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Abstract

The overall goal of this study has been to advance the understanding of the role of family background variables, school, and peer influence in the explanation of juvenile delinquency, particularly in relation to different language groups. The assumptions which inform the basic theoretical perspective of this study have been developed from three major theoretical orientations known as strain, subculture and social control theories.

A quantitative methodology was adopted in this study. A self-report procedure, applied in survey form, was used to collect the required data. The study population consists of young people in the Illawarra region. The self-report data was obtained through questionnaire from a sample of 244 male and 236 female high school students, 11 to 17 years old. T-test, one-way and two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and stepwise multiple regression, were the statistical techniques used in the data analysis.

Three main objectives have generated the framework of this research. First was the explanation of delinquency in terms of age and sex. Second was the effect of language background and family socio-economic status on delinquent behaviour. The final objective was an evaluation of all major independent variables in relation to delinquent behaviour.

As far as the first objective is concerned, it is argued that one of the most consistent and basic findings in this self-reported delinquency is that delinquency tends to peak in the late teenage years (15 years and over). Overall, the study shows a weaker and more complex relationship between sex and delinquency than is generally acknowledged in the literature and official data.

Non-English speaking background youths and English speaking background youths were tested, and it is concluded that language background may not be
directly related to delinquency, because regardless of differences in language background, when individuals suffer socio-economic disadvantage increased delinquency will result.

In relation to the final objective, through using stepwise multiple regression analysis, the relative contributions of important variables in an explanation of delinquency has been systematically evaluated. The data demonstrates that several variables, asserted or implied by the above mentioned theories, were in fact related to delinquent behaviour. The relationship between delinquent behaviour and family and school-related variables is seen to be the strongest in comparison with other variables. Findings related to these three objectives are summarised, prior to exploring their overall implications in the areas of theory, research, intervention and policy.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1.1 The centrality of socio-economic status, family, school, and peer approval in explanations of delinquency

This chapter sets out the significance of this study and the aims of the research, then goes on to provide an outline of subsequent chapters.

Young people pass through a critical period between the ages of eleven and seventeen or eighteen. During this period there is risk that adult-child conflict might lead to acts of destruction both as a way of releasing tensions and as a protest against adult society (Cohen, 1955; Nye, 1958; Hirschi, 1969), and the exclusion of youths from the adult status system has long been thought a reason for their establishing alternative status systems within their peer groups (Cohen, 1955; Cloward and Ohlin, 1960; Matza, 1964). Juvenile delinquency is often related to low socio-economic status, poor parent-child relationships, family breakdown, non-attachment to school, involvement with peer groups, and cultural differences.

Sociological research on juvenile delinquency has led to the development of a variety of theories in order to understand and explain delinquent behaviour. The assumptions which inform the basic perspective of this thesis have been developed from three major theoretical orientations known as strain, subculture, and social control theories.
In accordance with these three theories, this study focuses on family socio-economic status, attitudes towards parents, school and migrants, and peer approval as factors in relation to juvenile delinquency. Strain and subculture theories have concentrated on socio-economic status, with the common implication that there is more delinquency in lower socio-economic groups than in others, and that the frequency of delinquent behaviour will vary according to differences in socio-economic status. Both the strain and subculture approaches are essentially motivational theories in which delinquent behaviour is seen as having been created by social conditions (Merton, 1938; Cohen, 1955; Cloward and Ohlin, 1960).

Control theory, on the other hand, is not concerned with delinquency-causing motivations but rather with factors that prevent delinquency occurring (Nye, 1958; Hirschi, 1969). Those who argue this position believe that delinquent behaviour declines when youths are controlled by bonds and ties to parents and school. The concern in this thesis with family factors is centred around the nature of the parent-child relationship and family stability. Control theory predicts that attachment to family can reduce delinquent behaviour. In contrast, youths who come from a family situation which is less stable tend to commit higher levels of delinquent behaviour. Control theory also focuses on negative school-related attitudes (Hirschi, 1969; Hindelang, 1973), arguing that positive feelings towards teachers will lessen the chance of student involvement in delinquent behaviour.

The quality of relations experienced at home and in school seem to be major predictors of delinquent behaviour. In essence, youths who have a good relationship with their parents tend to commit less delinquent behaviour, while youths who relate poorly to their parents and teachers tend to commit more delinquent behaviour. The amount of time spent with peers, and peer approval are other variables that have been identified as explaining levels of delinquency,
and Miller's (1981) subculture theory suggests a positive relationship between peer approval and delinquency.

This study attempts to examine the extent to which variables derived from strain, subculture, and control theories may be used in order to develop a more comprehensive understanding of delinquent behaviour among both male and female juveniles, and these theoretical approaches will be tested through a self-report technique. Previous research will compare the delinquent behaviour of non-English speaking background youths (NESB youths) and English speaking background youths (ESB youths) in regard to their family socio-economic status.

There are several major characteristics of this study that may be of advantage. Firstly, it provides a simultaneous analysis of family socio-economic status, family, school, and peer influences, and their relative importance, in the explanation of delinquent behaviour. This type of simultaneous analysis is rare in the literature. The research is based on the expectation that all these variables will be associated with delinquency. Another advantage of this study is that it also attempts to explore the delinquent behaviour of females, whereas most juvenile delinquency research has only used data from male subjects. The analysis of sex differences in the links between relations with parents, school, and peers and delinquent behaviour has been relatively unexplored, and this study attempts to redress that.

One of the problems in investigating the relationship between age and delinquent behaviour is that the sample used for research often provides an inadequate age variation for effective assessment of the influence of age. This problem is avoided here by including youths from the ages of 11 to 17 in the sample.
Finally, empirical studies that have directly compared the effects of socio-economic status on juvenile delinquency among different subgroupings in the Illawarra region are scarce. This study will provide a general comparison of delinquency across groups of ESB and NESB youths in this region. The findings of this research may therefore be useful for the development of practical approaches to the prevention and control of delinquency in the Illawarra.

1.2 Significance of research

Social behaviour is seen to vary between different communities and different socio-economic classes. Most industrial societies, such as the U.S.A., Australia and Canada, contain various subgroupings of people who share some characteristics of the society at large, but who have other characteristics unique to their group. In a plural society like Australia, two or more competing sets of values for each aspect of culture (be it language, family structure or social conduct) are usually available to each individual born into a minority culture or subculture.

Although there has been a great deal of research in the United States and Great Britain on variations in delinquency rates and the role of socio-economic factors, much less has been done in Australia, and particularly in the Illawarra region. There has also been very little research into the relationship between immigration and delinquent behaviour and very little systematic evidence is available in this area (Wooden et al., 1990).

Juvenile delinquency is a serious problem because it is dysfunctional for both the individual offender and for society. Society must pay a cost for juvenile delinquency through the juvenile justice system in terms of policing, judicial processing, supervision, and detention and compensation. Understanding the
problems of youth, particularly second generation immigrants, has also become important for social scientists and policy makers. Exploring the causes of juvenile delinquency and ways of dealing with delinquents thus fulfills an important function.

Residential areas with a high percentage of immigrants are supposed to have more delinquent behaviour than other areas (Shaw and McKay, 1931). Social composition also influences the rates of crime and delinquency, where high socio-economic status is related with a low rate of crime and delinquency, while low socio-economic status is associated with high rates. Factors such as immigrant density and socio-economic status are closely related (Shaw and McKay, 1931).

Most studies of juvenile delinquency in Australia show that delinquency is lower for first generation migrant children than for the second generation (Cox, 1985; Francis, 1981). Cox (1985) has also argued that immigrant youth generally may be more at risk of committing delinquent behaviour than other youths. Why delinquency problems are more acute in this group has yet to be tested on a systematic basis. In particular, no studies compare the relationship of delinquent behaviour in language subgroups with their socio-economic status in the Illawarra region.

This thesis, with its coverage of a range of items, including family breakdown, peer pressure, cultural conflict, and unemployment, is able to show that delinquency most often arises from an accumulation of diverse factors rather than from any single cause.

The Illawarra region is an important one for studying delinquent behaviour because it has a socio-economic identity which distinguishes it more clearly as a regional economy than is the case with other areas (McDonald and Wilson, 1991). A high proportion of the male workforce is in "blue collar" occupations
and the unemployment rate for the region is significantly higher than for New South Wales or Australia generally. Most people in the Illawarra earn low incomes, and greater Wollongong tends to be below the national average in socio-economic status (Jones, 1991).

The migrant community is diverse in regard to countries of origin. The 1986 census shows that immigrants in the Illawarra came from 89 countries, and first and second generation migrants made up 45 per cent of the region’s population. In June 1989, 36 per cent of all recipients of unemployment benefits in the Illawarra were born overseas, when their proportion in the Australian population generally was 27 per cent (McDonald and Wilson, 1991). In some areas, such as Warrawong and Unanderra, where the number and diversity of immigrants are greater than elsewhere, the number of youths involved in deviant behaviour is higher than for other local areas or for New South Wales generally (McDonald and Wilson, 1991).

1.3 Summary of research goals

This study seeks to clarify the effects of family socio-economic status, and attitudes towards parents, school, and peer approval, on delinquency rates among both ESB youths and NESB youths in the Illawarra region, taking account of male-female differences and degrees of delinquency.

The thesis is based on a systematic survey of a sample of six hundred high school students aged 11 to 17, including both NESB youths and ESB youths, in the Illawarra region. The aim is to obtain a better understanding of the reasons why some young people engage in delinquent behaviour. My thesis focuses on the strong and continuing influence of socio-economic background on who becomes delinquent, and seeks to assess the relative importance of various other
social pressures, such as unemployment, low occupational status, and a lack of formal educational qualifications.

Another aim of this research is to advance our understanding of the relationship between immigration, socio-economic status and juvenile delinquency. Since language background and socio-economic status are both important correlates of juvenile delinquency, it is important to assess whether youth-delinquency relationships vary between NESB youths and others. This thesis will also test whether different socio-economic factors contribute to variations in the level of delinquency.

The family as a major institution of socialisation is well recognised in relation to juvenile delinquency, and parent-child relationships have been implicated in numerous explanations of the etiology of delinquent behaviour. Social control theory suggests that inadequacies in the parent-child relationship predispose some children to delinquent behaviour by making them less likely to obey their parents (Nye, 1958; Hirschi, 1969). One of the aims of the present study is to examine how relations with parents are related to delinquent behaviour among both boys and girls in the Illawarra.

The final aim in exploring the relationship between family, school, peer approval, and delinquency is to develop a theoretical conception about how this relationship generally operates. This will lead to a clearer specification of which variables can most usefully be used to predict delinquent outcomes.

1.4 Outline of the thesis

The central issue in Chapter Two is the development of an integrated theoretical approach to delinquency. It provides a discussion of the extent to which variables derived from strain, subculture, and social control theories can be used
in conjunction to develop a more comprehensive understanding of delinquency among both males and females. It is argued that combined factors from these theories can account for more variance than any one theory considered independently.

Strain theory is operationalised through the use of two indices, one to determine the respondents' socio-economic status, based on parental occupation, and the other their parents' level of education. Subculture theory is operationalised through the use of several items in relation to peer approval, asking respondents about their behaviour and attitudes with their friends. This theory is also operationalised in several items that explore acceptance or rejection of the dominant culture, and asking respondents about their attitudes towards migrants. Educational aspirations are an indicator for both subculture theory and control theory. Those who aspire to educational success are assumed to be less likely to engage in delinquent behaviour. The most important variables derived from social control theory include parent-child relations, parental relations, family disruption, discipline, and parental interaction with the child. Social control theory is also operationalised in several items devised to assess school attachment or ties of affection and respect towards teachers and school staff.

In Chapter Three, I highlight the status, cultural conflicts, language problems, and relative deprivation of NESB immigrants in the context of multiculturalism, parental occupation, family structure, school-related variables, and peer influence, in order to see how this web of factors might help to explain juvenile delinquency. This chapter also looks at the role of the socio-economic status of NESB migrant parents. Since official delinquency rates tend to be higher in lower socio-economic groups one would expect such migrant groups to be at higher risk of being processed for delinquent behaviour.
I focus on parental occupation as an important index of socio-economic status in relation to juvenile delinquency because occupation correlates highly with class position, and relates to values, norms, beliefs, attitudes, and goals. Using occupation as a criterion allows a better correlation of delinquent behaviour than does the geographic area of residence.

In the first part of Chapter Four, I describe the social history and socio-economic characteristics of the Illawarra region and include a description of specific socio-economic problems in relation to juvenile delinquency. The second part of this chapter discusses the official data on youth offences with regard to age, sex and ethnicity. The statistics were extracted from databases of offences recorded by the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research and the Office of Juvenile Justice from 1989 to 1993. Rates were also calculated for a number of offence categories involving injury to a person or damaging property. Finally, this chapter argues that because of a number limitations in using official data, delinquent behaviour is better measured by self-report than by official statistics.

Chapter Five describes the design and initial measurement strategy used in my research. The debate over whether, and how, delinquency research is possible raises such issues as: the questions that can be asked; the concepts and language in which those questions can be formulated; the method of collecting data and sampling; statistical procedures; and the method of administration and its limitations.

The survey method was used because it allowed the study of subjects in a broad sample from the population, in order to discover the relative incidence, distribution, and interrelation of background variables in delinquency items. The sample population consisted of all students enrolled in the high schools of the Illawarra region in 1994. This population was felt to have sufficient variation in language and migrant status, socio-economic position, area of residence, family
structure, and incidence of delinquency to provide a reasonable test of the integrated theoretical approach proposed in this thesis.

Chapter Six examines the hypothesis that juvenile delinquency is mainly a function of background variables such as family socio-economic status, family structure, parental relationship, parent-child relations, school-related variables, and peer approval. Basically this chapter seeks to use different statistical methods in order to measure the major variables specified by the integrated theoretical approach developed in Chapter Two. This approach allows for an evaluation of the multivariates produced by the interrelationship of the background variables and delinquency.

The first task is to estimate and test the variables derived from strain, subculture, and social control theories on the prediction of self-reported delinquency among girls and boys for the total sample. Next, the analysis tests the power of each background variable to explain self-reported delinquency in the previous two years when major variables are entered in a multiple regression equation.

Chapter Seven concludes this research with a review and discussion of the main findings, with implications for theory and research. Some suggestions for intervention and policy are also discussed. In this chapter, I summarise how an integrated theoretical approach can aid the search for a better explanation of delinquency. The analysis will indicate that delinquency is related to a multiplicity of factors and can be affected by a set of background variables. I will argue that constructing a testable integrated theoretical approach will require a modified form of measurement of delinquent behaviour. The argument attempts to link findings, theory, and methodology in order to explain the differences between NESB youths and ESB youths as two subgroupings in relation to socio-economic status and delinquency.
In conclusion, I seek to provide a perspective for studying juvenile delinquency in the future, and point to some measurement issues which can be explored in future research. Finally, I suggest an important issue for development of approaches to the prevention and control of delinquency.
CHAPTER TWO

Theoretical Perspectives on Delinquency

2.1 Introduction

If we begin by asking "what creates delinquency?" each discipline answers the question by pointing to its own central concepts: biology looks to inheritance; psychology looks to personality; economics looks to employment or work; and sociology looks to social class, culture, and organisation. Scientific study of delinquent behaviour was born in biology and psychology, and is experiencing its adolescence in sociology.

In the early modern era, delinquency was seen as an individual problem, to be tackled at the individual level by reference to essential biological or personality characteristics. Towards the close of the nineteenth century, criminology located deviant behaviour in biology, and sought to understand criminality in terms of biological characteristics. A number of scientists have conducted studies claiming to find that certain body types are more prone to deviant behaviour than others (Kretschmer, 1921; Hooton, 1939; Von Hentig, 1948; Sheldon, 1949). They also believed that certain people were born with criminal tendencies, or were throw-backs to a more primitive type of human being.

The Lombroso (1968) approach is no longer taken seriously by scientists, but biological explanations are still popular. In relation to female delinquency, for example, it has been suggested that males commit more delinquent behaviour than females because men are more aggressive, and that this aggressiveness has a biological basis (Newbold, 1992). In contrast, female delinquency is explained
in terms of female sexual characteristics such as sexual disorders, premenstrual syndrome, and menstrual cycle (Newbold, 1992).

In the second half of the 20th century, measurements of juvenile delinquency have become more sophisticated and the biological explanation has become less powerful as the importance of social variables in the explanation of delinquency is acknowledged in empirical research. Although biological theories might help to explain why particular delinquents repeatedly commit offences, they do not explain how, or if, all delinquents differ from the general population and why they have committed delinquent behaviour.

According to feminist writers, there is no particular distinction between males and females who commit delinquent behaviour in terms of their biological characteristics; the variations are socially conditioned because boys and girls are socialised differently (Naffine, 1987; Naffine and Gale, 1989; Smart, 1977). Naffine (1987) has argued that although males commit more delinquent behaviour than girls, the greater delinquency of males may not fully be explained by masculine traits. She suggests that female delinquency should be considered in terms of class, gender and ethnicity.

The psychological approach again attempts to explain delinquency in terms of individual differences, believing that those who commit delinquent acts differ from the general population (Shoemaker, 1990). Individuals who have psychopathic traits, for example, do sometimes commit violent crimes. The key issue is whether individual differences or personality influence behaviour to the extent suggested by psychologists. Psychological tests or measurements of personality differences have often been developed in intelligence (IQ) tests. In these, delinquents have been tested with personality scales to discover how their personalities differ from those of nondelinquents through comparisons of test scores (Schuessler and Cressey, 1950; Waldo and Dinitz, 1967). However,
while individual differences between delinquents and non-delinquents may exist and may influence behaviour, personalities are complex phenomena which cannot easily be tested in relation to delinquent behaviour.

A discussion of all psychological theories is beyond the scope of this thesis, but I wish to discuss the more important of them briefly. Intelligence theories using IQ measurements may be modified to include indirect influences from socialisation and school experiences. Hindelang, Hirschi, and Weis (1981) analysed the relationship between intelligence and delinquency and concluded that there was no direct effect of IQ on delinquency, but they did suggest an indirect effect in that juveniles with low IQs do poorly in school, because they become discouraged and develop a negative attitude toward school work, then in turn search elsewhere for acceptance and activity.

Despite the fact that psychological theories suffer from certain shortcomings, they are still considered important as explanatory theories. While this study focuses on the macro and micro levels of sociological theories, psychological theories are not downgraded.

Juvenile delinquency as a social phenomenon has been the subject of much theoretical speculation and empirical investigation in sociology and social psychology, particularly from the second half of the nineteenth century. In opposition to the individualistic approaches, most classical sociologists saw delinquency as a phenomenon generated outside individual characteristics, and thus concentrated on the group contexts of youths. The theoretical development of the concepts of anomie and social disorganisation by Durkheim (1968) and Burgess (1967), and the concept of alienation by Marx (1963) contributed to European social explanations of criminality and delinquency. Such studies found correlations between deviant behaviour and factors such as
work conditions and poverty (Marx); age, sex, and religion (Durkheim); and urban growth (Park and Burgess).

Anomie and social disorganisation feed into two streams of causal theory. One is a product of European sociological thought, to which Durkheim contributed, and which was carried forward in the United States by Parsons, Merton and others. This represents a structural-functional analysis of deviant behaviour in terms of social stratification and social means and goals. In this analysis, deviance consists of those acts which do not follow the norms and rules of a society or a particular social group with crime and delinquency as the most obvious forms of deviance. In this view, social rules represent objective standards for making judgements.

The other approach is a product of American sociologists such as Park, Burgess, Shaw, and Sutherland, and represents an analysis of deviant behaviour in terms of ecological processes of social differentiation, differential social organisation, and differential criminal association and criminal learning.

These approaches share a common set of assumptions. Firstly, delinquency and crime are assumed to be primarily caused by social factors. Secondly, the structure and institutions of society can be seen as either stable or unstable. When social factors are stable, it is assumed they can control crime and delinquency. When they become unstable, individuals are more likely to commit deviant acts. It is assumed that the weakened effectiveness of social structures and institutions (e.g., family and school) causes deviant behaviour, and that in such conditions, young disadvantaged groups such as the working classes, immigrants, and ethnic minorities are more likely to commit deviant behaviour. Social disorganisation and anomie themselves are often caused by rapid industrialisation, urbanisation, and increased immigration to urban areas.
Theories of anomie or social disorganisation have especially influenced the analysis of delinquency and crime in capitalist societies. These societies in the modernisation process have been confronted with a decline in the effectiveness of institutional and informal social controls through the family, school, and religion, the disappearance of the neighbourhood, and weakening bonds of kinship.

Marxists, on the other hand, reject the consensus model of a stable integrated society where members are in basic agreement on their interests. They attribute deviance not to the different cultural norms of social classes, but to their different class interests. The first assumption of Marxism is that capitalism is the root cause of much criminal behaviour, particularly that committed by the lower class. The capitalist system creates crime and delinquency because of class exploitation, and deviance will develop as class inequalities and class exploitation continue (Quinney, 1980; Chambliss and Seidman, 1971; Clinard and Quinney, 1967). Secondly, Marxism assumes that deviant behaviour is the product of a struggle between the bourgeoisie (those who own the means of production) and the proletariat (those alienated from the means of production). From a Marxist viewpoint, most official crime and delinquency is committed by the lower and working classes as a form of accommodation to the restraints placed on them by the bourgeoisie. In addition, some criminal acts of the proletariat are artifactual judgments imposed by the agents of the bourgeoisie to keep certain people or certain situations under control (Shoemaker, 1990, p. 230).

The major contribution to the explanation of delinquency made by Marxism is in the awareness of class prejudice and discrimination in the enforcement of laws and in some of the negative consequences felt by juveniles in this process.
Marxist or conflict theorists believe that there is a relationship between class inequality, class exploitation and the crime and delinquency rates in capitalist societies, but while some studies find such a relationship (Mednick et al., 1990) others do not (Krohn et al., 1980; Hindelang, et al., 1981).

The New Criminologists were influenced by Marx in their explanation of deviant behaviour. On the one hand they define crime and deviance as political acts. On the other hand, they believe that delinquency is a struggle or reaction against normalized repression (Taylor, Walton, and Young, 1973). They suggest that deviant behaviour is a result of the repressive attempts of the ruling class to control the lower-class, and claim that laws are passed in response to the struggles of competing interest groups. Furthermore, they contend that some criminal behaviours are committed in accordance with norms that were previously acceptable, but that have become illegal because of the successful efforts of particular interest groups. The new criminology thus starts from the point of view of a system of social control rather than patterns of deviant behaviour.

A major approach in contemporary perspectives on delinquent behaviour is criminal-career theory, which focuses on the differences between ordinary offenders and career criminals (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1986; Blumstein et al. 1986; Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985). The two main points in this approach are the prevalence of crime in a population and the incidence rate of crime. The former refers to the total volume of crime, while the latter refers to the per capita rate of crime. However, criminal-career researchers alter the incidence measure by using only the number of "active criminals" as the denominator, not the total population, to produce what they refer to as a 'lambda' measure (Blumstein et al. 1986). They thus draw a distinction between ordinary offenders and career criminals, and focus on the dimensions of active criminal careers (Blumstein et al. 1986).
When researchers divide subjects into delinquents and nondelinquents, a prevalence statistic may be calculated, but when the number of persons committing at least one delinquent act and the number of acts they have committed are known, one can calculate the lambda measure. Blumstein et al. suggest that the "factors that distinguish participants from nonparticipants could well be different from the factors that distinguish among participants, in terms of their offending frequency" (1986, p. 54). Therefore, criminal-career researchers conclude that the causes of subsequent offences may differ from the causes of the first offence, so that offenders who commit six crimes, for example, may differ analytically from those who commit ten. In other words, there are significant differences in terms of types of offences and their causes. For example, the offender who moves from petty theft to rape to vandalism may differ in causal terms from the offender who starts with aggravated assault and moves to shoplifting. Such sequences are significant to criminal-career research, making the lambda measure important for the explanation of delinquent behaviour.

Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1986) theory would predict that the correlates of the prevalence of crime are also correlates of crime incidence. That is, it is assumed that the causes of criminal acts are the same regardless of the number of such acts. Gottfredson and Hirschi (1986) tested these assumptions on data from the Richmond Youth Project (Hirschi, 1969), which collected police records and self-report data on 2,587 males and self-report data on 1,488 females. Such a large sample, and the large number of serious offences recorded and reported, are sufficient to allow examination of the prevalence-incidence distinction. The results of this study showed that, in general, substantive conclusions about the causes and correlates of crime do not depend on career distinctions. Further, as one moves from participation to general lambda measures to lambda measures for serious offences, the correlations become smaller, eventually approaching insignificance as the sample sizes also decline. The career paradigm thus pursues
ever smaller correlations based on ever smaller sample sizes, with nothing but a statistical test show whether the results are meaningful.

Blumstein, Cohen, and Farrington (1988), criminal-career theorists, summarize Gottfredson and Hirschi’s research as a testable hypothesis and conclude that if Gottfredson and Hirschi are right, "all criminal career features will be interrelated, and the correlates and predictors of participation, for example, will have to be the same as the correlates and predictors of frequency and career length" (1988, p. 5).

It can be concluded that criminal-career theorists seek strategies for identifying career criminals: offenders whose patterns of criminal activity deviate from those of the general population of offenders, or who are criminally active long after their colleagues have retired (Blumstein et al. 1986). Gottfredson and Hirschi (1986) suggest that although considerable criminal-career research effort has concentrated on the search for such offenders, this effort has yielded little in the way of positive results.

Where sociologists have focused on delinquents and their behaviour as the object of study, two perspectives have evolved. One argues that delinquency is the result of motivational factors (Merton, 1956; Cohen, 1955; Cloward and Ohlin, 1960; Miller, 1975; Matza, 1964; and Becker, 1963). The main points in this approach are:

a) delinquency is the result of blocked access to social rewards, both material (wealth and power) and cultural (status and prestige). Subcultures are deviant not in their ends but in their means to those ends (Merton, 1956);

b) delinquents reverse dominant social values in order to legitimate their "failure" according to those values (Cohen, 1955);
c) the perception of limited opportunities is likely to predispose individuals to delinquency, particularly individuals from lower socio-economic backgrounds (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960);

d) delinquency is an aspect of 'lower-class culture' and is therefore only delinquent according to middle class norms (Miller, 1958);

e) delinquency involves the 'inappropriate expression' of widely shared but subterranean social values (Matza, 1964, 1969);

f) youth groups are 'delinquent' because of the labelling reaction to them by society and moral authorities (teachers, police, courts, mass media) (Becker, 1963). Labelling theory focuses on both self-labelling and how the individual is labelled by others. On the one hand, delinquents may regard themselves as becoming delinquent, and label themselves in this way. On the other hand, we can explain delinquency as the consequence of labels which are employed by accusers and rule-makers; and

g) delinquency is the result of the effects of the capitalist economy on work situations and family socialisation patterns (Hagan et al., 1990).

The second approach focuses on social ecology, arguing that delinquency is due to the inadequacy of the delinquent's family background, a consequence of poverty, or other environmental factors. In this view, the role of the family is of considerable importance. Social control theory has concentrated on the particular groups or institutions into which individuals are integrated, highlighting attachments to families, schools, and local communities (Hirschi, 1969; Krohn and Massey, 1980). Social learning theory as another example of this approach argues that delinquent behaviour must be learned through the same processes and mechanisms as conforming behaviour (Akers, 1977). Social learning theory predicts that attachment to conventional others would decrease
the likelihood of delinquent behaviour if such behaviour would risk the loss of rewards from these conventional others. Further, attachment itself is seen as a result of the reward value which peer or parent has for the potential delinquent.

Different theorists have sought the origins of delinquency in social systems (e.g. in class conflict, economic and social discrimination), in delinquent affiliations (e.g. 'differential association', delinquent subcultures), and in unsatisfactory upbringing (e.g. broken homes, parental neglect).

The integration of concepts from several theories is likely to have better explanatory power than any single theory, as the many different theories often appear to complement rather than contradict each other. Research that seeks to measure a diversity of variables and to use concepts from different theories will allow the main points of several theories to be combined.

Although in recent decades control theory has been dominant in delinquency research, there are clear signs of a reassertion of integrated theoretical approaches in order to explain delinquent behaviour. A group of scholars has recently argued that strain, subculture, and social control theories are not antithetical but can advantageously be integrated in the same explanatory model (Eve, 1978; McDonough, 1986; Johnson, 1979). Therefore, in this thesis I argue that although no single theory of delinquency can explain delinquent behaviour completely, each theory can have relative explanatory power.

Johnson (1979) took this as a starting-point for research and measured a diversity of variables in order to construct a broad explanatory model. He suggested that a strong child-parent attachment encouraged the child to identify with adult social values, which in turn promoted a favourable attitude to school, and an identification with the conformist values which teachers support. This diminished the influence of peer groups and discouraged associations with
delinquents. Conversely, a lack of parental and school attachment increased the likelihood of association with delinquent peers.

Elliott and Voss (1974) integrated strain and subculture perspectives to provide a comprehensive theoretical framework for understanding delinquency whereby the path to delinquency clearly requires participation in social groups in which delinquent behaviour patterns can be learned and reinforced. Segrave and Hastad (1985) integrated variables derived from strain, subculture, and control theories and developed a more comprehensive understanding of the etiology of delinquency among both males and females. This integrated model was tested in self-report data obtained from a sample of 891 male and 885 female high school students. This study showed that all variables derived from these three theories were significantly predictive of delinquency. The results of this study also provided a support for the contention that theories of delinquency, largely developed from male populations, are equally applicable to females.

A variety of sociological theories have developed in order to explain different dimensions of delinquent behaviour. Generally, they have suggested that delinquency can occur in the context of the community, school, or family structure, on the one hand, and as a result of the effects of family socio-economic status in the other. For purposes of this study, the available theoretical perspectives may be differentiated into at least two levels of analysis, which form the basis for my investigation of juvenile delinquency. The first has assumed that the initial premise in explaining delinquency is that social factors leading to delinquent activities are background and developmental attributes. This view is based on the impact of wider social forces, particularly the socio-economic status of community life. The second has concentrated on situational factors by focusing on the bonding of young people to conventional institutions. Many of the discussions taking this approach have concentrated on how young people bond to school and parents. This view tends to focus on social control factors
and assumes that vulnerability to delinquency is determined by variation in the strength of social controls.

Theories that delinquency prevails among lower class youth grew out of research in sociology at the University of Chicago. Researchers found that in areas with high delinquency rates, there was a wide diversity of norms resulting from cultural diversity and a lack of assimilation by immigrant groups, as well as the fact that low-income areas contained high numbers of migrant youth (Sumner, 1994). This view continued through the work of Merton in an essay on social structure and anomie (1938), and was developed by Cohen (1955), and Cloward and Ohlin (1960). Cloward and Ohlin, for example, propose that pressures toward delinquent behaviour originate in the perceived discrepancy between goals prescribed by the dominant culture and anticipated possibilities of achieving them by socially approved means (Voss, 1966).

Numerous research studies, particularly those based on official statistics, have confirmed the relationship between delinquency and socio-economic status (Wolfgang and Ferracuti, 1967; Braithwaite, 1981), but this assumption has come under attack from micro level theories of delinquency (Nye, 1958; Hirschi, 1969), which have denied the relationship between delinquency and social class.

Each theoretical formulation represents only a relative explanation of delinquent behaviour, whereas delinquency may be viewed as the product of multiple social factors. For this reason, researchers have often integrated the major elements from several theories of delinquency, though most integrated approaches have only focused on micro social levels. Some investigators, for example, have integrated social control and social learning theories, and attempted to combine them into a broader body of explanatory principles (Conger, 1976; Thornberry, 1981, 1987). Thornberry's (1987) integrated model focused on interrelationships between five concepts: attachment to parents, commitment to school, and belief
in conventional values as major elements of social control theory; and association with delinquent peers, and adopting delinquent values as elements of social learning theory.

Integrated theoretical approaches have tended to conclude that social class is not of causal importance and thus have ignored the role of socio-economic factors in the explanation of delinquency. They also ignore the possibility that, although social class may not have a strong direct relationship to delinquency, it can have an important effect on parental relations, parent-child relationships, and the stability of family, and the outcomes of these effects may in turn increase delinquent behaviour among young people.

Power-control theory as an integrated theoretical approach, on the other hand, provide an explanation of delinquency which starts with a radical, neo-Marxist set of assumptions and proceeds to examine the effects of the capitalist economy on work situations and family socialisation patterns (Hagan, et al., 1990; Colvin, and Pauly, 1983). This integrated approach suggests that the direct causes of delinquency lie in patterns of parental socialisation, and family relations and peer associations. Family relations are seen as directly shaped by the occupational positions of parents, which in turn are a function of the economic system as a structural element of society.

Power-control theory has been used to test the relationship of social class and family relations to delinquency without taking other variables into account. Although this theory seems to provide a promising explanation of delinquency, there are still many family-related issues such as single-parent families and step-parent relationships, and school-related variables which must be addressed. All these factors have been ignored in power-control theory.

An appropriate integrated approach should also include background characteristics such as the levels of parental education, age, sex, geographical
location, cultural affiliations, and language background. All, or combinations, of these can affect delinquent behaviour. Yet the extent to which these factors might contribute to our understanding of delinquent behaviour is still unexplored in most of the literature that seek to integrate diverse theories of delinquency. In order to obtain a comprehensive integrated theoretical approach to delinquency, one would have to design research that took all these variables, and their effects, into account.

This study has taken two structural theories (strain and subculture theories) and attempted to combine them with major elements of social control theory in order to explain delinquent behaviour. The analysis examines delinquent behaviour in the institutional contexts of home, school, and peer influences, on the one hand, and family socio-economic status on the other. Any theoretical integration combining micro and macro levels from theories of delinquency also needs to consider the role of cultural differences. At present there is no single compelling theory which involves these levels and provides an integration of them.

I now want to draw attention to some of the strengths, as well as some of the gaps and weaknesses, in the three delinquency theories I have chosen. I will then suggest an integration of some variables derived from strain, subculture, and control theories to form a conceptual framework which can significantly explain delinquent behaviour among both male and female youths.

2.2 Strain Theories

In opposition to psychologists, who stressed that delinquent behaviour was abnormal and sought the cause in individual offenders, strain theorists focused on opportunity elements and social factors that motivated young people to commit delinquent behaviour. Durkheim (1968) considered that social regulation
was necessary if deviance was to be prevented. Strain theorists, such as Merton, Cohen, and Cloward and Ohlin, on the other hand, argue that it is the disruption of social regulation that gives rise to deviance.

The key to any strain explanation of juvenile delinquency (Merton, 1956; Cohen, 1955; and Cloward and Ohlin, 1960) is the proposition that some youths are driven to law violation in response to the frustration of experiencing or anticipating social failure. These individuals internalise the goals of society but must employ illegitimate means to obtain them when the legitimate means to success are blocked.

Merton (1970) suggests that the social structure creates situations in which nonconformity is a normal response, a "symptom of disassociation between culturally defined aspirations and socially structured means" (Merton, 1970, p. 240). Similarity, Cohen (1955) suggested that delinquency should be explained in terms of conflicts between lower class and middle class values in the school system, while Cloward and Ohlin argued that strains between aspirations to economic success and the opportunities for achieving success fall most heavily on lower-class youth, thus encouraging delinquent behaviour (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960). In a related approach, Miller (1975) suggested that delinquency is a result not of class conflicts, but of general adherence to lower-class cultural values. Such approaches can help to explain delinquent behaviour because they not only take account of the links between class values and behaviour, but also focus on socialisation factors and school experience.

Merton (1956) modified Durkheim's concept of anomie. In his opinion, the conflict between cultural goals (such as money, power, prestige) and the institutionalized legitimate means to achieve them is the primary source of anomie. Merton used this concept of anomie to explain not only suicide but various types of deviant behaviour, and attempted to
discover how some social structures exert a definite pressure upon certain persons in the society to engage in non-conforming rather than conforming conduct. If we can locate groups peculiarly subject to such pressures, we should expect to find high rates of deviant behaviour in these groups, .... because they are responding to the social situation in which they find themselves (Merton, 1969, p. 255).

From this viewpoint, social structures are active and produce patterns of behaviour. So the focus is on social order and the influence of normative structures on individual behaviour. Merton notes that society encourages all its members to aspire to wealth and social position, but enables only a few to succeed.

Merton saw an increasing disjunction between the American ideal of equality of opportunity and the reality of poverty that was linked to a rising crime rate in the USA. Juvenile delinquency, from this perspective, was best understood as reflecting a confusion about norms, about the relation between legitimate and illegitimate means and ends. He argued:

Several researchers have shown that specialized areas of vice and crime constitute a 'normal' response to a situation where the cultural emphasis upon pecuniary success has been absorbed, but when there is little access to conventional and legitimate means for becoming successful. The occupational opportunities of people in these areas are largely confined to manual labor and the lesser white collar jobs. Given the American stigmatization of manual labor which has been found to hold rather uniformly in the social classes, and the absence of realistic opportunities for advancement beyond this level, the result is a marked tendency toward deviant behavior (1969, pp. 268-269).
Merton argued that all people in society are taught to seek culturally prescribed goals, such as occupational success and money, and that when these are impossible to attain the result will be deviance. A prediction derived from Merton's theory is that deviance will be more prevalent in the lower socio-economic classes because these people are less likely to have access to legitimate means to success.

The ability to secure a high paying position, or one with advancement potential, is dependent on a variety of factors that are absent in a large part of the population (Shoemaker, 1990). Youths of average ability and with no special opportunities have very little chance of becoming rich and respected, and in such circumstances may then violate social rules. Merton classified the modes of individual adaptation to norms as:

1- Conformity- an acceptance of both conventional goals and the institutionalized means of achieving them;

2- Innovation- an attempt to attain conventional goals through unconventional means (including illicit or criminal means);

3- Ritualism- where a person preserves the institutionalized means, which have become ends in themselves, but where goals are largely ignored or forgotten. Merton argues that members of the lower middle class are more heavily represented in this category;

4- Retreatism- abandonment of both conventional goals and the institutionalized means for attaining them, as illustrated by advanced alcoholics, drug addicts, and other dropouts.; and

5- Rebellion- a rejection of conventional goals and means in order to modify social structures. Revolutionaries, organized political action, and populist movements represent degrees of rebellion (Merton, 1957).
A common question is whether Merton's theory can explain deviant behaviour outside the lower class, for example, white-collar crime. Middle and upper class people usually have access to the legitimate means for success, yet there is considerable evidence that a great deal of white-collar crime occurs. Merton provides no explanation for this.

Cohen's work is a modification and development of Merton's position, making major criticisms of Merton's views on working-class deviance, and arguing that delinquency is a collective rather than an individual response. Whereas Merton sees individuals responding singly to their position in the class structure, Cohen sees them joining together in a collective response. Further, Cohen argues that Merton fails to account for 'non-utilitarian delinquency' such as vandalism.

Cohen (1955), like Merton, argued that lower-class youths felt unable to achieve high social status and the material rewards that go with it, and thus developed a hostility towards the larger society which deprived them. However, he criticised Merton for being unable to account for the content of juvenile delinquency. He suggested that, instead of employing illegal means to achieve the cultural goals of success, young boys sometimes engage in delinquent behaviour which is "non-utilitarian, malicious and negativistic" (1955, p. 55), such as stealing goods without the intent to increase wealth or acquire personal possessions. Cohen argued that the "delinquent's conduct is right, by the standard of his subculture, because it is wrong by the norms of the larger culture" (1955, p. 28).

Cohen sees juvenile gang delinquency as non-utilitarian. Most activities such as physical violence do not involve the pursuit of material goals but are enjoyed for themselves. Youth gangs, for example, may steal cars not to resell but for the fun of joy-riding and crashing them. It is the gangs that give their members status and prestige.
Cohen argued that the criteria by which teachers assess students are middle-class standards, and students socialised in working-class families are relatively under-prepared for status competition in school. The result is that a large section of working-class students experience problems when they are evaluated in middle class terms, and these problems need to be resolved. One favoured solution is joining with similar students to form a delinquent gang, in which status is settled by reference to criteria that members can more easily satisfy. In other words, delinquent behaviour is the direct antithesis of middle-class standards. It provides a new set of norms which stimulate lower-class boys to vandalism and aggressive actions against the symbols of the middle class.

Cohen (1955) summarizes this pattern of delinquency in the following six characteristics: a) non-utilitarianism: even in the case of theft, goods would be stolen in order to destroy them rather than consuming them or selling them for profit; b) malice: wanton vandalism; c) negativism; d) short-run hedonism in the delinquent gang; e) versatility: the gang's activities ran the gamut through theft, vandalism and physical aggression; and f) group autonomy: gang loyalty came first, all other allegiances being subordinated to it.

Cohen assumes delinquency is a working class phenomenon because middle class values represent the American norm and other values were therefore delinquent by definition. This point was taken up by Miller (1958), who argued that juvenile delinquency was best understood not in terms of non-conformity to middle class values but as conformity to the norms of the lower class. He believed that what made lower class youth delinquent was the intensity of their concern to conform to lower class values and to conflict with middle class authority, for example in school. The flaw in Miller's approach was that logically all working class boys should have the same behaviour in the same cultural environment, that is, all working class boys should be delinquent.
'Autonomy' and 'trouble' are important elements of Miller's theory. 'Trouble' refers to the fact that lower class people are more likely to view obedience to the law as a matter of expediency rather than morality. Policing is one of the few barriers to criminal and delinquent activity, and members of the lower class are less likely to view the police as a source of protection or community service. The police instead are viewed as a source of trouble and harassment, so children of the lower class are less respectful towards them than those in higher status families. Autonomy is especially relevant to juvenile delinquency. Miller believes that lower class boys are more concerned with expressing their freedom and independence through adult activities such as driving, drinking, and smoking than are middle class boys.

Hirschi (1969) tested Miller's theory and found that in general lower class boys are not more independent. He examined the relationship between Miller's focal concerns and father's occupation, which was found to be a weak correlate of delinquent behaviour. In contrast, both unemployment and welfare status were relatively strongly correlated with delinquency in Hirschi's data set.

Brownfield (1987) tested Miller's theory by questionnaire administered to a sample of male students in eleven high schools in western California. He found that a number of Miller's indicators, such as trouble and autonomy, were linked to underclass membership (as measured by father's unemployment, or by welfare status). He also found that these indicators were significantly associated with delinquent behaviour.

In a more specific argument, Cloward and Ohlin (1960) believe that there are many applicants with the necessary abilities for each job in industrial societies, but that selection is sometimes dependent on ascriptive criteria such as ethnicity, religion, or class. Those who perceive themselves as unable to obtain opportunities, such as educational achievement, display a willingness to engage
in delinquent activity. Whereas Merton and Cohen only applied their arguments to the underprivileged or those unjustly deprived of opportunities, Cloward and Ohlin focus only on those who have the ability to satisfy the formal criteria of achievement.

Cloward and Ohlin (1960) suggested that the candidates for delinquency, then, are those lower class boys who are better qualified or who have higher ability. They are more likely to compare themselves with successful boys and feel that they are similar in qualifications or ability, but differ in ascriptive criteria. The system is not fair because equality of opportunity for those of equal ability is overcome by discrimination in terms of factors such as social class, ethnicity, or religion. It is this exclusion of some individuals with ability from social rewards that provides a motive for delinquent behaviour.

Cloward and Ohlin use the term 'delinquency' to cover quite different sorts of behaviour. According to them, young people do not make a clear decision to be delinquent, but rather respond to opportunities, and find themselves engaged in particular sorts of conflict with various forms of authority. Therefore, in the production of 'delinquency', the behaviour of police, teachers and courts as authorities is important. Because Cloward and Ohlin understand delinquent behaviour among lower-class adolescents in terms of illegitimate opportunities for access to social status and economic success, delinquent behaviour is seen to occur in those communities where illegitimate opportunity structures are open.

In recent decades, strain theory has came under attack by some investigators who have criticised the relationship between social class and delinquency. The proposition that delinquency is primarily restricted to a single social class is not supported by a number of studies. From the late 1950s to the 1980s, the use of self-report techniques became a popular way of examining the relationship between social class and juvenile delinquency. A number of these self-report
studies have found virtually no class differences in delinquent behaviour (Nye, 1958; Erickson and Empey, 1965), while others have found consistent but only small class differences (Clark and Wenninger, 1962; McDonald, 1969; Williams and Gold, 1972; Linden, 1978).

Tittle, Villemez, and Smith (1978) argued that social differences in delinquency rates are mostly found in official figures, while in self-report studies, social class differences decreased. This difference between official and self-report data may arise because self-report studies include trivial offences, while official data tend to measure more serious offences (Braithwaite, 1981; Elliott and Ageton, 1980; Elliott and Huizinga, 1983).

Linden (1978) tested the nature and amount of middle-class delinquency on a sample of 1588 white boys from public high schools in the San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area in the USA. Social class was measured on the basis of the father's occupation. This study shows a strong correlation between father's occupation and self-reported delinquency.

However, Gold (1970) in a study of 522 youths between thirteen and sixteen years old showed that the relationship between father's occupation and delinquency was slight and suggested that class theories alone cannot explain delinquent behaviour. In another study, Williams and Gold (1972) used 847 thirteen to sixteen year olds and concluded that there was no significant relationship between socio-economic status and juvenile delinquency.

Basilevsky (1975) examined the relationship between social class and delinquency in metropolitan London. In this study, social class or status explained a very large variation in delinquency, but other factors such as cultural influences had an important role.
It may be concluded that a study of juvenile delinquency based on socio-economic status is incomplete because delinquent behaviour may be affected by other factors in the social and family environment. Cohen (1955) argued that delinquency had its origins in the differences between class values. He believed that working-class boys attempting to succeed in schools dominated by middle-class values are likely to suffer status frustration because their working-class values result in constant failure in a system that is alien to them. "There is a deep ambiguity in its interstices which he himself saw: should the working-class male have his values changed, or should middle-class teachers be retrained to modify their approach? The merit of his work lay in its willingness to problematize the imposition of middle-class values" (Sumner, 1994, p. 180).

A focus on socio-economic status alone would mean that the multidimensional nature of delinquency is ignored. Overall, it seems that variables derived from strain theory can play a limited role in explaining juvenile delinquency. This study therefore assumes that some variables derived from strain theory do have a role to play in the explanation of delinquent behaviour, but that their contribution will be limited.

### 2.3 Subcultural Theories

An important school of sociological analysis of juvenile delinquency focuses on the subcultural characteristics of groups with unique values, beliefs, norms, language, habits, and lifestyles. Attempts to explain juvenile delinquency in terms of class cultures and subcultures have developed rapidly over the past few decades because
modern societies contain many different subcultures, and behaviour that conforms to the norms of a particular subcultural setting may be regarded as deviant outside it. (Giddens, 1989, p. 126).

Subcultural theories attempt to explain delinquency among juvenile gangs in terms of internal social organisation, emphasising the cultural patterns of behaviour embodied in the class structure of society.

The English criminologist Mays believed that:

working-class culture has embodied the socialisation of children, their discipline and training. If the values and attitudes maintained in the home and in the neighbourhood are contrary to those of the wider society then the child will very likely develop anti-social tendencies (1963, p. 130).

Subculture theories of delinquency are important because of the key role assigned to beliefs in the determination of delinquent behaviour. The focus is on key factors such as the inability of working-class boys to effectively compete for status with better trained boys from more privileged classes of society, the belief of working-class boys that opportunities do not await them upon graduation from school, the discriminatory treatment of ethnic groups, and the conflicts and marginality experienced by second generation immigrants (Matza, 1964). Matza sees delinquency as the result of people behaving in certain ways and other people responding to that behaviour. Thus, to call an action delinquent is also to describe the social reaction to it.

