forces*, 64: 151-167.

Angelli, S. 1986. *Street children: A growing urban tragedy*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Barlow, H. D. 1990. *Introduction to Criminology*. Fifth Edition. Glenview, Chicago, Illinois.: Scott, Foreman/Little, Brown.

Barlow, H. D. and Ferdinand, Theodore N. 1992. *Understanding delinquency*. New York: HarperCollins.

Hindelang, M. J., Hirschi T. & Weis J. G. 1979. Correlates of Delinquency: The Illusion Discrepancy Between Self-Report and Official Measures. *American Sociological Review*, 44:995-1014.

Short, J. F. 1990. *Delinquency and society*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

South Africa. 1983. Child Care Act (no. 74 of 1983). Pretoria: Government Printer.

South Africa. 2002. Child Justice Bill. Pretoria: Government Printers.  
(Promulgated in terms of Government Gazzette no.23728 of August 2002).

The Star. 2008. *Child Justice Bill on the brink of becoming law*, 24 June: 5.

**Detailed Map of the Eastern Cape, South Africa**



King

Sabata Dalindyebo Municipality

(Mthatha and Mqanduli)

ANNEXURE B

Walter Sisulu University  
Department of Criminology  
P/Bag X1  
Mthatha  
June 20, 2005

The District Manager  
Mthatha District of Education  
Mthatha  
5100

Dear Mr. Dyasi

M.A. Research: *Juvenile delinquency among secondary school pupils in the Mthatha District of Education: A Self-Report Survey*

---

It is a great pleasure to inform you that I am a registered student at the University of Zululand for Master's degree in Criminology. Currently I am conducting an empirical research for the fulfillment of my degree programme. I here therefore seek your approval to pursue the proposed self-report study among pupils of senior secondary schools under your leadership and responsibility. The following senior secondary schools have been arbitrarily identified and selected as the geographical demarcated field of the study: Dalibaso Senior Secondary School, Gengqe,

Lutubeni, Mthatha High, Mthatha International, and Qokolweni Senior Secondary School.

Mr. Dyasi please note that I envisage the inclusion of Grade 10, 11, and 12 pupils only in the final sample. The ultimate size of the sample will depend on accurate sampling estimates, i.e. the exact number of pupils registered in each grade (10, 11, & 12) at ALL seven schools listed above.

I would be grateful sir, if you can grant written permission so I may pursue the proposed self-report study among the grades listed above at all seven schools. And also if you can provide me with the name(s) of contact person (teacher) or principal who could act as a supervisor to facilitate questionnaire distribution under controlled conditions i.e. during a spare period in class.

A copy of the final research report will be submitted to your office as soon as it is ready at the end of the study.

Your sympathetic, but expeditious treatment of this request is indeed highly appreciated. I could be reached by fax at: 047 502 2595/ tel. 047502 2464/ cell. 082 354 3465

Looking forward to hearing from you soon.

---

Enoch Zenzile (Student)



QUESTIONNAIRE

*Juvenile delinquency among secondary school pupils in the Mthatha District of  
Education: A Self-Report Survey*

---

INSTRUCTION TO RESPONDENTS:

- DO NOT write your NAME, ADDRESS, GRADE, NAME OF YOUR SCHOOL, or any other CONTACT PARTICULARS on this document.
  - ALL information provided by you, will be treated in the strictest confidence and shall NOT be disclosed to any unauthorized person or organization.
  - Your ANONIMITY (secrecy of your name) and your INTERGRITY as an individual will be respected and maintained at all costs.
  - Rest assured: you are '*in safe hands*' when filling in this questionnaire!
  - Please note: there are NO right or wrong answers here. Only your *honest responses* to all the questions that best reflect your personal opinion or past experience are required here.
  - Thank you very much for your willingness to participate in this very important study. Your assistance has been invaluable to me
-

SECTION A : DEMOGRAPHIC PARTICULARS

Please fill in the following particulars as accurately as possible by means of a cross (X) in the appropriate block. Numbers appearing in blocks have no specific meaning or value; they are only necessary for quantification purpose:

Q. 1 Your GENDER?

Male	1
Female	2

Q. 2 To which Age group below, do you belong today?

Younger than 16 years (i.e. 15, 14 years)	1
16 years old	2
17 “ “	3
18 “ “	4
19 “ “	5
20 “ “	6
21 “ “	7
Other (Specify.....)	8

Q. 3 What is your population race?

African	1
---------	---

Coloured	2
Indian	3
White	4

Q. 4 What is your mother-tongue (home) language?

Answer : \_\_\_\_\_

Q.5 Do you belong to any Church?