Matza's analysis is a radical criticism of strain theorists such as Cohen, and Cloward and Ohlin. He believes that there is a basic difference between the subculture of delinquency and a delinquent subculture.
A subculture of delinquency is a setting in which the commission of delinquency is common knowledge among a group of juveniles (Matza, 1964, p. 33).

This differs from the basic thesis of other writers, which is that of a delinquent subculture. He rejects the view of Cohen, and Cloward and Ohlin, that delinquent subcultures emerge from a rejection of the conventional dominant culture by lower class people. He also rejects the argument of Miller that the lower class has a unique and historically developed culture which, because it differs from that of the middle and upper classes, is subject to criminalisation.

The delinquent subculture is the modern sociological rendition of the positivist assumptions regarding delinquency and crime. Juveniles may for a variety of reasons become adherents of the delinquent subculture, but once connected their delinquencies are explained as expressions of the peculiar standards which reign in that part of the world. Their behaviour is determined by subculture as ours is by conventional culture. The precepts of the delinquent subculture are the immediate cause, according to current sociological theorists, of delinquent acts. All that intervenes between subcultural precept and delinquent act are the standard mechanisms of learning, conformity to reference group, and the seeking of status and reputation within that reference group. It is in the peculiar subculture to which they owe allegiance that we may find the fundamental difference between juvenile delinquents and other youth. Their subcultural affiliations set them apart (Matza, 1964, pp. 33-34).

Matza suggests that lower-class adolescents are neither committed to the dominant culture nor do they reject it. Instead they neutralise the moral bind of the legal order by extending those special circumstances under which infraction
is possible. They learn linguistic constructs which enable them to justify delinquent behaviour, negating intention and denying the moral right of judicial persons to evaluate them.

That is to say, adolescents extend conventional values in order that they may act outside the law without feeling too guilty, or generating a belief that they are acting within the law. Such conditions of drift, Matza says, follow from individuals breaking the moral bind of the law by learning and utilising techniques of neutralisation. During drift, or the breaking of the moral bind, adolescents may commit delinquent acts because they feel free to do so. Adolescents catch themselves in a mood of desperation in which they see themselves as an effect, an object being pushed around by forces outside their control.

Subcultural delinquents experience desperation when caught in the mood of fatalism. Naturally enough, they seek to undo or cast away so unpleasant and undesired a state of being. They seek, in other words, to restore the mood of humanism in which the self is experienced as cause—the state in which man himself makes things happen. ....The restoration of the humanistic mood—and incidentally the restoration of the moral bind that is implicit in the responsible character of the humanistic mood—may be accomplished by the commission of infraction. The delinquent is rejoined to the moral order by the commission of crime (Matza, 1964, p. 189).

Matza's view of delinquent behaviour can be summarised in the following sequential stages:

1) adolescents feel unable to break the law because their attachment to it is sufficient to act as a brake on their behaviour;
2) adolescents may learn techniques of neutralisation which then enable them to break the law without too much guilt;

3) one of the techniques of neutralisation is the perception of oneself as governed by fate;

4) the mood of fatalism gives rise to a sense of desperation. This uncomfortable condition may be negated, at least momentarily, by a criminal act such as drug consumption, vandalism, or robbery;

5) the sense of desperation puts juveniles in drift, making them available for delinquent acts; and

6) adolescents convince themselves by techniques of neutralisation that what they are doing is not really bad, and after the act, they seek to persuade others that what they did was not really bad. They believe their own accounts to be authentic.

Matza's analysis is not easy to establish empirically. He proposes a motivational force that propels adolescents in drift into illegal behaviour, but it is not clear how this can be discerned or measured.

In order to explain delinquency in terms of different subcultures, Sutherland (1939) used the term "differential association". That is, in a society which contains many different subcultures, some social environments tend to encourage illegal activities whereas others do not. Individuals become delinquent or criminal through associating with others who transmit criminal norms. According to Sutherland, criminal behaviour is learned within primary groups, particularly peer groups. He argues that a person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favourable to violation of the law over definitions that are unfavourable.
Differential association applies to both conformity and deviance as forms of learned behaviour. Both are outcomes of the normal processes of socialisation that occur when individuals interact with each other. The major hypothesis of this theory is that the social contexts for learning both deviance and conformity have increased in industrialised capitalist nations because the populations of these countries grow up and live in large complex societies composed of groups holding conflicting values, norms, and attitudes towards the law.

Sutherland discusses techniques for committing crime, and opportunities for putting these techniques to profitable use, as well as motives for engaging in criminal conduct and justifications for law-violating behaviour. He also hypothesises that the conflict of cultures is fundamental in the explanation of delinquency, because it provides the content of differential association through which delinquent and criminal behaviours are learned.

Subcultural theories have successfully been used in empirical research in order to explain delinquent behaviour (eg. Gorden et al., 1963; Rossi et al., 1974; Chilton and DeAmicis, 1975), finding significant variations by social class in attitudes toward general legal norms, measuring social class through indices such as income and occupation.

2.4 Social Control Theory

The implication of both strain and subcultural theories is that the frequency, seriousness, and even the basic patterns or types of delinquent behaviour should vary with social class. Studies based on these theories have often focused on lower class delinquency (particularly male delinquency), with emphasis on economic factors. However, it is clear that not all lower-class disadvantaged children become delinquent (nor are upper-class advantaged children free of
such activity). What constrains people from committing delinquent acts? The answers of social control theory are usually framed in terms of attachments and bonds which integrate people into conventional groups, and personal and social controls which regulate certain behaviours (Krohn and Massey, 1980). Social control theorists (e.g. Hirschi, 1969; Nye, 1958; Elliott et al., 1985) have linked specific mechanisms of social control (e.g. family and school) to patterns of delinquent behaviour (e.g. drug use, alcohol consumption, vandalism).

Social control has been the dominant theory of delinquency for several decades, and has particularly concentrated on the social control mechanisms of family and school (Hirschi, 1969). The main assumption of this theory is that juveniles commit delinquency because some controlling force is absent or defective, that is, delinquents are youths who are relatively uncontrolled psychologically or socially. There are assumed to be two general types of control system, personal and social. The main personal control is self-esteem. Social controls involve attachments to basic social institutions, such as families and schools, and these attachments are often measured by the amount of interaction between parents and children.

There are four elements in the social bond: (a) attachment to conventional others, such as parents and teachers; (b) commitment to conventional goals and activities, such as educational expectations; (c) involvement in conventional activities, such as time spent with the family; and (d) belief in conventional norms. If these bonds become weak, individuals commit delinquent behaviour, so that when attachment to parents and teachers becomes weak, the individual becomes "free" to engage in delinquent behaviour. The four elements of the social bond are interrelated, so a breakdown in one area is likely to affect other areas too.
Attachment refers to the capacity of young people to become involved with others, such as parents, teachers, and peer groups, and to be sensitive to their thoughts, feelings, and expectations, particularly in relation to one’s own behaviour (Box, 1981). Involvement refers to participation in conventional and legitimate activities, for example, when students participate in school activities. Commitment is the rational aspect of the social bond of conformity to conventional rules.

Hirschi (1969) believes that the causal significance of friendships has been overstated, arguing that because delinquents are less strongly attached to conventional adults, they are also less likely to be attached to each other. It is possible that weakened personal or social control factors as a result of socialisation experiences in the family and school contribute to delinquency, and this study will explore that possibility.

Nye (1958), an early social control theorist, focused on the relationship of the family to delinquency. He suggested that restriction and punishment, affectional identification with parents, and internalised controls are the major sources of control in children. However, Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory has become the more dominant explanation of delinquent behaviour in most empirical research, and was based on one of the most extensive studies. Some of his findings were that delinquents were less likely to be closely attached to their parents, and that students who liked school were less likely to be delinquent. Students who did not like school also tended to be weakly attached to their parents. Analysing self-report delinquency among 4077 high school students in California, he found an association between broken homes and delinquency, as well as associations between delinquency and several measures of family relationships such as affectional identification with parents, and the bonds of attachment within the juvenile’s family. Hirschi’s data led to the conclusion that ties to the family were inversely related to delinquency.
The interest in family factors and delinquency has involved both the structure of the family and the nature of relationships within the family (Geismar and Wood, 1986). Issues of family structure include the broken home, that is, a home where one or both biological parents is permanently absent because of events such as death, desertion, or divorce. Family relationships involve parental conflicts, parent-child relationships, and discipline and supervision patterns.

The relevance of family variables to delinquency has been studied in some empirical research. Several investigators have observed a relationship between negative family affect and delinquency. Nye (1958), for example, examined the relationships between numerous family factors and self-reported delinquency among 780 high school students in Washington. Nearly 95 per cent of the associations were consistent with the assumptions of control theory, and about 50 per cent of these associations were statistically significant. Parent-child relationships were measured by children's acceptance or rejection of methods of parental discipline, punishment and so on. In general, those youths whose parents treated them fairly and with respect tended to be considerably less delinquent than others.

School factors have been associated with delinquency among all youth, irrespective of age, race, social class, and gender (Hirschi, 1969). The school has thus become a central concern for social control theory, focusing on the extent to which young people become involved in school, have plans or desires for future academic success, and experience positive relationships with teachers. Alternatively, school failures or rejects might perceive that they have little to lose by committing delinquent acts because their future looks bleak without academic qualifications as a key to better-paid jobs (Box, 1981).

White and LaGrange (1987) examined the relative effects of parents, school, and peers as major elements of social control theory in male and female delinquency.
Self-report data on 304 male and female adolescents was derived from a representative selection of fifteen year old male and female adolescents from the general New Jersey youth population. This study found that the measures of social control theory and differential association were significantly correlated with delinquency for each gender. They found that, on the one hand, females are more strongly "bonded to society" in terms of family, school, and peer measures. On the other hand, while males reported engaging in significantly more delinquent behaviour than females overall, the difference for less serious delinquency was low.

The social control theorist's position may be summarised as positing that conformity is dependent upon a bond between the individual and the social order. When this bond is weakened, delinquency is a potential outcome. Social control theory has both strengths and weaknesses. There is an important focus on primary relationships with parents, school, and peer groups as major sources in the internalisation of norms and rules. Moreover, the relationships between family variables and delinquent behaviour predicted by social control theory can be tested in empirical research.

This theory also allows the exploration of ethnic differences, since control structures may differ across ethnic groups as parent-child relationships are influenced by different values. The particular aspects of parental control which have emerged in social control theory include attachment, supervision and discipline. Ethnicity has also been used in analysing the ties of attachment and belonging experienced by a particular group with a common heritage and culture (Mindel, et al., 1988). Generally delinquency has been associated with an overall lack of parental control over children (Patterson, 1982). There is some evidence that ethnic differences exist in the expression of parental control, most particularly in the exercise of discipline (Peters, 1988), although the effect of such differences on delinquent behaviour has not been explored.
Finally, an important strength of social control theory is that researchers can integrate its various elements with other theories of delinquency such as strain theory and Sutherland's differential association theory.

Although social control theory appears to have the greatest explanatory capability for delinquent behaviour, it does not explain all the major variables related to delinquent behaviour. Despite the existence of a high correlation between delinquency, family conditions and school experiences, social control theory cannot explain which factors may destroy social bonds and create delinquent behaviour. The answer to this question must come from other perspectives.

Although attachment to parents and school have been suggested to be consistently negatively related to delinquency, the relationship between peer approval and delinquency have been mostly ignored. Hirschi (1969) found that attachment to peer has a small negative association with delinquency. This study assumed that, the joint influences of parents and school in one hand, and peers on the other, can be explored as they relate to delinquent behaviour.

Delinquency should also be considered in terms of cultural values and the socio-economic status of parents, whereas in most studies influenced by social control theory, for example, the broken home as a causal variable has been analysed without regard to social class. Yet delinquency can be highly associated with the socio-economic status of parents. One of the factors in social control theory that can affect delinquency is family size, but this may be due to the fact large families are more likely to be of lower socio-economic status. When parental socio-economic status is measured by educational attainment level and occupational situation as control variables, the effect of family size on juvenile delinquency may be reduced. When juveniles are surveyed over several factors,
it may be found that weakened social bonds can explain initial instances of delinquency, but not continued occurrences (Agnew, 1985).

2.5 Female Delinquency

Both official statistics and self-report data have revealed considerable differences between male and female delinquency. Girls usually have been reported as committing significantly less delinquency than boys. In recent years, the proportion of female delinquency, particularly in the case of mild offences such as running away from home and skipping school, has increased (Jensen and Rojek, 1980).

Most theories of delinquency such as strain theory and subculture theory were developed and tested exclusively with males. Some researchers explain this by the fact that males not only report significantly more involvement in delinquency, but because arrests of young women are largely for minor crimes and status offences such as running away from home and truancy (Morash, 1986; Naffine, 1989). Even where theorising and research on female delinquency have occurred, they have often been limited to considering personal variables, biological and psychological.

In the last century, the main explanation of female deviant behaviour was given by Lombroso, who focused on biological traits. He found that females were more sensitive, jealous, vengeful and passive than men. However, he claimed that the majority of female delinquents could be classified as occasional criminals whose physical features contained no signs of degeneration and whose moral character was similar to that of their normal sisters (Lombroso, 1968).

The earlier literature on delinquency offers very different explanations of male and female delinquency. While theories of male delinquency focused on socio-
economic status and blocked opportunity structures (Merton, 1938; Cohen, 1955, Cloward and Ohlin, 1960), poverty and urban density (Shaw and McKay, 1942), and delinquent peer groups (Miller, 1975), explanations of female delinquency mostly applied a psychological framework that focused on personality maladjustment and family problems (Klein, 1973; Gibbons, 1976).

Recent empirical research has rejected this theoretical separation. Some studies have found that the peer group is an important factor in the creation of female delinquency (Elliott and Voss, 1974; Cernkovich, 1978; Erickson and Jensen, 1977). Agnew (1991) argued that delinquency is conditioned among both males and females by attachment to peers, time spent with peers, and the extent to which peers present delinquent patterns. Johnson (1979) tested a modified control theory on samples of males and females and discovered a significant relationship between the weakness of family ties as a family problem, and delinquency, for both groups. Johnson (1979) concluded that most general patterns remain similar for males and females.

Where theories and research have considered social factors, these have often focused on home and the family (Chesney-Lind, 1989). A substantial proportion of delinquent females seem to be engaging in survival strategies on the streets after taking refuge from sexual abuse in their home. Henggeler, Edwards, and Borduin (1987) argued that families of female delinquents are more dysfunctional than those of male delinquents, and family relationships strongly predicted future delinquent activity among girls. In most research of dysfunctional families and female delinquency, relevant variables include physical and sexual abuse, and parental neglect or abandonment. Morris (1964) found that significantly more female delinquents were reared in single-parent households than either male delinquents or male and female non-delinquents.
Hirschi's social control theory may be useful in explaining why some youths of the same gender commit delinquent behaviour while others do not, and also why males as compared to females engage in more delinquent behaviour. He argued that girls are more closely supervised by their parents than boys and are more likely to be emotionally dependent on them. Where the delinquency rate among low-income and ethnic minority families is higher than in other groups, it is because such families are less able to control their children. He also suggested that girls were much more likely than boys to be sensitive to the opinions of teachers, so that school attachment explains still more of this difference (Hirschi, 1977). Several studies also offer evidence that social control theory may be useful in explaining both male and female delinquency (Johnson, 1979; Smith, 1979; Box, 1981). These studies found that attachment to parents and teachers as major elements of social control theory are stronger among females than among males.

Giordano, Cernkovich, and Pugh (1986) discovered that females who are members of a regular group- not necessarily a delinquent group- are more likely to be delinquent than females who are not. They also suggested that peer group support is a more important factor in female delinquency because girls have a greater need to neutralise the moral bind of stronger normative restraints (Johnson, 1979).

It seems that there are three important reasons for the current interest in the study of female delinquency. First, changes in gender roles raise questions about their influence on female crime and delinquency. Second, both official data and self-report surveys of crime and delinquency have recently shown increases in criminal activity, particularly property crime, by both young and adult females (White and LaGrange, 1987; Silverman, 1982). Third, the growth of the women's movement has led to greater attention and research on issues affecting women.
such as domestic violence, sex discrimination in the labour market, and female criminality.

The differences between male and female delinquency have generally been explained in terms of the different social roles and status positions occupied by the two sexes in society (Canter, 1982). Males are considered to be more attached to peers and consequently to spend more time away from home with their friends, while young females are seen to be more attached to their parents and to spend less time away from home. Another reason may be that female delinquency is more likely to be dealt with in an informal way, thereby contributing to an under-representation in official crime statistics.

The rate of female delinquency may change because of the changing role of females within society, and differential roles according to gender, ethnicity, and social class. Female delinquency should be considered not only in terms of class, gender and ethnicity but also peer and group influences on young females. Large numbers of girls are joining larger groupings and gangs with an increasing similarity of roles for boys and girls (McClelland, 1982). This may lead to an increased level of delinquency among females as leisure time spent with the group increases.

The issue of gender roles and their influence on female crime has led to the debate about the 'New Female Criminal'. Simon (1975) identified a significant increase in the proportion of women involved in crime, particularly for offences such as theft, forgery, fraud and embezzlement, but not in crimes of violence, prostitution or child abuse. Elliott (1988) argued that this increase was congruent with opportunity theory and the changing role of women resulting from the influence of the women's movement.

Oakley (1972) and Alder (1975) in their empirical research saw a strong association between criminality and the male gender role, so that as the female
role takes on more of the attributes traditionally regarded as male, female crime will increase. Using official crime statistics, Weis (1976) found a significant relationship between women's liberation and a considerable increase in the female crime rate.

Calhoun, Jurgens, and Chen (1993) indicate that female delinquency has increased because girls are caught between the stereotypical traditional female role and a newer, more active role and some are unable to live up to their role expectations at home, school, or among peers.

Rhodes and Fischer (1993) used official and self-report records of adolescent delinquents in a large midwestern US city to study the relationship between gender and delinquency in drug use and gang involvement. They found that both males and females engaged in aggressive offences and selling drugs, and that gang membership had an intensifying effect on the delinquent behaviours of all youth.

This thesis examines delinquent behaviour among both males and females, to investigate whether the types of acts committed by young women have become more serious, resembling those of males. However, there is clearly a need for much further research on female delinquency and on gender differences in delinquent behaviour.

2.6 Conclusion

There are two theoretical tendencies in analyses of the causes of delinquency. The first is to focus on background variables. In this vein, strain and subcultural theories locate the motivation for delinquency in cumulative frustrations arising from structural inequalities. The second tendency incorporates situational
effects. Here, social control theory focuses on the failure of family and school experiences to establish social bonds.

The structural approach (strain and subculture theories) and social control theory offer quite different accounts of the onset of delinquent behaviour. Generally, the structural approach views the individual’s socio-economic location as a crucial variable in the etiological processes leading to delinquent involvement. This approach emphasises various structural pressures that force the individual into delinquency. Control theory, on the other hand, suggests that delinquency is the result of weakened ties to the conventional order. When this bond is weakened or broken, the individual becomes “free” to engage in delinquent activities. According to this theory, no special motivation is needed for involvement in delinquent behaviour, as the reduction of conventional orientations is sufficient.

Theories of delinquency vary in content, but also in their levels of empirical investigation. It seems that no one theory can be used to explain all types of delinquent behaviour, as each focuses on different aspects of delinquency and each has its own strengths and weaknesses. Any single theory has too few variables to have strong explanatory power. A common solution to this problem is theoretical integration and much recent theoretical work on delinquency has focused on the integration of different delinquency theories. Many sociologists (eg. Eve, 1978; Johnson, 1979; Elliott, et al., 1979) now advocate integrated theoretical formulations which employ variables drawn from several theories of delinquency.

There have been several attempts to present an integrated theoretical model (Elliott, 1979; Empey, 1982; Colvin and Pauly, 1983; Pearson and Weiner, 1985; Buikhuisen and Mednik, 1988; Hagan et al., 1979, 1990). These offer combinations which include strain theory, subcultural theory, inadequate
socialisation, and social disorganisation. Power-control theory (Hagan et al., 1979, 1990) integrates major elements of conflict theories as a macrostructural explanation and social control theory as a micro level explanation. Power-control theory employs the means of production as a major element of conflict theories on the macrolevel. It also focuses on relations of dominance in the family as an element of control theory on the microlevel. The recent Canadian study by Hagan et al., (1988) suggested that the gender differential in delinquency is greater in the upper social classes than in the lower classes because of gender differences in the degree of freedom and power. Power-control theory concludes that the presence of power and the absence of control allow youths the freedom to deviate (Hagan et al., 1985), but there are still many variables, such as family disruption and school-related variables, which have been ignored in the power-control theory.

In an important empirical study, Segrave and Hastad (1985) used strain, subculture and control theories of deviance in order to develop a comprehensive understanding of the etiology of delinquency among both males and females. Self-report data was obtained from a sample of 891 male and 885 female high school students, using different model variables for each theory. The findings show that the combined effects of all three models accounted for more variance among both males and females than each of the models considered independently.

Cernkovich and Giordano (1992) have used several different theoretical models (social control, strain, social learning, deterrence, and subcultural theories), to identify a number of school-bonding variables in relation to delinquent behaviour. This integrated model was administered to 942 high school students in the Toledo, Ohio metropolitan area. They found a significant difference in delinquent behaviour across four subgroups. Both black and white males report significantly more delinquency than do black and white females. Females report
significantly higher levels of school attachment and commitment than males, and also committed fewer delinquent acts than males. This study found that delinquent behaviour is positively associated with both deviant associates and peer approval of delinquency. Moreover, in relation to the effects of peer groups, the data in this study showed that delinquent associates are a more salient factor in the etiology of male delinquency than in female delinquency.

Conger (1976) integrated two theories of delinquent behaviour, social control and social learning theories. This integrated approach was tested among high school students in San Francisco and found that social control theory is more incomplete than incorrect because attachments to peers is still important in determining delinquent behaviour. Therefore, no real predictions can be made when variables from a single theory of delinquency are taken into account.

Hagan and McCarthy (1992) tested control and integrated strain theories of delinquency among Canadian youths in the city of Toronto. They restricted the concept of class to parental origins, and focused on street youth, a method which was once central to studies of delinquency. This involved sampling from the response population (i.e. young people who spent a lot of time on the street) and the remaining larger population (in this case, high school students). They found significant correlations between strain and control variables and delinquency.

Cerkovich (1978) combined strain theory and control theory to discover that the combination significantly improved the prediction of delinquency. Eve (1978) proposes a model that combines social control theory, cultural deviance theory and strain theory, which offers more explanation for the findings than each theory alone. The findings of this study showed that an intervening set of class conditions-life on the street versus life at home and in the school-transmits
indirect effects of parental class origins and other variables related to delinquency. They also found that street life itself increases serious delinquency.

In an empirical study, Tygart (1991) integrated social control theory and differential association and tested this with 800 high school students in metropolitan southern California, using a self-report study. The data generally support an integrated theory. Tygart found that positive family influences decreased delinquency and found a positive relationship between juvenile delinquency and youth peer influence. One of the variables in this research was family size, which had a positive association with both increased delinquency and greater peer group influence.

Simons, Whitbeck, and Conger (1991) combined elements of social control theory and differential association and constructed a model of delinquency which specifies the manner in which parenting factors, value commitments, and problems in school contribute to association with delinquent peers and involvement in delinquent behaviour. The model was tested with a self-reported technique among both seven high school students and their parents. The research found that youth who are attached to, or identify with, their parents are more likely to be influenced by their parents' beliefs and opinions. In contrast, young people who do not identify with their parents often fail to develop social value commitments.

It can be concluded that, on the one hand, strain theory and subculture theory do not contradict social control theory because all of them explain delinquency in terms of the individual's social relationships. On the other hand, strain theory and subculture theory are distinguished from social control theory in their specification of the types of social relationships that lead to delinquent behaviour and the motivation for delinquency.
An integrated theoretical perspective should be better able to explain why youth become involved in delinquent behaviour. If we build an integrated theory, it should use multivariate methods of statistical analysis, such as multiple regression or path analysis, as these techniques can help to determine the relative influence of different factors on delinquency. Therefore, in the present study, an attempt is made to measure the proportion of variance in delinquency explained by family socio-economic status, and attitudes towards parents, school, peers, and migrants as major elements of these three theories.

A problem facing any integrated theoretical explanation is the question of which factors of the various theories ought to be used. Each theory has several main propositions, each of which can be subdivided, and each implying different indicators. The solution is to limit the number of variables on the basis of overlapping explanations between the propositions within a theory, or between theories.

In order to justify my integrated theoretical approach, it should be stated that the focus is on "delinquent behaviour" as a continuous variable rather than "delinquency" as an official status. This thesis is based on the assumption that both situational and motivational factors may lead to the involvement of youths in delinquent behaviour. My integrated theoretical approach is grounded in the presumption that delinquent behaviour is both a situational and motivational phenomenon, and begins with the assumption that social institutions such as family and school, as suggested by social control theory, may develop delinquent behaviour, as well as the location of an individual within the class system, as suggested by both strain and subculture theories, is relevant to their propensity to delinquent behaviour.

Attempts to explain delinquent behaviour based on a combination of strain, subculture, and social control theories enable a broad range of situational and
motivational factors to be considered. My hypothesis is that greater explanatory power will be achieved by considering two sets of variables. The first set refers to factors which motivate delinquent behaviour, while the second refers to obstacles that restrain delinquent behaviour. Historically, strain and subculture theories have dominated as motivational theories, and social control theory as a restraint theory.

In order to justify why the previous research want to integrate strain, subculture, and social control theories, it can be referred to the assumptions of this study. Although social control theory has been dominated in explaining delinquent behaviour, it has hypothesised that, contrary to the assumptions of social control theory, some youths are adequately socialised and then commit delinquent behaviour, an assumption of strain theory. It has also hypothesised that, contrary to the assumptions of social control theory, positive attitudes towards a peer group can explain delinquent behaviour, an assumption of subculture/differential association theory. It has hypothesised that, contrary to the assumptions of social control, delinquent behaviour is associated with socio-economic status, an assumption of both strain and subculture theories. On the other hand, it has hypothesised that, contrary to the strain and subculture theories, some youths commit delinquent behaviour because of negative attitudes towards their families and school regardless to socio-economic status, an assumption of social control theory.

These three theories or a combination of two or all of them have been used for the current sociological explanations of delinquent behaviour (Empey, 1982; Colvin and Pauly, 1983; Pearson and Weiner, 1985; Buikhuisen and Mednik, 1988; Cerkovich and Giordano, 1992). In 1979, Johnson published an additional work on the topic that addressing the general issue of theory integration by using the major versions of strain, subculture, and social control theories. This integrated approach was tested by Johnson (1979), and Segrave and Hastad
(1985), the results of these studies provided an evidence of the overall predictive power of this integrated approach specified by the theories involved.

It is still necessary to justify why this study has selected strain, subculture, and social control theories. Labelling theorists, such as that conducted by Hirschi (1969), emphasis on criminal events rather than criminal actors that rarely provided hypotheses that are empirically testable (e.g. Becker, 1963). Conflict theories, often explicitly Marxism, "tend to be less interested in the particular patterns of juvenile delinquency and more interested in an analysis of the law itself and how its workings relate to class structures within the society" (Coventry and Polk, 1985, p. 48). Therefore, based on the assumptions of this thesis delinquent behaviour may be anticipated to result from both strong socio-economic disadvantages and weak controls. In order to test the hypotheses of this study, my integrated theoretical approach can provide a better understanding of juvenile delinquency because it is assumed that both controls and strains (socio-economic disadvantages) can affect on delinquent behaviour.

This thesis only focuses on certain elements of strain, subculture, and control theories. Strain theory is operationalised through the use of two indices, one to determine the respondents' socio-economic status based on parental occupation and level of education; the other to evaluate the respondents' attitudes to blocked or limited opportunities. That is, I assume that parental occupation and level of education are major indices of socio-economic status, and that the perception of limited opportunities is a significant factor in the explanation of delinquent behaviour.

Subculture theory is operationalised through the use of several items in relation to peer approval and attitudes towards migrants, asking respondents about their behaviour and attitudes with their friends and migrants.
Although Hirschi discussed four elements of bonding to society in relation to juvenile delinquency, only attachment is used in this study due to its focus on the family and school. Family control as major element of Nye's (1958) social control theory is also used in this study. Parental control of their children may be imposed by physical punishment, and restriction of freedom by keeping them at home. Nye believed that the amount of time spent with parents would probably be a factor in delinquency prevention. "This affection controls behaviour because children who have this attachment for their parents and others do not want to embarrass, hurt, or disappoint these people by committing delinquent acts" (Nye, 1958, p.6).

The most important variables derived from control theory include parental relations, parental acceptance or rejection, discipline, and parental interaction with the child. Control theory is also operationalised in several items devised to assess family and school attachment, or ties of affection and respect towards significant others, including parents, teachers, and peers. It is assumed that such variables are interrelated. Hirschi's control theory suggested that delinquency is related to the quality of the relationship between parent and child. This family variable can be measured,

whether by asking the parent or child or by observing their behaviour with each other, and whatever it is called, whether "cohesiveness," "respect," or "love," the results are the same. (1977, p. 332).

He believed that lack of attachment to parents easily spills over into a lack of respect for teachers, and that attachments to parents and school are key determinants of delinquent behaviour. It is assumed that the greater the degree of parental attachment, the less chance there is of involvement in delinquent behaviour. By contrast, the greater the deterrence in the family (e.g. hitting or
smacking by parents, limiting freedom in the family) the greater the risk of delinquency. Social control theory is more compatible with such propositions than either strain or subculture theory.

Similarity, attachment to school which is operationalised in terms of positive feelings about teachers and school staff, and plans for the future, can be inversely related to delinquent involvement. Family attachment, school attachment, and delinquent behaviour are often linked together. It is assumed that attachment to parents can consequently affect attachment to school. In this process, if attachment to both parents and school has become weak, youths may be more easily influenced by peer groups. In turn, this may increase the risk of delinquent behaviour. On the other hand, a child's positive attitudes and feelings toward parents can influence attitudes to teachers and school staff, leading to doing well in school and making it more likely the child will conform at school. All such possible associations will be tested independently and in a multiple regression technique.

I have omitted some elements of these three theories. Delinquency has been associated with so many variables it is not possible to measure all of them in a self-report study. While this study has begun to examine a broader range of family, school, and other variables, it is still limited to a single questionnaire. Moreover, most empirical studies confirm that some elements of these theories are not important. The bond of involvement as an element of social control theory, for example, is ignored because most empirical research has suggested it is unimportant (Elliott et al., 1985; Agnew, 1991).

I adopt an integrated approach to the explanation of delinquency for both males and females. In order to evaluate the validity of an integrated theoretical approach to the delinquency of both groups, the data analysis will seek to determine the correlation between each of the independent variables derived
from strain, subculture, and social control theories, to determine which of these account for the greatest amount of variance in delinquent behaviour, and to determine whether a combination of variables increases the amount of explained variance.

My purpose is to re-examine the role of adverse situations in the explanation of delinquent behaviour. I also accept the place of background and developmental variables in this examination and am guided by an integration of background and developmental variables from social control theory.

The basic distinction between theoretical orientations becomes more apparent when contrasting the empirical literature on lower-class delinquency, on the one hand, and social psychological control factors on the other. In the first approach, delinquency literature has focused on the social class position of the individual as one of the most central etiological factors in delinquent involvement. In the second approach, conventional orientations are assumed to be instrumental in the etiology of delinquency. In contrast to these studies which have concentrated on only one approach, the present analysis will examine the extent to which variables derived from both structural and control theories can be synthesised into a single conceptual orientation which is significantly predictive of delinquent involvement.

This integration of strain and social control theories assumes that both the presence of strain and the absence of control can push youths to delinquent behaviour, as well as free them for it. However, it is important to establish the relative contribution of each and that the influence of one set of factors is not a spurious product of the other. It is assumed that youths who live in homes in conditions of great difficulty, or who leave and stay away from home, encounter conditions similar to adults, including unemployment and poverty.
To sum up, the present chapter has sought to evaluate the ability of strain, subculture, and social control theories to explain the role of family background, school, and peer influences in delinquency. The integration of these three theories provides a testable set of hypotheses for examining the relationship between such variables. On the basis of the theoretical framework described in this chapter, a list of major variables relevant to delinquent behaviour will be discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER THREE

A Review of Literature on Juvenile Delinquency

3.1 Introduction

The specific purpose of this chapter is to review the results of studies examining juvenile delinquency according to variables relating to family background, school and peer group involvement, particularly in relation to language background. In the first part of this chapter, comparisons will be made between non-English speaking background (NESB) and English speaking background (ESB) subgroups according to their socio-economic status. NESB youths comprise those young people in Australia who were either born in non-English-speaking countries, or born in Australia with one or both parents born in a non-English speaking country. The aim of this review is to situate the theoretical approach discussed in Chapter Two and to suggest why it might be relatively successful in explaining juvenile delinquency.

This chapter will look at the impact and interactive effects of migrant status, family background, school life, and peer groups on juvenile delinquency, as the most consistent finding in the literature is that these variables are more likely to be related to juvenile delinquency.

A growing body of empirical evidence shows that the delinquent activity of youths is related to family background (Patterson, 1986; Hindelang, Hirschi, and Weis, 1981). In this study, family background refers both to a family's socio-economic status and to family structure. In relation to a family's socio-economic status, I mainly focus on parental occupation, because this correlates highly
with class position, and also relates to values, norms, beliefs, attitudes, and goals. The literature shows that using occupation as a criterion allows a better correlation with delinquent behaviour than the geographic area where the delinquent lives. Family structure includes the quality of family relationships, family disruption, and family size.

In many theories of delinquency today there is widespread agreement about the direction and relative magnitude of a large number of correlates of delinquency. I will first turn my attention to language background and in particular migrant socio-economic status. I argue that some NESB immigrant parents came from lower socio-economic groups than the Australian national average, and that since official delinquency rates tend to be higher in lower socio-economic groups one would expect such migrant groups to be at a higher risk of being processed for delinquent behaviour.

3.2 Migrant Status

Australian society is quite heterogeneous, both in terms of the composition of its population and the multiplicity of subcultural value systems. Until the Second World War, Australia's population was mainly formed by migrants from the United Kingdom and Ireland, but since then the number of migrants from other countries has increased.

Immigrants come from different geographical regions, and for a variety of motives. Immigrants also come from different socio-economic backgrounds and display differences of custom, religion and culture. They may also have experienced a wide range of political and economic structures (Castles, 1989).

After World War Two, the reasons for migration varied. Some people migrated to Australia in order to escape the political and social dislocations produced by
war, which left many thousands of refugees homeless. The later influx of Vietnamese migrated to Australia because they did not want to live under a Communist government. Others migrated to Australia in order to improve their economic conditions. Australia in turn needed more people in order to develop and expand industry and to increase production. For these reasons, Australian policy has encouraged migrants and refugees to settle here (Castles, 1989; Worswick, 1991).

During the 1950s a large number of Europeans displaced by World War Two were admitted, and a steady influx of skilled and unskilled labour continued through the 1960s to meet local shortages. "But by the late 1960s there was growing concern about the ability of the economy to absorb an average of 170,000 new settlers each year. ...From 1975 to 1984 permanent intakes were reduced to between 54 - 95,000 (with the exception of 1981 and 1982 which were unusually high due to an increase in Vietnamese and other refugees arrival" (Hazlehurst, 1987, pp. 1-3).

It appears that every wave of immigration and every refugee movement to Australia has created some tensions in Australian society because most of the NESB immigrants have a serious problem adjusting to their new society, whereas the process of adaptation to Australian society may not be so difficult for ESB immigrants (Hawkins, 1991).

As far as migrant status is concerned, in this study I highlight the cultural conflicts, language problems, and relative deprivation of NESB immigrants in the context of multiculturalism, in order to see how these might help to explain juvenile delinquency. This is important because the extent of delinquent behaviour among NESB youths in comparison with ESB youths can be an important index of success or failure for Australians in a multicultural society.
3.2.1 Multiculturalism and migrant status

Most migrants who come to Australia from different cultural backgrounds want to maintain their language and cultural traditions, and to remove structural disadvantages to equal rights. There are millions of Australian citizens who are not considered to be 'Australians'. Many migrant Australians, both first and second generation, tend to label themselves by their original nationality because they do not want to disappear into the dominant culture and its institutions.

Australian immigration policy has passed through two phases: assimilation and multiculturalism. During the assimilation phase, migrant cultures were regarded as maladaptive and were rejected by Australians of British origin. "In Australia assimilation of both Aborigines and post-war migrants became the catch-cry; a belief in the equal ability of all men and women to become civilised like white people" (Bulbeck, 1993, p. 127). In the 1970s, assimilation began to be displaced by multiculturalism, a commitment to ethnic diversity, and a recognition of cultural differences.

Multiculturalism is a model of society "where different cultural groups compete for influence and power on the basis of relative equality, where conflicts of interest are resolved peacefully through democratic means" (Galbally, 1985, p.113). Multiculturalism encourages migrants to adjust to the wider society while helping to understand different cultures, histories and customs. Multiculturalism also means a positive commitment to maintaining intergroup relations and to retaining group cultures (Goot, 1993).

For immigrants, multiculturalism means equal opportunities in access to work, education and welfare. In an important survey, Goot (1993) shows that immigrant attitudes to multiculturalism correlate very strongly with views about equal opportunities. There is a gap between the ideology of equal rights for all Australians and the exclusion of NESB Australians from the centres of economic
and political power (Vasta, 1993). Disadvantage in terms of racism is also explored from the perspective of young people in studies such as that by Voulgaris and Castania (1987). Moreover, among Australians of British origin still believe that NESB migrants should adopt the dominant social and cultural values of Australia and reject their own cultures. Therefore, in practice, the dispute between assimilation and multiculturalism continues.

In Australia, while multiculturalism has generally taken on a positive meaning, it is still frequently attacked by various sectors in the community. On the one hand, some argue that multiculturalism poses a threat to the nation and its national culture. On the other hand, some believe that multiculturalism poses problems for the social, political, and economic rights of NESB immigrants. Anglo-Australians have complained that multiculturalism is disadvantaging them, and many believe that migrant welfare programs are over-funded (Vasta, 1993).

In spite of an official policy that sees Australia as a multicultural society, there remain barriers of class, culture, and education which insulate the dominant social group from NESB immigrants. The dominant cultural group displays a tendency to believe in its own superiority and thus demands respect, deference and adjustment from less powerful groupings.

Most public opposition to immigration in Australia is based on the argument that immigration has produced unemployment (particularly in times of recession and among unskilled workers), reduced the willingness of employers to train local employees, increased the need for public expenditure on essential services and social infrastructure, and created social problems by increasing crime rates (Botsman, 1990).

Migrant attitude surveys show different feelings or reactions depending on the group of immigrants. There were negative feelings towards NESB migrants (Markus, 1988; Cooray, 1986; Wooden, 1990) and racial discrimination was
prevalent in the experiences of refugee women (Pittaway, 1991) and Africans (Batrouney, 1991). A national sample survey showed that 32 per cent of Australians expressed negative feelings about Vietnamese, 32 per cent towards Muslim people, and 28 per cent towards Lebanese, compared with 7 per cent towards Italians, 9 per cent towards Greeks and 4 per cent towards British people (Office of Multicultural Affairs, 1989).

Immigrant groups, particularly those from non-English speaking backgrounds, have suffered prejudice. One approach to researching disadvantage is that of the Human Rights Commission, which used teams of NESB school students to explore prejudice in their schools (Henry, 1988). In an important survey using a scale of prejudice or social distance, Australians were asked for their reactions to groups such as Vietnamese, Lebanese, and Indians (Bell and Hall, 1991). The findings showed that Vietnamese immigrants were the most disliked ethnic group, and that one of the major reasons for this prejudice was the alleged high level of involvement in criminal activity by Vietnamese youth.

Prejudice means that ESB residents of industrial suburbs might not tolerate a policy allowing NESB migrants occupational opportunities, and that NESB immigrant settlement might lead to racism and conflict in poorer areas where different groups compete for employment, housing and community resources. Intergroup tension, racial conflict and discrimination are reflected on a personal level. Blainey (1984) argued that Asian immigrants were not welcomed by ESB people and that their presence would lead to social conflict. Such negative evaluation by majority groups of minority ethnic groups constitutes an extra handicap for minorities already caught up in the nexus of insecure, low-paid or low-status employment, and poor education (Little and Robbins, 1983). Discrimination and racial prejudice can also influence employment opportunities and access to community support networks. Matheson (1991) reviewed studies
of racism and community relations in Australia over the last twenty years and emphasises the link between economic downturn and racism.

Therefore, in order to explain juvenile delinquency, we must describe the complexity of the position of young people in the broader matrix of socio-economic relations, including in particular their subculture and the socio-economic status of their parents.

3.2.2 Migrant socio-economic status

Migrants come from different class backgrounds overseas, and this has considerable influence on their occupational and educational success in Australia. In general the first wave of post-World War Two migrants is now receiving similar incomes to Australian-born people, while later waves are worse off (Morrissey et al., 1992). Since World War Two, Anglophone and northern European immigrants have occupied labour market positions similar to those born in Australia, while NESB migrants have been concentrated in semi-skilled and unskilled jobs. The former group can therefore be described as 'labour aristocrats', earning higher pay, working in better conditions, and better able to control their work opportunities than those in the latter category (Bottomley, 1988).

In recent decades, poverty as a major cause of disadvantage has increased in Australia. Batrouney (1991) found that in 1981-82 the level of poverty was much higher for immigrants from non-English-speaking countries. He also found that poverty was greatest among those who had been in Australia the shortest time, though there was considerable variation according to birthplace.

A recent self-report study found that 80 per cent recent of African immigrants in Melbourne were living below the poverty line (Batrouney, 1991). Financial
problems are a major difficulty for many recent immigrants, at least in their first four years of settlement. Another self-report study on refugee women in Sydney shows that over two-thirds of the women had survived severe forms of torture and/or trauma and many of their children were also affected. In this case, most refugee women were given so little assistance from social services in Australia that they were unable in turn to assist their children (Pittaway, 1991).

Nieuwenhuysen (1992) found that during the recent severe economic recession (1990-92), migrants as a group suffered high unemployment rates. Moreover, migrants from non-English speaking backgrounds and newly arrived immigrants had greater difficulty finding a job than migrants who had been in Australia longer.

There is a stark contrast between the present and the 1950s-1960s. In the latter period, there was a large intake of people, many without skills, to a full employment economy where they readily gained jobs. In the 1990s, not only is the unemployment rate high, but the nature of industry has also changed so that those without formal skills now have much greater difficulty finding work (Nieuwenhuysen, 1992).

The socio-economic status of immigrants has often been influenced by production changes in the industrial sector. Such changes at BHP's Port Kembla Steel Plant in the Illawarra region, for example, have affected labour demand. Nieuwenhuysen (1992) found that since 1980 in the Illawarra, three major economic influences have had an impact on immigrant employment opportunities:

1- the economic downturn at the start of the decade was more severe in the Illawarra than for Australia as a whole;
2- the contraction of manufacturing employment through structural change was greater for the Illawarra than for Australia generally; and

3- the service sector in the Illawarra did not grow as rapidly as elsewhere.

Such dramatic changes have increased the rates of long-term unemployment for NESB workers in the region. This group has been acutely vulnerable to economic change and structural shifts in industry, as immigrant workers displaced from manufacturing have not been re-employed in the services sector to any great extent because of their poor English language and literacy skills. There has also been an inequity in the educational and occupational opportunities between working-class migrants and Australian workers (Burnley, 1986). Moreover, differences of social standing, language and skill level also exist between the migrant workforce and the Australian-born working-class.

The unemployment rate among immigrant arrivals between 1961 and 1970 was 10 per cent, 13 per cent for arrivals between 1971 and 1980, and 32 per cent for arrivals between 1981 and 1984. In 1984, the unemployment rate among those born in Lebanon was 29 per cent, and those born in Vietnam 34 per cent, whereas the unemployment rate for the Australian-born labour force was 8 per cent (Bureau of Immigration Research, 1986).

There is also political discrimination against immigrants from non-English speaking backgrounds. When we look at the institutions of power and authority in Australia, we do not find a multicultural membership. A study of power elites in Australia has shown that of the 600,000 Italian, Greek or Yugoslav-born people in the population, not one held an elite position. However, over 80 per cent of the elite were born in Australia, three quarters of them had parental links with Great Britain, and 17 per cent with Ireland. For migrants who had vital roles in the structure of power, 86 per cent came from English-speaking countries (Higley et al., 1979).
Deasey (1987) showed that income poverty among groups such as injured immigrant workers and unemployed newly arrived immigrants is compounded by a lack of language skills, poor access to information, and isolation from support networks. This lead to disadvantages such as low wages, high unemployment rates, and long duration of unemployment.

### 3.2.3 Cultural conflict and juvenile delinquency

Cultural conflict appears to be of considerable significance in explaining many problems of immigrant life, such as disorganisation and crisis, the generation gap between parents and children during settlement in the host society, and juvenile delinquency.

In a society with a large foreign population and from varied cultural backgrounds, where the social routine of migrants is disrupted by rapid change and the child is subjected to a great variety of divergent and conflicting standards of conduct, developing a stable life-style is extremely difficult. In this situation, many immigrant children fail to acquire respect for the law and the traditions of the host society (Suchar, 1978).

A degree of cultural disintegration often occurs when immigrants from non-industrial communities are drawn into city life. Shaw and McKay (1942) formulated a valuable sociological approach for explaining delinquent behaviour when they drew attention to the high rate of delinquency in socially disorganised inner-city areas. Where growing youths are alienated from the traditions of their families, they may engage in delinquent activity because the family fails to control young people's behaviour or to enforce conventional mores and social disciplines.
Sellin (1938), in a review of cultural conflict perspectives, focused on the conflict between the cultures of various foreign-born immigrants and their children, and the culture of the dominant society. He believed that value conflicts between different cultures are internalised as mental conflicts which in turn lead to participation in delinquent activities.

Merton (1956) believed that some young people from disadvantaged groups engage in illegal activities because some of their needs can only be satisfied outside family and school. They are typically in rebellion against family and school and form delinquent peer groups where they resocialise into new norms.

According to both strain and subculture theories, delinquent behaviour may be a result of motivational factors that accumulate over time. The situational circumstances derived from these theories that locate the motivation for delinquency among NESB youths are socio-economic disadvantage and cultural conflicts arising from structural inequality. Cloward and Ohlin (1960) have argued that socio-economically disadvantaged youths aspire to the same success goals held by conventional society, but that there is a gap between aspirations and what is realistically available to them. This discrepancy causes them to form dropout subcultures, in which vandalism, alcoholism, and other anti-social behaviour become the characteristic forms of delinquent participation.

However, Cohen's (1955) value-conflict explanation of delinquent behaviour emphasises both negative and rejective forces. He focused on deviant behaviour amongst groups such as second generation immigrants or mistreated ethnic minorities, and saw delinquent subcultures as a response to the cultural conflicts experienced by such groups. He believed that these groups could not socialise completely into the dominant culture in their daily life, so were more dependent
on peer groups for the satisfaction of various emotional needs. Peer group values thus became predominant reference points for behaviour.

In the new society, immigrant youths confront the process of transition between two cultures, the culture of the old world they left behind and the new world in which they live. The youths soon find themselves separated from the world of their parents because parents and children become assimilated at different rates into the host culture. Youths lose respect for their parents' customs and traditions and in many cases become ashamed of their origins. This may lead to a generation gap between immigrant parents and their children, because parents desire to transmit the values, norms, and beliefs of their culture to the next generation, while their children have been socialised into mixture of both their parents' culture and here, the wider Australian society.