Yes	1
No	2

Q.6 If YES to question 5, please provide the name of your Church:

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_

Q. 7 In which area do you currently live (i.e. where your home is)?

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_

Q. 8 In which Grade are you presently? (Tick ONE only):

Grade 12	1
Grade 11	2
Grade 10	3

SECTION B : FAMILY PARTICULARS

Following below, are few questions that relate to *your* family situation. Please answer each one by means of drawing a (X) in the appropriate block next to each question or statement:

Q. 9 What are marital status of your parents?

Married	1
Never married	2
Mother deceased	3
Father deceased	4
Both parents deceased	5
Divorced or separated (but both still alive)	6
Other (Please specify.....)	7

Q. 10 Who of the following act as your parent/ guardian at home?

Biological parents (either father or mother or both)	1
Grandmother/ -father	2
Stepmother/ -father	3
Uncle or Aunt	4
Brother or sister	5
Neighbours	6

Nobody	7
Other (Please specify.....)	8

Q. 11 Is your mother currently employed?

Yes	1
No	2
Not applicable	3

Q. 12 Is your father currently employed?

Yes	1
No	2
Not applicable	3

Q. 13 Number of children in your family staying together with you?

One only	1
Two	2
Three to four	3
Five to six	4
Seven to eight	5
More than eight	6
Not a single one: I'm the only child	7

SECTION C : PARENTAL CONTROL AND DISCIPLINE

Q. 14 To *WHOM* do you usually go for advice, whether it be in connection with school problems or life experiences and/ or developmental problems? (*see question 10*) (NB: Only mention the ONE you trust most!)

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_

(Example: Mother, Father, Aunt, Grandfather, etc.)

Q. 15 Do you attend Church services with your parent(s)-  
(NB: Tick only ONE please)

Always (i.e. regularly)	1
Sometimes	2
Often	3
Rarely	4
Never	5
Not applicable	6

Q. 16 Does your father praise you for ‘good things’ done, e.g. scholastic and/ or school achievements? (NB: Tick ONE only)

Always (i.e. regularly)	1
Sometimes	2
Often	3
Never	4
Not applicable	5

Q. 17 Does your mother praise you for ‘good things’ done, e.g. scholastic and/ or school achievements? (NB: Tick ONE only)

Always (i.e. regularly)	1
Sometimes	2
Often	3
Never	4
Not applicable	5

Did your father/ mother/ step parent (s)/ guardian (see question 10), *punish* you in any of the following ways during the PAST TWELVE MONTHS? (NB: Tick each one, but one cross (1) per statement):

Scale: 1=Always, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 4=Never, 5=Not applicable

Q	Statement	1	2	3	4	5
18	Hit you with a sjambok, stick or other kind of object?	1	2	3	4	5
19	Verbally warned you?	1	2	3	4	5
20	'Grounded' you (confined to home) for a fixed period of?	1	2	3	4	5
21	Refused you permission to visit friends after school?	1	2	3	4	5

Q. 22 Have you ever objected to the discipline from your parents/ step parents or guardians during the past twelve (12) months?

Never	1
Once or twice	2
Three or four times	3
Five times or more	4
Not applicable	5

#### SECTION D : JUVENILE ACTIVITIES

Following below is a list of common activities or 'offences', some of which school pupils usually engages in to reflect a 'teenage culture'. Carefully read through this list and then indicate to what extent, i.e. *how many times*, you were involved in, or have committed some or all of those acts during the past twelve (12) months.

NB: Mark *EACH ITEM/ STATEMENT* with a cross (X) in the appropriate block. Use the scale indicated below-

Scale: 1=Never, 2=Once, 3=Two or three times, 4=Four times or more, and 5=Not applicable...

Q	Activity	1	2	3	4	5
23	Have deliberately broken a window of a building	1	2	3	4	5
24	Driven a motor vehicle without the valid drivers license	1	2	3	4	5
25	Taken someone else's property worth less than R10.00	1	2	3	4	5
26	Secretly watched a video or film reserved for adults only	1	2	3	4	5
27	Intentionally thrown a stone (s) at someone's house or vehicle	1	2	3	4	5
28	Damaged a public telephone	1	2	3	4	5
29	Illegally taken someone's cell phone without his or her consent	1	2	3	4	5
30	Destroyed property belonging to my school	1	2	3	4	5
31	Damaged or defaced another pupil's school books	1	2	3	4	5
32	Avoided paying for a trip with a taxi or bus by 'sneaking in'	1	2	3	4	5
33	Spread bad stories about another pupil (s) at school	1	2	3	4	5
34	Driven a motor vehicle without the owner's consent	1	2	3	4	5
35	Disobeyed my parents/ step parents or guardian/s	1	2	3	4	5
36	Made marks or wrote mean things on school desks	1	2	3	4	5
37	Disobeyed my teacher or other school official	1	2	3	4	5
38	Pinched something small (e.g. a sweet) from a store worth less than R5.00 without paying for it	1	2	3	4	5
39	Smoked dagga at school or elsewhere	1	2	3	4	5
40	Drank beer, wine or hard liquor while with friends	1	2	3	4	5
41	Scratched a teachers motorcar at school	1	2	3	4	5
42	Inhaled benzine, petrol or other to get a 'kick'	1	2	3	4	5
43	Bought liquor without parents or guardian's permission	1	2	3	4	5

44	Sold drugs or dealt in drugs with the aim of 'earning' money	1	2	3	4	5
45	Bullied some younger guy(s) at school	1	2	3	4	5
46	Have been loud, rowdy or unruly at school or public place	1	2	3	4	5

47	Stayed away from school without a valid reason	1	2	3	4	5
48	Beaten up another pupil in fight	1	2	3	4	5

THANKING YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR VALUABLE CONTRIBUTION!  
AND THANKS FOR BEING HONEST GOD BLESS YOU.