As a result of the generation gap between parents and their children, parental control is weakened and the family is ineffective in developing attitudes, habits, and interests in the children which might serve as a safeguard against any demoralising influences they may encounter in gangs and play groups outside the home. Where parents are unable to control their children, the gang may become the overriding influence on children. In many instances the absorbing interest for such gangs is various forms of delinquency.

Conflict may occur between members of a family, parents and their children, or between neighbours, and between separating spouses where there is a continuing relationship between the people in conflict. This may result in violence against the person or property.

Subculture theory offers the conditions under which an individual may be willing to engage in deviant behaviour (Box, 1981). According to this theory, socio-economic disadvantage and cultural conflicts are the motivations behind delinquency. NESB youths seem to share a number of values and attitudes
which have developed over years into a social tradition and which are handed on, more or less intact, to the rising generation. One of the major propositions of subculture theory is that when the values and attitudes maintained in the home are contrary to those of wider society, then the child will likely develop anti-social behaviour like delinquent behaviour.

Although some studies have shown that delinquent behaviour has been affected by cultural conflicts, the socio-economic disadvantages of migrants is a factor that needs separate consideration. Migrant families which come from low socio-economic backgrounds usually cannot provide a stable setting for youths. In such cases peer group relationships may be available for young people who fail to find meaning in their lives within the family. Therefore, delinquent behaviour can arise from both the direct influence of cultural conflict and from migrants' socio-economic status.

3.3 Family background and delinquency

Investigation of the family as an agent of socialisation for youth behaviour has a long history. Nye (1958) reported that family process variables, including parents-child relationships, supervision and discipline, were the most important correlates of serious delinquency. Family ties, parental discipline, and delinquent behaviour are assumed to be linked to each other.

The family is considered the fundamental and primary socialising agent in the preparation of the child for adulthood because it provides the basis for participation in all subsequent social structures. Children are provided with a set of cultural beliefs and practices which will serve as equipment for participation in later life. Family life is an important aspect of well-being for all members, and most children spend their early years in a family setting, living with parents.
The association of family variables with juvenile delinquency has been highlighted by many studies (DiLalla et al., 1988; Johnstone, 1980; Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986; Johnson, 1979; Cernkovich and Giordano, 1987; Wells and Rankin, 1986; Lisabeth et al., 1988; Farrington, 1972). These have found that many different family variables can be linked with delinquency, but have generally established the importance of parent-child relationships, parental control over children, physical punishment at home, family stability, and family socio-economic status.

I have therefore assumed that family factors have a strong and consistent effect on participation in delinquent acts. In the following sections, I focus on the literature relating to family structure and family socio-economic status. This literature shows that consistent close supervision and strong parent-child relationships are associated with low rates of delinquent behaviour (West and Farrington, 1977; Blumstein et al., 1986).

3.3.1 Family structure and delinquency

Hirschi's (1969) social control theory focuses on a juvenile's attachment to his or her parents and the free time spent with their family. Therefore, the present research asked youths to characterise their parents' feelings toward them, as well as to indicate the free time spent with their parents.

Studies which have examined family structure demonstrate that the variables most frequently associated with delinquency include large family size, marital conflict, family break down, and poor parental supervision (Feather and Cross, 1975; West, 1973; Farnworth, 1984; Veneziano and Louis-Veneziano, 1992). One factor in family structure which has been subject of many studies of juvenile delinquency is the broken home. Family instability has been seen as relevant to
juvenile delinquency because of its possible interaction with other family variables such as parent-child relationships. Broken homes, that is homes which do not include both biological parents because of divorce, separation, desertion, or death, have also been a popular explanation of delinquency.

One group of research studies has supported the idea that delinquent behaviour is related to family disruption. In most studies that directly compare children living with both biological parents with those living in "broken" or reconstituted homes, the children from intact homes have lower rates of delinquency. Researchers have found a significant correlation between broken homes and delinquency through the self-report technique (West, 1973; Rankin, 1983; Wilson, 1980), and have also found that most delinquents had a background of severe family problems. One of the most consistent findings of such research is that the greater the breakdown of the family, the greater the likelihood that children will be delinquent.

Other studies have found that correlations between broken homes and delinquent behaviour are affected by age and sex. These findings show that broken homes have had a greater effect on the delinquency of younger rather than older adolescents, and on girls rather than boys (Toby, 1957; Chilton and Markle, 1972). They suggest that parents exercise more control over girls and that girls also feel closer emotional ties to their parents, making them more sensitive to family conflict.

Family instability is an important factor in producing delinquent children. When children lose a biological parent they also lose that parent's guidance, care, and disciplinary influence. Broken homes may make socialisation more difficult because of economic hardship for children, and a loss of proper role models for behaviour. Family instability is also thought to have an indirect effect on
delinquency through factors such as weakened parent-child relationships and the decreased potential for supervision by a single parent alone.

Although the literature shows a relationship between the broken home and delinquency, the importance of family break down for delinquency has been often exaggerated. For example, that where family break down is implicated in delinquency for a sample of youths from low-income families, when both parents are unemployed, delinquency may increase. Therefore, it should be asked whether the focus should be on family break down or various dimensions of the family's socio-economic status.

Studies which have focused on family structure have also shown associations between delinquency and family relations. Family relations refers to relations between parents and the closeness of the parent-child relationship. This entails feelings of love, respect, desire to be near and to please parents, and includes the sharing of time and feelings with them (Johnson, 1979). Johnson believed there was an inverse relation between attachment to parents and delinquent behaviour. In the social development of children, the quality of the relations experienced at home has been found to be a major determinant. Hindelang (1973) in a study of self-report delinquency among 900 juveniles in New York found that attachment to parents was inversely related to delinquency, while Haskell and Yablonsky (1974) concluded that patterns of interaction within the family are important in the explanation of delinquency.

In a survey of over 900 youths aged 12-19, Cernkovich and Giordano (1987) found that family interaction patterns have significant associations with delinquency. The more delinquent youths in the sample were more likely to have conflicts with their parents, and to have difficulties with parents rather than with friends. The potential negative impact of stepfathers upon children was noted when comparing delinquent behaviour between white and black males.
Campbell (1987) examined the correlation between family relationships and delinquency in a sample of British high school girls, using some elements of Hirschi's theory, and concluded that supervision, control, communication, and time spent together as family factors were all important in understanding the association between delinquency and family relationships.

Wilson (1987) has argued that it is the degree of parental supervision that is the important factor in controlling delinquency, but this has been disputed by Rankin (1983), who argued for the importance of the quality of the parent-child relationship itself. Supervision is, however, less likely to be effective without a close relationship between parent and child.

Veneziano (1992) examined the relationship between family social environment and delinquent behaviour with a 90-item test that asked respondents about their perceptions. The subjects were 411 male adolescents aged 12-15, committed as delinquents to a state institution. Results showed that those delinquents with the most serious behavioural difficulties came from family environments with few or no strengths, and where conflict and violence were openly expressed. Most delinquents had high levels of conflict at home, appeared to have more family problems, and exhibited more serious acting out behaviours and skill deficits.

Another aspect of family structure which has often received a great deal of attention is family size. Tygart (1991) found that youths in larger families perceive their parents as having less influence on their decision making and as being less influential in helping them to stay out of trouble. The findings of this self-report study also show that youths in such families perceive other youths as having greater influence on their decision making, and that this leads them to engage in more delinquency.

Such findings demonstrate the significance of family structure in the study of juvenile delinquency. It can be concluded that delinquency is influenced by
family break down, large family size and weakness of parent-child relationships as major elements of family form and structure. Therefore, family variables are of central interest in this study. The findings also support social control theory in suggesting that aspects of family functioning are the most powerful predictors of delinquency.

According to the literature discussed in the previous chapter, elements of supervision, parent-child relationships, parental relations, and time spent together are all important in understanding the relationship between delinquency and family relationships. It would therefore be of interest to examine more closely the relative contribution of various family factors.

Delinquency may also be a response to living in painful or punishing environments. In this case, homeless youths may have fled from one set of adverse situations, such as abuse in the home and conflict at school, only to find themselves in other stressful situations such living on the streets with peers (Hagan and McCarthy, 1992). Youths who encounter strain both inside and outside the home may also experience little social control in these settings.

Taken as a whole, the literature presented here supports the assumption in this study that family structure is related to delinquent behaviour. It should be noted that most studies which found a positive relationship between family structure and delinquency only focused on the broken home, but clearly the quality of parental relations and parent-child relationships may intervene between the broken home and delinquent behaviour. Accordingly, both broken home and parent-child relationships will be measured in this study.
3.3.2 Family socio-economic status and delinquency

The relationship between socio-economic status and delinquency has occupied much empirical work, and the debate was initiated by Show and McKay (1942), Merton (1938), Cohen (1955), and Cloward and Ohlin (1960), though a number of the early influential studies based on official data, such as the work of Show and McKay (1942), saw juvenile delinquency as largely a lower-class phenomenon.

While the role of socio-economic status in juvenile delinquency has been considered in many theories of delinquency, the major theoretical orientations differ in their presumptions about the relationship. Strain theory was developed to account for the fact that official delinquency rates were more common among lower socio-economic classes, presuming that official rates reflected reality. Cloward and Ohlin (1960) share this presumption, and include opportunities for various kinds of illegal activities as another important variable in determining specific delinquent responses.

From the subcultural perspective, the important element for delinquent behaviour is that middle class and lower class youths have different norms, values, and aspirations (Miller, 1981), but the occupational status and level of education of parents are regarded as key socio-economic factors in this approach.

On the other hand, some studies have concluded that socio-economic status and social class are poor predictors of delinquent behaviour (Empey, 1967; Erickson and Empey, 1965; Nye, 1958; Hirschi, 1969). These studies can be criticized for their inclusion of predominantly non-serious items in the delinquency check-lists that were used. Although Hirschi's control theory found no relation between socio-economic status (based on father's occupation) and delinquency, his data "show that the boys whose fathers have been unemployed and/or whose
families are on welfare are more likely than children from fully employed, self-sufficient families to commit delinquent acts" (1969: 72).

Although the direct effect of a family's socio-economic status on delinquent behaviour is often limited, socio-economic status is thought to function as a moderating variable that can mediate the impact of other factors. Mednick, Baker, and Carothers (1990) measured the relationship between broken homes and delinquency among a total of 408 Danish males. This study shows that although a significant relationship existed between broken homes and male delinquent behaviour, once controls were imposed for socio-economic status, the relationship was not statistically significant.

The occupational status of parents is commonly regarded as a key socio-economic indicator, as work provides the means by which one achieves an acceptable standard of living. The notion that unemployment leads to crime and delinquency is suggested by some theorists of delinquency, and strain theorists describe offenders as frustrated in their efforts to acquire social acceptance through gainful employment (e.g. Cohen, 1955). Strain theorists did not focus on the kind of individual who tends to commit crime and delinquency, but on the socio-economic conditions that make it likely for people to commit such offences. This approach therefore tends to be more interested in an analysis of the law and its relationship to labour market structures in society.

Various studies have adopted approaches to the labour market that are more sensitive to the dimensions of economic risk, including unemployment (Sullivan, 1978; Clogg, 1979), and working class stratification (Form, 1985). There is considerable evidence to support the proposition that the unemployed commit more of those types of predatory and interpersonal crimes which are the predominant concern of the police (Braithwaite, 1978).
Some studies have found a positive correlation between unemployment rates and imprisonment (Dobbins and Bass, 1958), also showing that crime rates rise when unemployment increases. Greenberg (1977) demonstrated a remarkable correlation between unemployment and imprisonment in Canada between 1945 and 1959.

Such literature makes an important link between social structure and individual behaviour. Whether and how an individual acts depend on individual situations, goals, interests, and opportunities which in turn are shaped by the larger social structure. Structural conditions can effectively exclude some individuals (e.g. NESB people) from conventional systems of status like occupational prestige, leaving them available to the influence of subcultural values and prestige systems. Thus, behaviour may be influenced by the relative contact with criminal subcultures versus conventional culture (Matza, 1964), as a result of one's position in the legitimate and illegitimate opportunity structures (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960).

One of the distinctive characteristics of this study is that it compares delinquent behaviour for different language backgrounds, taking account of sex differences, and examines how they are related to theorised predictors of such behaviour. Another advantage of this study is that it examines delinquent behaviour among youths outside institutional and official processing, who may differ from official delinquents on the basis of family socio-economic status, language background, sex and age.

The small volume of literature which has linked socio-economic status, family structure, attachment to family and school, and peer approval has tended to provide mixed results (Segrave and Hastad, 1985; Johanson, 1979), and none of these studies has taken account of different language subgroups. This thesis seeks to add to the literature by exploring more fully the impact of language
background, to explore whether the impact of socio-economic status differs in effect across different language subgroups.

Despite inconsistencies, some consensus has been reached on the centrality of certain aspects of family life for child behaviour. While many different family variables have been linked with delinquency, research has generally established the importance of the quality of parent-child relationships, family stability, parental control over children, and family size in relation to delinquent behaviour. It seems that there is a significant interaction between these elements of family structure and family socio-economic status in delinquency. Therefore, the two should be simultaneously examined to determine their relative importance.

3.4 School and delinquency

Although the total amount of variance in delinquency explained by family variables is high in the literature, family factors have also been related to other predictors of delinquency, including school-related variables and peer associations (Elliott et al., 1985; Patterson and Dishion, 1985). Such studies have strongly suggested that delinquent commitments result in part from the adverse or negative school experiences of some youths.

The influence of school experiences on youths is reinforced by the fact that most social activities provided for the young are organised within and around the school. Such activities furnish a wide range of activities that can be both conventional and deviant (Polk, 1975).

Schools are important places in the lives of young people because youths spend large amounts of time there and much of their social life is channelled through it. For many students who lose interest in school or a sense of belonging there, or
who confront school failure, the alternative forms of behaviour are connected with peers outside school. Membership of peer groups may require truancy, alcohol consumption, or degrees of violence.

Most young people are socialised by the family to avoid involvement in delinquent acts. Those not sufficiently socialised by the family, particularly in the case of family breakdown or disruption, may eventually learn conformity to the social norms of other social institutions. The school is one of the most important institutions given principal responsibility for this task in modern society.

Strain theory focused on the school environment and suggested that frustrated student goals and aspirations led to delinquent behaviour (Cohen, 1955), while control theory argued that there is a relationship between a lack of attachment and commitment to the school and delinquent involvement (Hirschi, 1969). According to labelling theory, the negative labelling of school failure increases the likelihood of delinquency (Lemert, 1951; Becker, 1963), and Tannenbaum (1938) found the beginning of delinquency in the reaction of parents, teachers and adult authorities to children who do not like school. The child who does not like school does not do well in that setting, which may lead to truancy as a reaction against it.

Proponents of strain theories of delinquency (Cohen, 1955; Cloward and Ohlin, 1960) argue that when youths do not like school and do not perform well academically in school, they experience the strain of frustration. This can lead them to react against school and conventional society through delinquent behaviour. Youths in this situation may seek out peers who are experiencing the same problem and may then commit delinquent behaviour.

Social control theorists (Hirschi, 1969; Hindelang, 1973; Krohn and Massey, 1980) argue that delinquency is the result of a breakdown between youths and
those aspects of conventional society that control their behaviour. They see school as a social institution in which commitment to conventional values and behaviours can be developed through getting good grades, and so attempt to develop stakes in conformity that bind youths to conventional society.

In this view, a lack of attachment to parents and teachers and a weak commitment to educational and occupational goals are causally prior to both school failure and involvement in delinquency (Hirschi, 1969; Empey, 1982). Youths who do not have high aspirations for the future, and who generally do not want to be in school, are the most likely candidates for delinquency, while the greater the degree of school attachment, the less chance of involvement in delinquent behaviour. In this study, attachment to school is operationalised by several items with refer to positive feelings about teachers and school staff.

In social control theory, the role of the school as a socialising institution has been compared with that of the family. Gottfredson and Hirschi suggest that

As compared to the family, the school has several advantages as a socializing institution. First, it can more effectively monitor behavior than the family, with one teacher overseeing many children at a time. Second, as compared to most parents, teachers generally have no difficulty recognizing deviant or disruptive behavior. Third, as compared to the family, the school has such a clear interest in maintaining order and discipline that it can be expected to do what it can to control disruptive behavior. Finally, like the family, the school in theory has the authority and the means to punish lapses in self-control (1990, p. 105).

McDonough (1986) integrated social control and strain theories in order to examine how their variables predicted delinquency in the school context. Schools were chosen from a midwestern state of USA. The results showed that
both school attachment as an element of social control theory and illegal opportunity as an element of strain theory have significant effects on delinquent behaviour. Attachment to school was seen as effective in restraining students from involvement in delinquency. Other research also shows that positive school-child relations are associated with lower delinquency (Simons et al., 1991), while poor relations with school were found to associate with more self-reported delinquency. Patterson (1986) indicated that aggressive and nonconformist children are often disruptive, with the result that they are rejected by teachers, and in turn drift into association with each other.

School-related variables were measured in relation to early delinquency and adult criminality among white and black high school males in a longitudinal study in Philadelphia (Rosen et al., 1991). This study found that blacks have higher rates than total whites for early delinquency (43% to 18%) and a lower probability of high school graduation (33% to 63%). This study also found that failing to graduate high school has an additive effect on adult criminality. Conversely, completion of high school reduces the probability of adult criminality for young people. Although this study compared two racial subgroups and found higher delinquency rates among black than white, it ignore the comparison of delinquency rates of black and white in terms of their socio-economic status.

In an empirical study of 1,717 high school students aged between 12 and 16, Hurrelmann and Engel (1992) found evidence that delinquency was associated with adolescent conformity to social standards of prestige and success. The findings show a relationship between delinquency and inability to succeed at school on the one hand, and failure to achieve full recognition of status and prestige in a peer group on the other.
It seems that, for ESB students, the behaviour patterns expected in school are usually similar to those in the home, whereas NESB students often do not understand the ways in which teachers act. If teachers have behavioural standards which are alien to disadvantaged groups, the social mix of students in school creates conflict, and in this situation youths who fail or are labelled as failures have a higher probability of becoming delinquent.

Despite the voluminous body of literature that has developed around the area of the effects of school on juvenile delinquency in a variety of countries, very little research has specifically focused on this issue in Australia. Little is known about the nature of delinquency associated with school-related variables among the Australian youths because few studies have sought to examine the problem. Most of these studies have focused on truancy, which is regarded as a form of behaviour that may lead to delinquent behaviour (Coventry, 1984; Wilson and Braithwaite, 1977).

A survey conducted by Wilson and Braithwaite (1977) at two high schools and one primary school in Brisbane, clearly indicates that strains in the relationships between teachers and students contribute substantially towards truantaing. They argued that school characteristics such as forms of governance and curriculum have been linked to truancy. This study also showed that where truancy occurs it is more than three times as likely to happen with peers than by the truant alone.

By using both qualitative and quantitative research techniques, Coventry (1984) examined the relationships between school-related variables and truancy, on the one hand, and the relationship between truancy and delinquent behaviour on the other in Victorian secondary schools. Data comprised a combination of a large volume of literature related to truancy, a longitudinal panel study, case studies, a survey of school principals and senior staff, and
discussions with school, community welfare and police personnel. According to this study, truancy was found to be more prevalent among students who regard themselves as having a lower status in school, or who are not well placed in the success flows of schools. Those students who hold negative attitudes towards school or teachers are more likely to engage in truancy.

Although the results of two above studies support the view that truancy is a response to school-related factors, and while there appears to be a relationship between truancy and juvenile delinquency, the conclusion that truancy causes delinquent behaviour is still questionable.

Polk (1983) has argued the centrality of young people's school life in explaining delinquent behaviour. He has suggested the need for integrating labour market analysis, strain theory and labelling experiences in order to measure the role of school. From labelling experiences, various peer groupings emerge. Institutional and peer experiences, together, can establish a network of social bonds that result in either stronger or weaker ties to institutional conformity. According to him, "spanning all these perspectives, an integrated theory may explain why the school seems to be so important in adolescent life, why it is that such selection procedures as tracking and grading have their power in the prediction of delinquency, and how these school processes interact with distinctive peer groupings to create trouble, rebellion, and delinquency" (1983, p. 696).

Most studies which focus on school-related variables do not investigate the relationship between the family social status of students and their delinquency. I would argue that the general correlations between delinquency and major social factors need to be analysed within the school context, both inside and outside school in relation to peer influence during the school academic years, and in the context of the relationship between social class and individual delinquency. Unlike the shortcomings of most previous studies, my research assumes that
school, family, peers, and social class all affect delinquency. Although family, school, and peers are widely studied correlates of juvenile delinquency, little attention has been given to their combined role in the explanation of delinquent behaviour.

An important assumption in this study is that delinquency is primarily a function of the level and mode of control exerted by family and the school. Communities with strong families and schools are able to discourage youth from delinquent behaviour through supervision and socialisation to conventional values, and commitment to conventional activities. It is assumed that family and school relationship variables will correlate and that the greater the influence of family and school variables, the less influence these respondents will attribute to peers.

3.5 Peer influence and delinquency

Peer groups comprise friends of a similar age and often the same sex, and play a vital role in socialisation, particularly in modern societies where young people tend to be segregated from those of other ages. They also have an important role where youth groups perform major social functions. Such groups provide a mode of transition from family life to independent adult status and allow members to learn new social skills.

Peer relationships have been central to most delinquency theories and research, and there is general agreement that delinquency occurs most often within a group context. Merton (1957) believed that some young people from disadvantaged groups engage in illegal activities because some of their needs can only be satisfied outside the family and school. They are typically in rebellion against family and school and form delinquent peer groups where they can resocialise to new norms. He sees delinquent peer groups as linked to the
class structure and his research confirms such a relationship. He argued that, "the combination of high aspirations for success with low opportunity for achievement leads to collective attempts to use illegal methods of achieving the same goals" (Merton, 1957, pp. 131-94).

Social control theory and subcultural theories emphasise the relationship between peer influence and delinquent behaviour (e.g., Erickson and Jensen, 1977; Zimring, 1981; Reiss, 1988). The major claim here is that differences in adolescent crime and delinquency rates are due to differences in group membership. Looking at peer delinquency as an element of both control theory and subculture theory, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1987) have argued that there is a high degree of overlap between peer delinquency and the respondent's own delinquency. They suggest several reasons for this, including

"1) the respondent may have been at the scene, himself engaging in the activity,

2) the respondent may impute his own qualities to his friends, [and]

3) the respondent may impute friendship to people like himself" (1987, p. 598).

Therefore, items measuring a respondent's delinquency and peer delinquency may be measuring the same thing.

Youths who tend to dislike settings that require discipline, supervision, or other constraints on their behaviour, including school, work, and home, tend to spend their leisure time in the streets with a same-sex peer group, and it may be expected that these youths will be more likely to be delinquent.

Research on the family also demonstrates the importance of looking at interactions among peer variables. In relation to peer influences most attention
has been focused on family breakdown, family control, physical punishment, and attachment to parents (Agnew, 1991; Henggeler, 1989). Arguments in this area have also been stimulated by theories of social control, differential association and subcultural deviance.

Much of the research designed to prevent and control delinquency has focused on peer groups (Elliott, et al., 1985; Agnew, 1991; Giordano et al., 1986; Linden and Hackler, 1973), and has begun to focus on several dimensions of interaction within those groups. Giordano et al., (1986) pointed to the rewards of friendship, identity support, time spent with friends, and the pressure that friends exert on one another to behave in certain ways as the major dimensions of peer interaction. Each of these dimensions can affect the influence of the peer group on the individual and as a result on delinquency outcomes. Linden and Hackler (1973) argued that four dimensions should be considered in relation to peer associations: closeness to associates; visibility of the adolescent's behaviour to associates; the responsiveness of associates to the adolescent's behaviour; and the behavioural preferences of the adolescent's associates.

Some studies have focused on factors outside school such as home background and cultural heritage (Polk, 1975; Hirschi, 1969), yet have seldom emphasised causal factors in school, such as student-teacher relationships.

In a national probability sample, Elliott, Huizinga, and Ageton (1985) found that involvement with delinquent peers directly predicted self-reported offences, and that family difficulties predicted involvement with delinquent peers. DiLalla et al., (1988) tested the interaction of parental conflict and peer influence on delinquency, particularly aggressive behaviour, from a sample in the southeast U.S.A. They found that youths from families with parental conflicts were more likely to have higher rates of delinquency with peers.
Since young people lack any significant power in school or the family, spending much of their free time with peer groups may be attractive to them. In the peer group they can indulge in behaviour such as smoking, drinking alcohol, petty crime and violence, that may be frowned upon in school or at home. However, the response of young people to their position in school and the family varies considerably in practice. White (1993) has shown that many of the crimes committed by young people within peer groups in Australia are crimes of boredom (vandalism, car theft), crimes of survival (shoplifting, burglary), crimes of depression (alcohol and drug use, violence), and crimes of sexuality (status offences).

Young people may at one moment be treated as an adult with certain rights, or be told by parents and teachers that they must act like an adult, while in the next moment they may be forbidden to do something because they are too young or because of a rule made by the school or parent. This inconsistency can create tension, and much of the activity of young people is directed to escaping the authority figures of school and home. Participating in peer group activities is one haven available to young people.

It is my hypothesis that if an adolescent does not succeed in being accepted by his or her family, does not succeed in establishing an appropriate social position in society, and experiences failure at school, this can lead to conforming with peer delinquents. This study attempts to explore the relationship between peer involvement and delinquent behaviour by moving beyond the measurement of peer approval.

Despite the large number of studies that have examined the effects of official delinquent peers the issue of peer relationships in the general population and its linkage to delinquency is largely ignored. In most studies (e.g. Elliott et al., 1985;
Miller, 1981), the number of friends who are delinquent have been related to the frequency of delinquent acts which youths commit.

Another shortcoming of most delinquency research is that there is much more focus on boys than girls. In response to the widely recognised need to extend theories of delinquency beyond just males (Harris, 1977; Smart, 1977; Klein, 1973; Leonard, 1982), a major objective of the present study is to explore the relationship between gender, peer group influences and delinquency.

This study will begin with the assumption that peer approval and friendship relations are complex social bonds that will likely always be described incompletely if reliant on a single factor (e.g. time spent with delinquent peers).

Following the theoretical discussion in the last chapter, I propose that an integration of strain, subculture, and social control theories can integrate situational, background and developmental factors related to delinquent behaviour. A key to this integration is a focus on adverse conditions at home and school that may lead to delinquent activity. For example, when youths suffer parental abuse and neglect at home, this may lead to youths taking to the street, living with peers, and committing delinquent behaviour. The integrated approach also acknowledges that an absence of family and school ties can result in adoption of, and by, peers, when the presence of strain and absence of control can lead to delinquent behaviour.

3.6 Conclusion

In conclusion, I return to the question of why NESB youths are more likely to commit delinquent acts. NESB immigrants may be disadvantaged in several ways. First, they may be ignorant of the contents of the law to a greater degree than ESB people. Second, the functioning of the Australian criminal justice
system may be unfamiliar. Third, they may be ignorant of the assistance available for legal problems through agencies such as Legal Aid centres and Clerks of Court. Fourth, some NESB migrants come from lower socio-economic groups than the Australian national average, and official delinquency rates tend to be higher in lower socio-economic groups.

Most studies of juvenile delinquency in Australia have argued that immigrant youths are more at risk of committing delinquent behaviour than others (Cox, 1985; Francis, 1981), but the reasons for this have yet to be tested on a systematic basis, and little clear evidence is available. Official data from the police or courts are generally not collected or organised with a view to explaining juvenile delinquency. Moreover, newspaper stories have often been discounted as sensational and unreliable (Wooden, et al., 1990).

NESB youths may commit delinquent behaviour because of an inability to achieve social goals, particularly if they do not obtain adequate support such as transitional schooling, training programmes, counselling, and special scholarship provisions. They may also be socialised within a delinquent peer group. But without clear evidence such arguments remain speculative.

As far as the family and delinquency are concerned, two general areas of research are included this study. The first is family structure, which involves the quality of family relationships, family stability, family size, and parenting skills in the management of children (Hirschi, 1969, 1977; Patterson, 1982). Secondly, this research focuses on whether differences in family socio-economic status can explain delinquent behaviour. Although family structure has been found to have a strong independent effect on delinquent behaviour, it is also assumed that a family's socio-economic status may affect delinquency and therefore it is included in this analysis.
Another general issue which this study attempts to address is the importance of school-related variables, and school is hypothesized to be associated with delinquent behaviour.

To summarise, this study will measure the comparative strength of the relationship between several independent variables and delinquent behaviour. In its sample of male and female young people, it is hypothesized that language background, family socio-economic status, family structure, school-related variables, and peer influences will all be related to delinquency.
This chapter has two general objectives. The first part of the chapter attempts to identify and measure the socio-economic status of people living in the Illawarra region, including a description of the specific socio-economic problems of NESB migrants. The second part of the chapter discusses the official data relating to youth offences in the region by age, sex and ethnicity, extracted from a database of offences recorded by the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research and the Office of Juvenile Justice from 1989 to 1993.

4.1 Socio-economic characteristics of the Illawarra region

4.1.1 Introduction

The Illawarra region is the third largest urbanised region in New South Wales and the second largest non-metropolitan area in Australia. It is located to the south of Sydney and is centred on the city of Wollongong. This region consists of three local government areas—Wollongong, Shellharbour and Kiama (McDonald and Wilson, 1991). There is also considerable variety within the Illawarra between people and the social environments in which they live, highlighted by differences in education, employment opportunities, and economic, social and environmental factors affecting youth and the unemployed, yet the region has a socio-economic identity which distinguishes it more clearly as a regional economy than is the case with other regions in NSW. The economic
predominance of Wollongong/Port Kembla, the demarcation from metropolitan Sydney provided by the Royal National Park, and the central role of a narrow range of related economic activities all contribute to a distinct regional focus.

The Illawarra has a particularly high proportion of people from non-English speaking backgrounds and the migrant community is diverse in regard to countries of origin. The Illawarra is one of Australia's great industrial regions. A high proportion of the male workforce is in "blue collar" occupations and the unemployment rate for the region is significantly higher than for NSW or Australia generally. There are also considerable differences in educational levels within the Illawarra. In some areas such as Warrawong and Unanderra, where the number and diversity of NESB migrants is greater than elsewhere, and the socio-economic status of residents is often low, the number of youths involved in deviant behaviour is higher than for other local areas or NSW generally.

4.1.2 Patterns of immigration in the Illawarra

By the end of the nineteenth century Wollongong was the commercial centre of the Illawarra. Discussions about the creation of a new harbour near Wollongong had been promoted by two considerations. One was the need for larger and deeper facilities than those provided by Belmore Basin. The other was the New South Wales government's awareness of the attraction of the Illawarra as a place for industrial development because land was available close to coal mines and the sea (Mitchell and Sherington, 1984).

Patterns of immigration in the Illawarra region have been influenced by the need for unskilled labour for regional industries, particularly the steel industry dominated by BHP, and most of the migrants by the end of Second World War began their life in the Illawarra as unskilled workers in the steel industry.
The immigrants who arrived in the greatest numbers between WW11 and the mid-1970s show the highest levels of employment concentration in manufacturing industry. In the early period they were typically eastern and southern Europeans, and later, from Turkey and west Asia (Morrissey et al., 1992). The majority of migrants were unskilled and from a rural background, and made up more than 70 per cent of the extra workers needed in the steel industry. They were followed by a large number of migrants from Germany, Austria, and Holland, and by southern European migrants from Italy and Greece and to a lesser degree from Spain (Geisler, 1990).

Patterns of migrant residence within Illawarra region are explicable in terms of the classical ecological processes identified by the Chicago School. Early groups settled in the Illawarra because regional industries, such as BHP and coal mines needed a workforce. Decisions about residential location were made more complex by ethnicity, level of integration, and the processes of adjustment and assimilation. The process of adjustment in turn has been influenced by immigrant characteristics such as sex, age, degree of familism, marital status and so on. Other factors which have affected the process of adjustment are socio-economic characteristics such as occupation, income level, and level of education.

In general, before World War Two the NESB population was at low levels, declining from 4 per cent in 1901 to 2 per cent in 1933. Between 1947 and 1961 the proportion increased rapidly from 2 per cent to 9 per cent, and this has increased again in recent times because of continued immigration from NESB European countries and from other countries such as Vietnam and the Philippines (Nieuwenhuysen, 1992). Indeed, the post-World War Two growth and development of the Illawarra region has been heavily dependent upon the influx of large numbers of NESB immigrants, who have settled in areas that are easily accessible to industrial centres such as Port Kembla, Wollongong, Cringila and Warrawong.
In 1981, 53% of Wollongong's population were either immigrants or had at least one parent born overseas, compared to 41 per cent in Australia overall (Keys and Wilson, 1984). Wollongong also has the highest percentage of NESB migrants at 27 per cent, and the 1986 Census shows that immigrants came from 89 countries to the Illawarra region. In all, 24 per cent of the Illawarra's population was born overseas, and 12 per cent came from NESB countries. Thus, the impact of immigration has been much higher than in NSW or Australia generally.

4.1.3 NESB migrants as a disadvantaged group

NESB migrants who have settled in the Illawarra often encounter major problems, such as high unemployment rates, poor English language ability, low income, and concentrated ethnic residence affecting adjustment.

NESB workers have been hard hit by restructuring and the decline of manufacturing and construction over the last decade. During the period 1981-89 a labour-replacing technological change has occurred in the region's two major industries, steel and coal (Morrissey et al., 1992), and workers displaced from manufacturing have not been re-employed in the service sector to any significant degree. During this period, NESB workers were discriminated against in the process of change when compared with other workers, and have experienced long-term unemployment. Unemployment rates for overseas-born workers have been higher on average than for the Australian born, through rates have varied substantially by ethnic group. For example, between 1980 and 1990, 41 per cent of the Yugoslavian male labour force, 23% of Italian, 64% of Vietnamese and 19% of Germans have been retrenched from BHP Port Kembla, while the percentage was 5% for Australian-born male labour and 14% for UK/Ireland born (Morrissey et al., 1992).
NESB workers have a higher unemployment rate than the Australian-born and also a higher rate than ESB immigrants. In the analysis of unemployment rates, after controlling for English language proficiency, migrants from Yugoslavia and Italy were found to be less likely to be in employment than migrants from other NESB countries (Morrissey et al., 1992).

Although a lack of English language proficiency can be a source of labour market disadvantage for NESB immigrants, a number of studies found that even NESB immigrants who spoke English well were disadvantaged compared to native English speakers. Beggs and Chapman (1988) found that the employment effects of education were not the same for NESB immigrants as for the Australian-born. Wooden and Robertson (1989) argued that at all levels of education the Australian-born are found to have lower probabilities of unemployment than the overseas born. They also suggested that post-school educational qualifications from overseas do not have as large an effect on employability as do the same level of qualifications obtained in Australia, but that this was only true for NESB migrants.

The economic and social problems that make settlement in rural areas difficult for NESB immigrants are similar to those that make remaining in rural areas difficult for many country people. An important survey (Gray, et al., 1991) shows that immigrant settlers in rural areas of the Illawarra region are disadvantaged in terms of their capacity to recognise and access service agencies and to find jobs. The survey also shows that the Illawarra's rural people in general have been identified as a disadvantaged group because of the distance of their communities from capital cities and their limited access to services.

Another study undertaken by the Australian Housing Research Council (1989) pointed to some particular problems with housing in rural areas. Although housing is relatively cheaper in rural areas, it can still be very expensive for
people with little money. While employers in areas with large immigrant populations are more likely to be used to hiring immigrants and indeed may be immigrants themselves, in places where immigrants are viewed more like strangers, the chances for cooperation and assistance are less and the possibility for discrimination greater.

Youth in disadvantaged ethnic groups tend to be less secure, more confused about their sense of identity, and to be underachievers at school and in work. They appear to experience more difficulty than others because they possess, or are thought to possess, characteristics which render them less acceptable to the host society (Borowski and Murray, 1985). When the situation of an ethnic group is such that its youth are disadvantaged, then delinquent behaviour in particular may be determined by the causes of that disadvantage.

The assumptions of this section are that marked disadvantages exist for NESB migrant communities which have arrived since the end of WW2. They have been shown to have very high levels of unemployment, poor English language skills, and problems in adjusting to their new social environment. I also assume that a number of ethnic communities can be identified as being more disadvantaged than others.

4.1.3.1 Employment and unemployment

During the past two decades, the massive economic changes that have taken place in Australia have transformed labour market conditions, the nature of work, and work organisation. Modern technology is organized around professional and technical staff requiring high levels of training and experience, whereas a significant proportion of the work force is unskilled (Nieuwenhuysen 1992). Such changes may encourage the growth of illegitimate alternatives
among those who are jobless in order to satisfy their economic needs. The restructuring currently occurring in the Illawarra's industries has affected the life of immigrant workers, especially because of the non-recognition or non-utilisation of overseas qualifications, and poor English language skills.

From the late 1970s, it became obvious that the regional steel industry would not survive without massive technological change through the processes of automation, computerisation, and technological innovation. For this reason, not only did the steel industry reduce the number of workers it required, it also made changes in the type of worker required. The introduction of a new range of skills effectively reduced the aggregate amount of physical labour associated with steel making. Changes in production techniques also took place in the coal and textile industries, in turn affecting service sector employment. It seems that NESB workers have been differently affected by these changes in employment, because new production techniques tend to demand high levels of English language ability.

The Illawarra Region over the last decade has had significantly higher unemployment rates than the NSW average or Australia as a whole. Since June 1981, the region's unemployment situation has dramatically worsened as a result of the redundancy of workers in manufacturing and mining and associated job losses in other sectors. Between late May 1981 and early January 1984 those receiving unemployment benefits rose from 6,043 to 15,271 (Keys and Wilson, 1984). In 1989 the unemployment rate for the Illawarra region was 11 per cent compared with 7 per cent for NSW, but this figure was double for migrants (ABS, 1989, 7,1,26). To the north and south of Lake Illawarra, and also in Bellambi, between 45% and 70% of all males in the workforce are employed in the least skilled or unskilled jobs and are therefore often in the least well-paid positions (McDonald and Wilson, 1991).
One of the most important regional changes has been a decrease in the employment of young women and an increase in the employment of older women in part-time, low waged, and low skill jobs. Between 1985 and 1989 women's full-time employment grew by 22%, but for 15-19 year old women it dropped by 4%. In the same period, full time employment for 15-19 year old males grew by 9% (Polk and Tait, 1990). Such changes may lead to increased tension in the home. The inability of young women to engage in the public sphere may lead to rebellion against their families, directed against authority relations within the household and arising from resentment at being treated like children.

The unemployment rates in suburbs dominated by migrants, such as Cringila, Lake Heights, Warrawong, Port Kembla and Primbee to the south of Wollongong, and Fairy Meadow to the north, are particularly high. These suburbs also show the highest percentage of unskilled workers. In 1986, 26% of all migrants in Wollongong were employed as unskilled workers, whereas in "migrant suburbs" 40% of the migrant labour force comprised unskilled workers (Wollongong City Council, 1989).

One study has shown that delinquent behaviour was higher during periods of unemployment, particularly for youths ages 15-16 who had had lower status jobs when they were in employment (Farrington et al., 1986). Some young unemployed people come to rely on the informal waged economy, the informal unwaged economy, or the criminal economy for their survival (White, 1989), and working-class families cannot provide an adequate living for many young people because the labour market only provides legal access to an income just above the poverty line.
4-1-3-2 English language proficiency

For migrants from non-English speaking backgrounds, language is a significant feature of disadvantage. An unskilled person with poor English language ability is likely to have a lower income and a greater ignorance of the labour market system, which in turn may result in increased deviant behaviour.

The ability to speak, read, understand, and write English is an important skill which affects the daily life of ethnic groups in the Illawarra region. Lack of English language skills not only creates lasting isolation through the inability to communicate with neighbours and others, it also greatly affects performance in the labour market. One survey among Arabic-speakers in Cringila showed that the majority of men had predominantly poor to no English skills (Geisler, 1990). Those who have only a limited capacity to use the English language will also have the greatest difficulty in effectively accessing community services. Moreover, those who are the most recent immigrants, particularly women and older people, tend to be most disadvantaged linguistically.

The highest proportions of people five years of age and over and born overseas who declared themselves in the 1986 Census as speaking English either "not well" or "not at all" are heavily concentrated in the low income, blue collar suburbs near Port Kembla, but the proportions remain surprisingly high over much of central Wollongong, probably reflecting the concentration in that area of newer immigrants from Southeast Asia.

The occupational conditions and social mobility of immigrant workers have also been influenced by the racism, prejudice and discrimination against them. The majority of immigrants from Yugoslavia, Turkey and Lebanon are unskilled, with poor English language ability, and have suffered a high degree of racial prejudice which has heightened their disadvantage in the labour market (Morrissey et al., 1992).
For NESB workers, it is quite clear that the major effect of structural changes in the Illawarra's two industries—steel and coal—have created long-term unemployment. NESB workers have rarely been re-employed because they have much lower ability in English as a result of working for many years in an environment that neither made much demand for that skill nor provided an opportunity to acquire it. Therefore, NESB workers have been much more vulnerable to the consequences of structural change, making the labour market experience of NESB workers different from that of other workers.

A study of English language competence undertaken at the beginning of the 1980s showed very low levels of English language ability among ethnic groups with high participation in the steel industry labour force (Morrissey et al., 1992). Changes in production techniques in the region's industries have tended to increase the need for language skills, meaning that NESB workers would be more adversely affected.

The importance of English language speaking ability should not be underestimated. Wooden (1990) analysed the 1986 Census data and indicated that, compared with an Australian-born control group, persons who speak English poorly, or not at all, have a probability of unemployment which is about 15 percentage points higher in the case of males and 8 percentage points in the case of females.

Immigrants are also systematically discriminated against within the labour market on the basis of ethnicity. A major strand of thought believes that there is a significant group within the population which expresses racist and ethnocentric prejudice against immigrants. The result is both direct and indirect forms of discrimination which influence the jobs, housing and services available to immigrants (Feagin, 1993). This approach assumes that prejudice and discrimination are consequences of political and economic systems which
militate against particular ethnic groups, or of economic competition between immigrants and the locally born for jobs and other economic necessities. In such a scenario, the natural economic motivations of employers will be overridden by their prejudices.

As a result of both discrimination and the lack of English language proficiency, NESB migrants are under-represented in professional and managerial fields regardless of their qualifications and experience, and it seems that many do not utilise the qualifications they obtained overseas. NESB migrants may therefore experience employment problems in this region which are quite different from any previous experiences.

4-1-3-3 Cultural conflict

A great degree of cultural differentiation has been found among NESB migrants in the Illawarra region, against the relatively high level of homogeneity characteristic of Anglo-Australian culture, and immigrants have often suffered in racial disputes. The Community Justice Centres of NSW showed 255 family disputes and other cultural conflicts for 1987-88 in Sydney/Wollongong, including matters related to gender, lifestyle, generation, class and religion (Fisher and Long 1991). In this survey, racism was mentioned as a factor in disputes amongst three NESB immigrant groups: Arabic-speaking, Italian, and Pakistani.

Cultural conflict has always existed in some immigrant families, particularly amongst Middle Eastern immigrants. Arabic-speaking migrants have expressed a lot of concern about their children. Like most migrants the loss of their young to Australian culture, involving alienation from parents, and the dangers of Western society are traumatising for parents. The Muslim community is particularly
concerned about the problem of their children growing up outside the Islamic value system, and Muslim immigrants in Cringila have been very vocal about the need to keep their children off the streets and to give them something useful to do (Geisler, 1990).

First generation immigrants have usually brought with them the set of norms prevalent in their original countries, and have a distinct behavioural style including language and preferences for leisure time activities. It has been established that within some groups, such as Indian immigrants, familial values provide the normative framework for behaviour. An important survey of Indian immigrants shows that male dominance and female subordination are considered part of the natural order of things. It was also found that parents desire their children to adhere to the parents' culture and to practise their language and religion (Dhruvarajan, 1993).

The generation gap experienced by many migrants is compounded by language problems, which broaden and deepen the gap, and the very ability to communicate between parents and children. Arabic culture stresses the importance of women as educators of their children, but mothers often lose contact if they cannot speak English, and the children often refuse to talk to their parents in their native language. Almost all second generation migrants have better English language skills than their parents, and a greater ability to operate in Australian society. It seems that this inter-generational conflict and the stresses of living in two worlds may lead to maladjustment and delinquency.

To sum up, one of the important factors related to immigrant delinquency is the result of a conflict between the norms of the immigrants' original culture and those of the new culture, exacerbated by rapid transition from one culture to another. This can lead to a gradual loss of primary group controls, particularly noticeable in the family. Parent-child relationships may be weakened by the
process of migration, because immigrants have been unable to set up well-defined behaviour patterns for their children, especially the younger ones.

4-1-4 Conclusion

The first part of this chapter has suggested a number of factors which may influence the socio-economic status of NESB migrants compared with other groups. Most important would appear to be discrimination in the labour market, birthplace, level of English language proficiency and the presence of cultural conflict.

This section has also looked at the socio-economic status of NESB workers as a result of technological changes that have occurred in the region's two major industries and concluded that NESB workers have been progressively disadvantaged and as a result have experienced long-term unemployment. Since official delinquency rates tend to be higher in lower socio-economic groups this tends to place such migrant groups at higher risk of being arrested for delinquent behaviour.

Finally, the focus on cultural conflict in NESB immigrant families between parents and their children seeks to provide an explanation for the delinquent behaviour of some migrants. It seems that cultural conflict can lead to a generation gap between the first and second generations during settlement in the host society, and possibly lead to juvenile delinquency.

In this chapter I have focused on socio-economic disadvantages in the Illawarra region which are assumed to be related to delinquent behaviour. Both strain and subculture theories argue that delinquent behaviour is positively linked to socio-economic disadvantages (Merton, 1938; Cohen, 1955; Cloward and Ohlin, 1960), while subculture theory has sought the cause of delinquency in the
conflicting subcultures of highly differentiated societies (Miller, 1958). Based on these two theories, one of the hypotheses of this study is that under a higher level of socio-economic disadvantage delinquent behaviour should increase. Following social control theory, another hypothesis of this thesis is that delinquent behaviour is negatively affected by attachment to parents. Attachment to parents as a major proposition of Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory may in turn be affected by family socio-economic status. In other words, low socio-economic status may aggravate both parental relationships and parent-child relationships, so that the influence of parents on their children is determined by the family’s socio-economic status. As a result, youths living in socio-economic disadvantage may be more vulnerable to committing delinquent behaviour.

I have also argued that NESB migrants are living under more socio-economic disadvantages than other groups. They appear, for example, to experience long term unemployment because of their lower English language proficiency, and suffer discrimination in the labour market. Youths in such disadvantaged groups can not be assisted by their families and may be at risk of committing more delinquent behaviour than others. Therefore, the overall influence of language background on rates of delinquency needs to be qualified by the extent to which NESB youths are living under socio-economic deprivation.

The most general conclusion from the previous section is that there are important differences between NESB youths and other groups in terms of their socio-economic status. The proposition that the lower class is more delinquent than the rest of population has dominated strain and subculture theories, and is a central assumption of this thesis. Therefore, if there is high delinquency among NESB youths as a minority group, it may be attributable to their socio-economic disadvantage rather than to their language background.
4.2 Official data on juvenile delinquency

In this section, I review several categories of deviance recorded by local police in the Illawarra region. I also describe the juvenile offence rates for a range of violent and property offences comparing rates in the Illawarra with those for NSW generally during the period 1989 to 1993. This description takes account of characteristics such as age, sex, and ethnicity.

4-2-1 Delinquent behaviour in the Illawarra region

In this section, I review malicious injury, common assault, assault on females, assault on police, domestic violence, and illegal drug supply and use as major categories of crime in the Illawarra region.

The category of malicious injury includes damage to public or private property, regardless of the motive. Incidents of malicious injury have been calculated as an index based upon the proportion of population within each area, and this shows that Windang, Coledale, Port Kembla and Albion Park have higher levels of malicious injury than other areas. The highest incidence occurs in areas where most families are at socio-economic disadvantage (McDonald and Wilson, 1991).

Common assault is defined as all assaults which occur in public places, usually between males and often related to the consumption of alcohol. Most incidents reported to police occurred in central Wollongong, Berkeley and Windang where the average annual income is less than $15,000 (McDonald and Wilson, 1991). People who live in these areas have been classified as having a lower level of mobility (for example, having no, or only one car) than the state or national averages. According to the 1986 Census, Berkeley has a higher level of people living in poverty than the state or national average, as well as having several different ethnic communities. Home ownership is low, and the number
living in government housing is six times the state or national average. Moreover, the level of listed community services is surprisingly low for youth and adult support, health advice outlets, welfare agencies, and other services such as charity and aged care.

Assault on females refers to any direct physical assault on a female by another person in their own or someone else's home. Police officers were most commonly called to assist women in central Wollongong. This area is recognised as a dangerous zone for women, and there are consequently opportunities for women to participate in community activities here. Other areas of high violence towards women are Bellambi, Corrimal, Warilla, Warrawong, Port Kembla and Nowra (McDonald and Wilson, 1991).

The highest rates of assaults on police were found to be in central Wollongong, Berkeley, Cringila, and Dapto. Berkeley-Cringila is an industrialised area close to the steelworks, and Berkeley has high levels of families in poverty and high numbers of female headed single parent families living there. In Cringila there is a large Yugoslavian community and smaller communities of other NESB people. Australian-born citizens are almost 40 per cent fewer in Cringila than in New South Wales or Australia generally, with 43 per cent of the local population in Cringila having difficulty speaking English (McDonald and Wilson, 1991). Although some areas with high unemployment, such as Port Kembla and Unanderra, are also recognised as being involved with illegal drug supply and use, the distribution of such behaviour is not restricted to either lower socio-economic groups or more affluent communities. Kiama with a high level of employment and as a high income area, displayed similar levels of illegal drug supply and use as Unanderra or Port Kembla (McDonald and Wilson, 1991).
4-2-2 Delinquent behaviour in NSW and the Illawarra from 1989 to 1993

Offences data were extracted from a database of all offences recorded by the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research from 1989 to 1993. The offence classification system is based on the Australian National Classification of Offences (ANCO) which is used for both adult court appearances and children's courts. The main categories used are:

1- violent offences, such as violence against the person, robbery, and sexual offences;

2- theft offences, such as break and enter, stealing a motor vehicle, and shoplifting;

3- drug offences, such as dealing, trafficking and cultivating; and

4- 'other' offences including those against good order and offences not elsewhere classified.
# Table 4.1

## Means of recorded offences during 1989-1993 in NSW and the Illawarra region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>Illawarra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Rate, per 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>2976</td>
<td>508.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>4016</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>5454</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking and entering</td>
<td>95950</td>
<td>1591.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>44000</td>
<td>753.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving</td>
<td>6099</td>
<td>104.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle theft</td>
<td>49450</td>
<td>846.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>131500</td>
<td>2247.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>2310</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicious damage to property</td>
<td>49525</td>
<td>845.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession and/or use of cocaine</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession and/or use of narcotics</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession and/or use of cannabis</td>
<td>11210</td>
<td>191.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing, trafficking in cocaine</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing, trafficking in narcotics</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing, trafficking in cannabis</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating cannabis</td>
<td>2557</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive behaviour</td>
<td>12631</td>
<td>216.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 shows the means of five years (1989-1993) of offences in both NSW and the Illawarra region. For some offences, such as murder, robbery, fraud,
receiving, and motor vehicle theft, the statistics show relatively low rates of crime in the Illawarra compared to the NSW average. Two interpretations of this result are possible. The first is refereed to the demographic structure of regions in New South Wales regions.

New South Wales is an urbanised state with more than half of its total population of 6 million living in Sydney, however, only 355,1000 live in the Illawarra region (Department of Planning, 1994). The city of Sydney has a demographic structure unlike that of other cities or suburbs or of New South Wales as a whole. The metropolitan area of Sydney experiences the highest rate of crime. In 1987-1988, the court conviction rates in urban areas show the highest rates for all property offences are in Sydney (898 per 100,000 population), while the rate for Wollongong is 340. The conviction rate for all offences against the person for Sydney is 454 per 100,000, whereas for Wollongong it is 335 (Devery, 1991). The high rate of crime in the Sydney region has affected the rate of crime in NSW generally, and made the rate of crime in NSW high in comparison with the Illawarra region.

Generally speaking, a variety of investigations shows that social environment affects types and rates of crime and delinquency (Shaw and McKay, 1942; Burgess, 1967). Therefore, it seems plausible that delinquency and crime occur more frequently in Sydney (particularly inner Sydney) as a metropolitan area than Illawarra. A considerable difference has been demonstrated statistically in this respect. For example according to NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research (1991), murder, robbery, fraud, receiving, and motor vehicle theft for Sydney have been 1.5, 143.6, 948.1, 106.4, and 1188.6 per 100,000 population, while these data for Illawarra have been 0.3, 36.5, 292.6, 80.8, and 875.9. While these differences are more pronounced if comparison made between Inner Sydney as the heart of urbanised life in NSW, and Illawarra as a semi urbanised
region (5.7, 694.4, 4467.9, 401.2, and 2674.8 for Inner Sydney in comparison with 0.3, 36.5, 292.6, 80.8, and 875.9 for Illawarra region).

The differences between rates and types of crime and delinquency will be reduced when a comparison is made between Illawarra and a like area in terms of their demographic and socio-economic characteristics. For instance, there is lesser differences between Hunter and Illawarra (in comparison with differences between Sydney or Inner Sydney and Illawarra) in terms of murder, robbery, fraud, receiving, and motor vehicle theft. According to NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research (1991), Illawarra has been identified by 0.3, 36.5, 292.6, 80.8, and 875.9 per 100,000 population and the corresponding for Hunter have been 1.0, 37.6, 386.2, 79.8 and 446.9, respectively. The comparison partly demonstrates more similarities than dissimilarities between these two areas. It can be concluded that, apparently similar characteristics of urbanisation develop similar crime and delinquency rates by a function of urbanisation.

The study of crime and delinquency in urban areas has a long history among researchers, and began with the work of Shaw and McKay (1942). Significant correlations were found between the rates of crime and delinquency and the development of urbanisation, which led to theories that urbanism leads to a breakdown in some mechanisms of social control, which in turn lead to delinquency and crime. They suggested that in areas with high rates of crime and delinquency, criminal behaviour was almost a traditional aspect of social life, where involvement in crime and delinquency was transmitted from one generation to the next.

Research in the area of criminology and social geography has focused on the socio-economic and demographic conditions associated with crime. Where the city is the unit of analysis, the size and density of the population, the proportion of poor, people, and proportions of black residents have all been demonstrated
to have consistent positive statistical relationships with the crime rate even when controls for other socio-economic and demographic characteristics are introduced. One reason for the higher crime rate in large cities is that the dispersion of activity away from the home has a greater impact on the crime rate due to higher levels of anonymity and correspondingly lower levels of social cohesion and informal surveillance (Rahav, 1981 and Ray, 1985).

The second possibility is in the relationship between urbanisation, sociocultural composition, and crime in NSW. Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967) explained delinquent behaviour in terms of cultural conflict in urban areas, arguing that individuals in such areas are socialised into deviant local subcultures and act most "naturally" when they break the law. Sellin (1938) noted that conditions of cultural conflict arose in urban areas where cultural borderlines often exist. Delinquency, as a systematic response to subcultural strains, appears when the local juvenile group is large enough to develop a delinquent subculture.

Some types of offence may be particularly likely to go unreported. These include cases where victims are related to offenders, and where fear or a lack of power (especially in the case of female or child victims) militate against the offences being reported. A number of steps must be taken between a crime being committed and a person appearing before the courts. These stages include discovery of the crime, reporting the offence, an arrest by police, and the offender being charged. Some offences are more also likely to be discovered than others, but may or may not be reported to the police. For example, motor vehicle thefts are much more likely to be reported than sexual assault, because the former must be reported to police for insurance purposes. Even when a suspect has been identified, the police may, for various reasons, choose not to proceed with the matter (Wundersitz, 1993). The most recent Crime and Safety Survey in NSW (Australian Bureau of Statistics 1991) indicates that only about
30 per cent of completed break and enters in NSW are reported to the police.

**TABLE 4.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Against Person</th>
<th>Sexual Offences</th>
<th>Break &amp; Enter</th>
<th>Steal Motor</th>
<th>Theft, Other</th>
<th>Property Damage</th>
<th>Offensive Behaviour</th>
<th>Firearm &amp; Weapons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against Person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Offences</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break &amp; Enter</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steal Motor</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft, Other</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive Behaviour</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm &amp; Weapons</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Delinquency reported by police for a seven year period from 1986/87 to 1992/1993.

Table 4.2 presents the matrix of delinquency index intercorrelations. It shows three kinds of delinquency can be hypothesized as major indices from official reports: (i) violent offences, including violence against the person and sexual offences; (ii) theft offences including break and enter, steal motor vehicle, shoplifting and theft; and (iii) other offences including firearm and weapons, property damage, offensive behaviour.
This table shows that positive correlations exist between most offence categories, although in some cases the correlations are small. Table 4.2 shows that for NSW all offences against the person and property are an acceptable indicator of variation in the specific offences against person (e.g. assault) and specific property offences (e.g. break, enter and steal).

Thus, although the intercorrelations between the four kinds of delinquency are not high, they show a significant validity for selecting items to measure delinquent behaviour.

4-2-3 Juvenile delinquency related to age, sex and ethnicity

Data were extracted from a database recorded by the Office of Juvenile Justice in NSW from 1989 to 1993 for NSW and the Illawarra region. This data set contained some demographic characteristics of delinquents, including age, sex, and ethnicity.
### TABLE 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>Illawarra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 15 Years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years and over</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESB</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESB</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 shows the proportions of delinquents detained in juvenile justice centres in NSW and the Illawarra region in terms of age, sex and ethnicity. The distributions show some very clear differences.

One of the most consistent and basic findings in delinquency statistics is that delinquency tends to peak in the late teenage years. About two thirds of delinquents in NSW and the Illawarra were aged 15 years and over. One of the reasons for this may be that young people are progressively less subject to parental control as they grow older. Social control theory suggests that the willingness to engage in delinquent behaviour is distributed unequally among age groups because the costs of apprehension are different for persons of
different ages (Hirschi, 1969). The effects of parental control on delinquency may also be reduced with increasing age (Hirschi, 1977; Rosen, 1985; Seydlitz, 1991).

This table also shows that young women are under-represented. In 1993, only 7% of delinquents in NSW’s detention centres, and 22% in the Illawarra, were girls. However, it is necessary to consider what such differences really mean, and whether such statistics are the best measure of delinquency.

The significant difference between male and female delinquency rates suggests that gender is a determining factor in young people’s involvement in the juvenile justice system. The most important difference in the delinquency of girls and boys may be due to differences in the socialisation of males and females which involves different activities, different constraints, and different patterns of accepted behaviour.

The relatively low rate of involvement in delinquent activities by girls may be due to the greater participation of young men in public behaviour such as sport, drinking and street leisure, where the opportunities for committing delinquent activities are high. Even if girls are not as delinquent as boys (or are delinquent in different ways), we still need to account for this with other techniques of data collection, such as self-reporting.

Table 4.3 also shows that the proportion of official delinquents who are Aborigines is slightly higher than the proportions of ESB and NESB youths. Approximately a quarter of young people in the Illawarra and NSW detention centres are Aboriginal, though Aboriginals comprise less than two per cent of young people in NSW (Australian Housing Research Council, 1989).

The over-representation of Aboriginal young people in detention centres is often not a reflection of real rates of delinquent behaviour. This may be due to a
bias in the juvenile justice system, where Aboriginal youths are detained for longer periods because they are supposed to be at higher risk of delinquency. An recent study found that Aboriginal young people are 36 times more likely to be charged than others (Youth Justice Coalition, 1990), which may help to explain elevated official rates of delinquency. Such differences can also be linked with socio-economic disadvantage, institutional racism, and prejudice. One of the reasons of high level of Aboriginal offences could be differential treatment in the juvenile justice system. The justice system is unjust to visible minorities who are already socially and economically disadvantaged (Milne, 1983).

4-2-4 Conclusion

This brief analysis of official data on delinquency shows that there are a number limitations on its use. Official data shows that the majority of delinquents are male, above 15 years old, and the proportion of delinquents who are Aborigines is higher than the proportions of ESB and NESB youths.

Differences in the offence rates between Aboriginal, NESB, and ESB youths should be discussed in the context of family socio-economic backgrounds, but there is little evidence about parental occupation or family background in the police and court records. Official information therefore can not show a complete picture of juvenile delinquency in this region, and we cannot introduce measures to deal with juvenile delinquency without having comprehensive information about the characteristics of delinquents.

It may be that differences in delinquency rates arise from the ways in which delinquency is measured and conceptualised for official use. The official data is based on records of individuals who admit committing offences but takes no
account of the context in which the offence occurred, nor often the severity of the offence. For example, a juvenile who admitted stealing $5 from his friend may be treated as a property offender in the same category as a juvenile who has committed a sophisticated supermarket burglary. It is clear that these offences differ both in severity and in their social context. Therefore, the study of juvenile delinquency need to pay greater attention to these issues of context.

In official data on juvenile delinquency, there is no clear means to separate variations in the rates among different ethnic groups from the effects of bias in the official measurement of offending. Official data cannot provide enough evidence to suggest why the rates of delinquency for one group are higher than for another, so it is not a strong predictor of delinquent behaviour in terms of correlations between immigrant status and family, social, economic and home environment factors. An adequate explanation of juvenile delinquency can only be provided by a complex of demographic and family factors.

A very small proportion of young people become involved with the formal juvenile system in Australia. In 1988-89 only 41 cases per 1000 of the youth population were processed by the juvenile justice system, either by way of a formal police caution or a court appearance, and only 4 per cent were targeted for some form of official intervention. In 1990-1991 the rate of official intervention by the juvenile system was 27 cases per 1000 of the youth population (Wundersitz, 1993). Wundersitz found that in comparison with other states, NSW on a per capita basis recorded the lowest number of youths being processed, either by way of an official police caution or a court appearance.

In relation to the official data on offences it can be concluded that there exists a 'dark figure' that remains undetected, unreported and unrecorded (Jensen and Rojek, 1980). Research suggests that this figure greater for juvenile delinquency. For example, an American study has indicated that as little as three
per cent of delinquent acts for which there could have been an official reaction actually result in a conviction (Griffin and Griffin, 1978).

Although most NESB immigrants do not have the ability or confidence to communicate in English, police do not always use interpreters when needed, and unqualified or inappropriate persons have often been used. A 1991 survey of 332 NSW police officers found that professional interpreters were used on average less than ten times during the past year, even though officers estimated that they encountered language problems an average of fifty-two times during that year (Chan, 1994). When interpreters are not used in criminal investigations, the language disadvantages suffered by NESB migrants may be further compounded by their cultural fears and inhibitions.

It should be reiterated that data generated by the police and courts are often poor indicators of crime and delinquency. This is because there are significant sources of variation in official crime data that have nothing to do with the variation in the number of crimes committed. Although in NSW, where a specialised governmental bureau exists to compile and publish crime data, official crime statistics, such as those used here, are a product not only of young people's offending behaviour, but also of the way in which the juvenile justice system itself operates (Wundersitz, 1993). The methodology employed in this study therefore seeks to address some of these deficiencies.

Despite the fact that official records of juvenile delinquency are sometimes useful, such as in studying the processes of the juvenile justice system, the existing data is inappropriate for the purposes of the present study, which seeks explanations for delinquency as a behavioural variable.

On the basis of the theories which have been chosen for this study, demographic, socio-economic status, and attitudinal variables are regarded as central in explaining delinquent behaviour. Therefore, this study attempts to
explore relationships between these variables and delinquent behaviour in the study population. Information derived from official sources such as police and court records is insufficient to explore issues such as attitudes towards parents and teachers, or the extent to which youths are attached to their parents and school. Therefore, I have chosen to generate the data by means of a self-administered anonymous questionnaire.
CHAPTER FIVE

Methodology: Research Design and Measurement

5-1 Introduction

This chapter explains the hypotheses underlying the integrated theoretical approach used in this study. It also describes the design and initial measurement strategy used in my research. The debate over whether, and how, delinquency research is possible raises issues such as: the questions that can be asked; the concepts and language in which those questions can be formulated; the method of collecting data and sampling; statistical procedures; the method of administration; and limitations.

A quantitative methodology is adopted and the study aims to describe the nature and extent of delinquency among both ESB and NESB youths. A self-report procedure was used to collect the required data.

In order to measure delinquent behaviour in relation to background variables, I used dependent and independent variables, and chose a survey as the appropriate method. In this chapter, I will explain the dependent and independent variables and introduce the data collection technique, levels of measurement, and research questions. I will also explain why I chose the self-report method. This chapter then covers the technical aspects of research, such as the construction of questionnaires for data collection, drawing a random sample, and statistical procedures for analysing data.

This research does not involve manipulated treatments because both independent variables and dependent variables have already occurred. Therefore,
I began with delinquent behaviour as the dependent variable and measurements of socio-economic factors as independent variables in order to determine their effects, if any, on delinquent behaviour.

5.2 Hypotheses

This study is based on the hypothesis that each variable drawn from strain, subculture, and social control theories can play a role in generating delinquent behaviour. In accordance with these theories, the study centers on the roles of socio-economic status, family, school, and peer associations, and determines the relationships between them and delinquency.

Strain, subculture, and social control theories offer different perspectives in the explanation of delinquent behaviour, but the central implication from both strain and subculture theories is that delinquent behaviour should vary according to socio-economic status. Both those theories posit that certain members of society because of their relative class position are driven to delinquent behaviour. Strain theory postulates the greatest amount of delinquency amongst lower class youth (Cohen, 1955), because they are more likely to perceive obstacles of access to legitimate social advancement opportunities than their middle or upper class contemporaries (Merton, 1938; Cloward and Ohlin, 1960). Other frequently stressed variables in subculture formulations are delinquent associates and peer approval of delinquent acts. Cloward and Ohlin (1960) suggest that delinquents are socialized within cohesive peer groups to hold values and attitudes which permit illegal behaviour.

Social control theory, on the other hand, makes no assumption about the relative strength of social controls or bonds in different socio-economic classes. It focuses instead on the strength of socialization practices, particularly in the
family and in school, to determine the degree of juvenile conformity to social norms. My hypotheses therefore seek to link propositions about socio-economic status with these more general control variables in relation to delinquent behaviour. These different approaches were tested by using a self-report technique which measured delinquent behaviour in terms of each of the main concepts in these three theories.

All the statements of strain, subculture, and social control theories cannot be tested in detail by a single self-report study, so I have omitted some elements of these three theories. Delinquency has been related to so many variables it is not possible to measure all of them in a single questionnaire. Moreover, most empirical studies confirm that some elements of these theories are not important. The bond of involvement as an element of social control theory, for example, is ignored because most empirical research has suggested it is unimportant (Elliott et al. 1985; Agnew, 1991). I have therefore restricted my attention to variables which previous research has shown significant for these particular theories.

The survey investigates two major hypotheses linking socio-economic status, attitudinal factors and delinquent behaviour. The first hypothesis proposes that as socio-economic status increases, delinquent behaviour is expected to decrease. This is an important statement of both strain and subculture theories. In the context of this hypothesis, my study also distinguishes the socio-economic status of NESB youths and ESB youths in relation to juvenile delinquency. The second hypothesis argues that delinquent behaviour will be related to several variables drawn from social control theory, such as attitudes towards parents and school. The relationship between peer approval of delinquent acts and delinquent behaviour, which has been considered in subculture theory, will also be tested.
Age, sex, residential area, and language background have been included as the major demographic and individual variables. These have been implicated as major contributors to variations in delinquent behaviour by previous researchers (Empey, 1982; Hirschi, 1969; LaGrange and White, 1985; Jensen and Rojek, 1980; Shaw and McKay, 1942). Hirschi's (1969) social control theory focused on age as a key demographic variable and suggested that the willingness to become involved in delinquent behaviour varies among different age groups because the costs of apprehension are different for individuals of different ages. Gender also was one of the best predictors in Hirschi's theory. He believed that the most important difference in the delinquent behaviour of males and females may be due to differences in their socialization in the family. Language background has been selected as a major demographic variable because it may be linked with socio-economic status. I will try to measure and discuss the differences in the amount of delinquent behaviour between ESB and NESB youths in the context of family socio-economic background. Residential area has been chosen because it may be linked to systems of social control. Youths outside urban areas may be less involved in delinquent behaviour because of wider networks of personal relationships and informal systems of social control. The relationship between such factors and delinquent behaviour will be measured in this study.

5-3 Survey method

The purpose of this research is analytic and attempts to test combinations of several key theoretical variables related to delinquent behaviour. Official data is not always available for all of these variables, particularly for attitudinal issues. Questions related to attitudes may be personal or private, and young people especially may not wish to detail their behaviour openly. This study partially
addresses this by using a survey method that assured respondents their responses would remain confidential and anonymous.

The survey method is a tool that has an important contribution to make in sociology (Miller, 1983), and it is often used to test hypotheses about how some variables affect others. The survey may be defined as an inquiry which involves the collection of systematic data across a sample of cases and the statistical analysis of the results (Miller, 1983).

Survey research has been utilized to obtain data on respondents' backgrounds, opinions, attitudes, and reasons for behaviour. Background data includes information on variables such as sex, age, residential area, language background, marital status, education, occupation, family-child relationships, cultural differences, school-related variables, the influence of peer groups, and delinquent behaviour.

Surveys allow the study of subjects in broad selected samples from the population and measurement of the relative incidence, distribution, and interrelation of sociological variables. Surveys can also be used in studies where the direct unit of analysis is the individual and indirectly the group. This characteristic of the survey method has been utilized for my research, because I want to ask questions of individuals and then try to account for their delinquent behaviour. Moreover, in a survey method, we can discover what associations occur between phenomena by looking at changes in variables across different cases, and looking for characteristics which are systematically linked.

5-4 Population and sample selection

The population in this research consisted of all students enrolled in the high schools of the Illawarra region in 1994 from grades seven to twelve. A single
member of the population is referred to as a sampling unit. In order to choose sampling units, I used probability sampling to compare two groups of NESB youths and ESB youths, aged 11 to 17, on measures of socio-economic factors in relation to delinquent behaviour.

A large data set was necessary to complete the subgroup analysis in order to examine the hypothesized interactions. Because the purpose of this research is analytic, the sampling criterion should be to obtain a sufficient amount of variation in key variables such as socio-economic status, sex and language background. The sampling procedure was designed to maximise variance in delinquency and to represent the general youth population of the Illawarra region. The sample plan was designed to produce roughly equal proportions of respondents in respect of gender, social class and geographical area of residence. The procedure was conducted in two stages: selection of schools, and sample selection of each school.

Subjects were selected from high school students in the Illawarra region and stratified random sampling was employed. Stratification was based on area of residence. First, the Illawarra region was divided into two zones on the basis of family income, families who earned less than $15,000 and families earning above $15,000 annually, in accordance with previous research (McDonald and Wilson, 1991). The selection procedure attempted to build in representativeness by using postcodes to select each area and school. The postcodes of each zone were used to determine the location of each high school in the Illawarra region. Two schools were selected randomly in relatively lower income areas, and two in higher income areas. Single-sex schools and private schools were not included.

The size of the sample of high school students was 600, comprising 150 from each of four schools. The sample was randomly selected from the lists of 7th and 12th grade students supplied by the schools. Students who were older than 17
were excluded. The sample is a true probability sample, because each person's chance of selection is known equally.

5-5 Method of data collection

The fundamental sources for gathering information in delinquency research are: participant observation, official records, and self-reporting. The various techniques of data collection all have limitations and weaknesses. It also true that any one method is not totally appropriate for all purposes. In order to choose the best technique, we must decide if the technique will work with the particular questions and in the particular settings of a given study.

Participant observation is a systematic description of events and behaviour in the social setting chosen for study. Through such in-depth observation, meanings may be attached to behaviour. Major advantages of participant observation are that it is based on how reality is perceived by the subjects themselves, and that it looks at delinquency in its natural setting. Through participant observation researchers can look at delinquency as a dynamic phenomenon rather than a statistical relationship between some independent variables and delinquency. Critics of participant observation claim that researchers are confronted with a massive amount of data and must therefore make decisions about which items are significant. Another problem is that participant observation may only allow a very small amount of delinquency to be observed.

Most theories of delinquency are based on the assumption that delinquent behaviour is concentrated among young, urban, lower-class males, with especially heavy concentrations among ethnic and disadvantaged groups. Such theories were developed in the ecological studies of Burgess (1967) and Shaw
and McKay (1931), along with the work of Merton (1956), and Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967). Research studies based on official statistics have confirmed these earlier pictures (Hirschi, 1969; Braithwaite, 1981), and official statistics serve as the main source of support for such theories.

In contrast, more recent theories start from the assumption that delinquent behaviour occurs in all social classes and in all age groups, and that almost everyone commits delinquent behaviour (Schur, 1973; Taylor, Walton and Young, 1973). Official data may thus reflect the activities of the criminal justice system rather than the level of criminal behaviour, so that official statistics are not objective pictures of the social reality of delinquency.

Supporters of the participant observation technique criticise studies based on official records because: (i) an unknown number of offences are never discovered; (ii) some offences such as prostitution and rape are not reported to official institutions, or when reported are not recorded; and (iii) some offence categories are very broad in terms of their definitions over time and place.

A number of researchers have made the point that official data on criminal behaviour do not reflect the true level of offences being committed (Kitsuse and Cicourel, 1963; Box, 1981). They have argued that such statistics are affected by the operation of the organisations producing the statistics and the activities of individuals within these organisations. Official data on deviant behaviour are often produced by people in governmental organisations which define, classify and record certain behaviours and people as criminal.

Although official crime and delinquency statistics shows that some groups, such as Aborigines, NESB immigrants, and the working class are more criminal or delinquent, this is not necessarily because they are more likely to offend. The essence of this view is that youths from low socio-economic status are systematically discriminated against in the juvenile justice system. "There is now
a compelling body of research which argues that crime statistics are a measure not of crime but of the assumptions of crime recorders. The working class, some ethnic groups and Aborigines are believed to have criminal tendencies by many of those responsible for justice administration” (Bulbeck, 1993, p. 374).

At the point of referral to court, some groups, such as NESB immigrant youth, Aborigines, and lower class youth, may be referred more often and for less serious delinquent acts. Moreover, sometimes the rate of reporting offences to the police is higher in some areas than in others. For example, in Australia, the criminal justice system exhibits bias against young disadvantaged groups such as Aboriginal youth and the working-class, and official data shows that Aboriginal youth were 36 times more likely to be charged than non-Aboriginals (Youth Justice Coalition, 1990).

While the over-representation of working class, Aboriginal, and other disadvantaged youths in recorded crime and delinquency rates and as inmates in institutions is not a reflection of the real rate of crime and delinquency, it is still likely that the crime rate for young disadvantaged groups is higher, in terms of the established links between unemployment, disadvantage, institutional racism and individual prejudice (Farrington et al., 1986).

It can also be argued that wrongful convictions might have occurred. Huff, Rattner, and Sagarin (1987) in a survey of criminal justice personnel showed some major contributing causes of miscarriages of justice in Australia. These cases usually refer to aspects of unprofessional police investigation that are considered significant in the miscarriage, the manner in which evidence has been presented or the unreliability of such evidence, use of secondary sources such as unreliable police or prison informers, media pressure conducive to a hasty or prejudicial coverage of the case, and trial processes such as erroneous judicial instructions.
NESB immigrants are more likely to be arrested, and more likely to be sent to court. If sent to court, they are more likely to receive a severe disposition. In contrast, delinquent behaviour committed by individuals from dominant groups is much less likely to receive a prison sentence (Fergusson et al., 1993). Thus, in view of the process of forming official data, the end product is often not a valid indicator of the level of delinquent behaviour, so that in using official statistics we need to be aware of such limitations.

In the self-report method, respondents are asked by questionnaire or interview to state the number of offences they have committed and the frequency. The basic aim is to obtain valid and more reliable information. Self-reports may range from in-depth unstructured interviews, to brief questioning, or more formal interviews. Researchers usually administer questionnaires to a sample of a population in order to learn about the distribution of characteristics, attitudes, beliefs, or sets of these.

There are some definite advantages in self-reporting. One is that it allows the researcher to get large amounts of data quickly. Other advantages can be accuracy in measurement and the ability to generalise to a larger population within known limits of error. Self-reporting also allows for a greater variety of information than with official records. Questionnaires are usually first tested by administration to small groups to determine their usefulness and reliability.

Like official records, the self-report technique has limitations and weaknesses. Researchers expect respondents to give honest answers about their delinquency involvement. However, some delinquents may tend to hide their delinquency, while others may tend to exaggerate. Delinquents may not be willing or able to share all the information that is needed. The varying definitions of delinquency across different cultural and subcultural groups is another source of bias. Thus,
the interpretation of data is dependent on what we already know from other sources about the phenomena under consideration.

Although a full picture of juvenile delinquency can never be obtained, in this research I will use self-reported juvenile delinquency in school students in order to compare the extent of delinquent behaviour among NESB youths with that among ESB youths. This study needs information related to key variables on which official data is sometimes unavailable. It was assumed that existing official data would not meet all the study requirements, and was therefore inappropriate. Moreover, the hypotheses in this study are based on the respondents' attitudes and socio-economic characteristics, which might not be discovered through participant observation for such a large sample. Therefore the self-report method was seen as the most useful tool for obtaining information, though evidence will also be derived from official statistics on young offenders to augment the data.

While self-report studies are not without their difficulties, at present they remain one of the best instruments for studying juvenile delinquency. The limitations outlined above can reduce the validity and reliability of this method, so in order to address this problem, respondents in this study were assured that confidentiality would be protected. They were told that the research was entirely anonymous, participation was voluntary, neither students nor their school would be identified, and that they could refuse to continue with the questionnaire at any time. One problem associated with anonymous self-reporting of delinquency is missing information. However, I consider the advantages of this procedure (such as greater willingness to participate) to outweigh the disadvantages.
5.6 Questionnaire development

The major steps in developing the questionnaire were as follows:

1- Initially guidelines were developed to define clearly the concepts employed and to explore some ambiguities related to them and their definitions.

2- A direction paragraph to introduce the questionnaire, explaining its purpose, seeking co-operation, and stressing the anonymity of replies was provided in order to reassure participants. Their rights of respondents to voluntary participation, withdrawal at any time, and answering questions in whole or part, were clearly indicated (Appendix A).

3- Approval was obtained from the Human Ethics Committee at the University of Wollongong, the Department of Education, and individual, schools (Appendix C).

5.6.1 Questionnaire design and level of measurement

The questionnaire consisted of three types of questions: 1- closed questions; 2- open questions; 3- scaled questions. Closed questions offer respondents clear answers to be indicated in the relevant box (e.g. sex, parents' educational attainment). The advantage of closed questions is that they are easy to use and analyse. However, they also restrict responses to a fixed answer, or may suggest responses that have not been thought about by respondents previously.

Open questions take a form in which the researcher is left to categorize the answer written by the respondent (e.g. Which country were your parents born in?).
The third kind of question was the scaled question. Attitude scales play an important role in question design. They usually consist of a set of statements which the researcher has designed based on a theoretical framework and the respondents are then asked their opinion of, or attitude toward, these. This sort of question is useful since it is possible to test a series of attitudes around a particular topic without relying on one question as the indicator. Attitudinal questions are usually sets of statements about topic, with responses ranging from agree to disagree or none to a lot. Respondents are instructed to tick the response option that best reflects their position on each item. Individual respondents are then given total scores on the basis of the sums of their ratings. These total scores are taken to indicate the respondent's position in respect to the attitude topic. This approach, because it has many items, reduces the effect of one-sided responses and increases the reliability of responses as against the single item questions.

5.6.2 The structure of the questionnaire and operational definitions

I developed some indicators in the questionnaire to measure the research questions of this study. For many variables, the development of indicators is simple (e.g. age, sex, residential area, family size), but for others, it is more complex (e.g. parent-child relationships). For this reason, I have made a scale for measuring variables in the questionnaire.

The questionnaire includes a large number and variety of items concerning family socio-economic status and youths' attitudes towards parents, school, peers, and migrants. This number and diversity of items was needed because delinquency is created by different and multiple factors. The questions cover both background variables and a delinquency scale.
I distinguish between dependent and independent variables. Delinquent behaviour as the dependent variable is affected by socio-economic factors as independent variables. Socio-economic factors are symbolised by $X_i$—thus, $X_i = X_1 + X_2 + X_3 + \ldots$. Where, for example, $X_1 = $ parents' occupation. Delinquent behaviour items are symbolised by $Y_i$, so $Y_i = Y_1 + Y_2 + Y_3 + \ldots$. For example, where $Y_1 = $ running away from home. If I want to test whether $X$ has an effect on $Y$, I have to measure $X$ and $Y$ on a variety of different subjects.

The questionnaire consists of questions that can be divided into four categories: demographic and autobiographical, socio-economic, attitudinal questions related to independent variables, and questions related to delinquent behaviour as the dependent variable.

### 5.6.2.1 Demographic and autobiographical variables

This category includes questions about regional distribution as well as age, sex, school grade level, language background, family size, and family disruption. A total of seven autobiographical variables were obtained about each respondent. Given the intercorrelation between age and grade level ($r = .91$), only age is used in the analysis.

In this study, the age grouping for 'youth' has been defined according to the NSW juvenile court system as persons aged 11 to 17. In most Australian jurisdictions a distinction is made between those under 17 or 18, and persons over that age. Until that age a person is considered a 'juvenile', and after that an 'adult', which has different consequences for police and court processing (Tait, 1994).

Language background comprises two different language subgroups, NESB youths and ESB youths. NESB youths refer to young people in Australia who
were either born in a non-English-speaking country, or born in Australia with one or both parents born in non-English-speaking countries (Federation of Ethnic Communities' Councils of Australia, 1991: 3). In this sample, all other youths are defined as ESB youths.

Family size and family disruption were variables included from control theory. Family disruption or a 'broken home' was defined by the situation in which one or two biological parents did not reside with the child as a result of divorce, separation, desertion, or death. Families were divided into two groups, broken and intact.

5.6.2.2 Socio-economic status

Questions in this category derive from strain and subculture theories, and relate to educational attainment as well as the occupational situations of parents.

One of the factors that may be used as an indicator for socio-economic status is income, because it is very closely associated with the economic or material circumstances of the family. Poverty has a direct effect on the quality of family life through bad housing, malnutrition and higher rates of sickness. Also, it has indirect effects on family relationships. Poverty, especially if it occurs over a long period of time with financial insecurity, may influence value orientation (Bank and Finlayson, 1973). The effects of poverty, whether direct or indirect, can influence the perceptions of individuals and lead them to develop a negative attitude toward social activities.

However, measuring and collecting accurate data on income presents well-documented difficulties (Linke, 1984) including the fact that juveniles may have little knowledge of parental incomes, so I have avoided the direct measure of income as an indicator of socio-economic status.
The second item that is well established as an indicator for socio-economic status is level of education, and in a great deal of research on juveniles the levels of parental education have been used (Bank and Finlayson, 1973). The effects of parental education are pervasive, and can affect a family’s style or way of life, parent-child interaction, linguistic style, values, and behaviour. The index of education in this study includes the educational levels of both parents and children. The levels of parental education were grouped into five categories from low to high, namely primary school, middle high school, end of high school, technical college, and university/CAE.

The third factor that is widely used as an indicator for socio-economic status is parental occupation, which is closely linked to income and level of education. It is also convenient to use this indicator because it is derived from information which can be easily collected and coded, and it is an item which juveniles are more likely to know. Its link to income, a major factor in socio-economic status, makes it the most suitable single indicator of socio-economic status (Bank and Finlayson, 1973).

Occupation also correlates highly with class position when measured by income and educational level, and further relates to values, norms, beliefs, attitudes, and goals. Using occupation as a criterion allows correlation of delinquent behaviour with elements within the family that are important in control theory. In this study, occupation is also used as a specific indicator for the more general notions of financial difficulty and family social status.

In order to group parental occupations I used the Australian Bureau of Statistics’ Australian Standard Classification of Occupations (ASCO), introduced in the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations (1983), which is a prestige ranking of occupations in Australia (scored 1-8 in the direction of increasing prestige). Respondents were asked the occupational title of their parents. The
responses to these open-ended questions were then categorised into the eight groups: labourers and related workers; plant and machine operators, and drivers; salespersons and personal service workers; clerks; tradespersons; para-professionals; professionals; and managers and administrators.

The criteria for defining socio-economic status and social class are nonetheless vague. Researchers have most frequently turned to father's occupation as the main indicator, because there is much evidence for its validity and reliability as an index of position along a socio-economic status continuum (Hirschi, 1969; Feather and Cross, 1975; Johnson, 1979; Segrave and Hastad 1985; Gold, 1970; Williams and Gold, 1972).

In this study, family socio-economic status has been measured in different ways in relation to delinquency. In the first stage, delinquency was tested by father's education, mother's education, father's occupation, mother's occupation, father's job situation, mother's job situation, work shifts, and work days per week as separate major factors.

In the second stage, the levels of parental occupation were collapsed into three classes from low to high as follows: (i) lower class occupations: labourers and related workers, plant and machine operators, and drivers; (ii) middle class occupations: salespersons, personal service workers and clerks, and tradespersons; and (iii) upper class occupations: professionals, para-professionals, managers, and administrators. These classifications have been used in other recent research in Australia (Anderson and Vervoorn, 1983; Patton and Noller, 1994).

In the final stage, I chose father's occupation as the criterion defining family socio-economic status and determined the proportion of variance explaining delinquency by family socio-economic status within other independent variables (e.g. attitudes towards school).
Father's occupation has been chosen as a criterion of family socio-economic status because in Australia, the number of men employed is higher than the number of women. In August 1992, Australia's labour force consisted of 3.6 million women and 5.0 million men (Castles, 1993, p. 118). Most women (43%) were employed part-time, compared to 11% of employed men (Castles, 1993, p. 124). Australian Bureau of Statistics surveys in 1991 found that in New South Wales, the main reasons women gave for working part-time were that they preferred it to full-time work, that their children were too young to be cared for by someone else, or that they preferred to look after children themselves (Castles, 1993, p. 124).

A considerable percentage of women has been employed in casual labour. In August 1992, 31% of female employees were employed on a casual basis compared to 16% of male employees (Castles, 1993, p. 124). The distribution of women's work is also skewed. More than half of all employed women are found in two occupational groups, 31% as clerks and 24% as salespersons and personal service workers, while only 4% of women were employed as tradespersons in comparison with 23% of men (Castles, 1993). Mother's occupation may therefore not be a good predictor for explaining delinquency because it is not as clearly indicative of family socio-economic status.

5.6.2.3 Attitudinal questions

Questions on attitudes towards parents, school, peers, and migrants cannot be closed questions because these are qualitative variables which must be converted into quantitative data by using attitude scale measurements. An attitude is an action or reaction tendency when an individual confronts a certain situation. The attitude of an individual can be defined by positive, neutral, or negative feelings about the issue in question. (e.g. an immigrant child is more
likely to be involved in delinquent behaviour: a- agree; b- don't know; c- disagree).

For measuring items such as attitudes towards parents, school, peers, and migrants, sociologists have used scaling techniques such as those of Likert, Guttman and Thurstone (Nachmias and Chava-Nachmias, 1976). Scales are ordinal measures of a variable, and scaling techniques can rank-order subjects according to certain variables.

Attitudes towards parents were measured by how a child described his or her relationship with parents, relations between parents, enjoyment of time spent with parents, the degree of freedom which the child wished to obtain at home, levels of physical punishment, the amount of free time spent with the family, and the incidence of disobeying parents. In relation to physical punishment, students were asked to indicate whether they would characterise parents as typically engaging in physical punishment as a means of parental discipline.

Attitudes towards school include educational aspirations and attitudes towards school life. Those who aspire to educational success are assumed to be pursuing conventional lines of behaviour and therefore be less likely to engage in delinquent behaviour (Hirschi, 1969). Educational aspiration was measured by a closed-ended question which asked respondents to indicate the kind of education they wanted to obtain. This variable ranged from year 10 to university.

Attitudes towards school were operationalised by questions exploring the way in which a student described the treatment of students by teachers and school staff, the respect shown by teachers towards students, the student's liking for school in general, and whether students discuss their personal problems with teachers.
Attitudes towards peers were measured by asking students the extent to which their classmates and friends are concerned about them, their enjoyment of time spent with friends, whether they discuss personal problems with their friends, and whether they spend free time with their friends. Such items have been developed and used by other researchers in order to measure peer involvement in relation to delinquent behaviour (Johnson, 1979; Elliott et al., 1985; Pabon, et al., 1992).

One of the assumptions of delinquency theorists is that most delinquent behaviour is committed in a group (Johnson, 1979; Elliott et al., 1985; Pabon, et al., 1992). Despite the large number of studies (e.g. Agnew, 1991; Giordano et al., 1986; Linden and Hackler, 1973) that have examined the effects of delinquent peers, the issue of the nature and quality of peer relationships and their linkage to delinquent behaviour is largely unclear and unresolved. This research points to several dimensions of peer relations, not just with delinquent peers, that may condition the effect of peers on behaviour. Some evidence for this broader approach is provided by the observation that, although 75% of adjudicated juveniles commit offences in concert with other juveniles, only 30% of these juveniles indicate that they are regularly involved with a group of friends who are involved in crime (National Institute of Justice, 1990). This suggests that many are committing delinquent behaviour in concert with a group of peers whom they do not consider to be, or do not have as, their primary delinquent friends.

Peer relationships in general cover the patterns of interaction and influence, such as the amount of time spent with friends, and the pressure that friends exert on one another to behave in certain ways. Peer relationships may offer youths opportunities for committing delinquent behaviour by providing many types of support (e.g. providing a comfortable arena in which to express identity concerns). In my thesis, this dimension of peer influence was measured by
asking students the extent to which their classmates and friends are concerned about them.

Such arguments have a direct bearing on differential association/subcultural deviance theory. Sutherland (1939) argues that the influence of significant others on a juvenile is in the direct encouragement of delinquency, so that "a youth commits an act of delinquency in response to an excess of attitudes favoring law or norm violation, at that time, and that principally he has attained this excess in association with others" (cited in Shoemaker, 1990, p. 151). Matza's (1964) subculture theory suggested that group membership may promote a delinquent response in certain situations, such as when there is a lack of family supervision. He believed that those who admitted involvement in delinquent behaviour were more likely to approve of such behaviour than those not involved. Juveniles often commit delinquent behaviour because they think their friends would approve of such behaviour.

For measuring attitudes towards migrants, I organised 13 items in relation to cultural conflicts or cultural differences which can exist in differentiated societies like Australia. These scaled items refer to cultural identity (e.g. migrants in Australia should be free to maintain their own cultures), discrimination (e.g. migrants cannot get a job as easily as other Australians), prejudice (e.g. migrants are more likely to be involved in delinquent behaviour.), equal opportunities (e.g. migrants should have the same political rights as other Australians.), and affiliation with the dominant culture (e.g. people who migrate to Australia should change their behaviour to be more like other Australians). Subculture theory has sought the cause of delinquency in the conflicting subcultures of highly differentiated societies (Miller, 1958). In areas with high delinquent behaviour, there is usually a wide diversity of norms resulting from cultural diversity and a lack of assimilation by immigrant groups (Sumner, 1994). This argument has continued in both strain and subculture theories through the work
of Merton (1938), and has been developed by Cohen (1955), and Cloward and Ohlin (1960), for example, have suggested that pressures toward delinquent behaviour originate in the perceived discrepancy between goals prescribed by the dominant culture and anticipated possibilities of achieving them by socially approved means (Voss, 1966).

For each attitudinal question, a range of one to five is scored. Most of these attitudinal items have been used by previous researchers who sought to integrate elements of strain, subculture, and social control theories (Johnson, 1979; Segrave and Hastad, 1985).

5.6.2.4 Delinquent behaviour

The literature on juvenile delinquency encompasses a variety of meanings, dimensions, and definitions. In this study, I have used a working set of behaviours that this thesis seeks to explore, but it may be useful to review some definitions of the concept of juvenile delinquency which have been used by other researchers, in order to locate the specific acts which serve as the focus for this thesis. I would also argue that consideration of the appropriateness of behaviour in terms of age is necessary for an adequate definition of delinquency.

In the early twentieth century the concept of 'juvenile delinquency' was modified to fit the law's view of responsibility when an offence is committed by a young person (Glaser, 1974). The development of the concept arose from the belief that during adolescence, the transitional age range between childhood and adulthood, individuals are only partially responsible for their behaviour. The legal definition of delinquency refers to an illegal act which is formally recorded in the juvenile records of the police or courts (Schlebusch, 1979). While a delinquent is a person under a legally specified age whose behaviour is illegal
and can be dealt with by a juvenile court, such behaviour may not necessarily be considered a crime if the youth were an adult.

Two main definitions of delinquency are evident in the sociological literature. In the first, the unit of analysis is a type of behaviour or a class of behaviour (Cohen, 1959; Cloward and Ohlin, 1960; Hirschi, 1969). The second definition concentrates on delinquency in reference to persons as well as groups, particularly gangs (Miller, 1958; Matza, 1964; Lemert, 1951; Becker, 1963; West, 1982). In this approach, the focus shifts from the act to the person or group involved.

Strain and social control theories were designed with attention to delinquent acts. Cohen suggested that "in order to build a sociology of deviant behavior, we most always keep as our point of reference deviant behavior, not kinds of people" (1959, p. 463). Hirschi stated that "delinquency is defined by acts, the detection of which is thought to result in punishment of the person committing them by agents of the large society" (1969, p. 47). Similarity, Cloward and Ohlin believed that delinquency "is behavior that violates basic norms of the society, and, when officially known, it evokes a judgment by agents of criminal justice that such norms have been violated" (1960, p. 3).

In most research, investigators have employed official contact with a law enforcement agency as the criterion of delinquency and have classified young people as delinquent or nondelinquent on this basis. Researchers also sometimes used lists of the offences which could lead to a criminal record in the courts. For example, West (1982) in a survey of 400 young males in London used behaviours from a standard list of offences used by Scotland Yard. Other writers refer to delinquency in terms of a 'delinquent subculture' and take delinquent gangs as their object of research (Matza, 1964; Miller, 1958). Here the unit of analysis is the group, and focus is on delinquency as a group phenomenon, or
activity in a group setting. Miller (1958) defined groups or gangs as delinquent on the basis of the frequency or seriousness of delinquent activity and on the proportion of members having official delinquency records. In the view of labelling theorists, 'delinquency' is a status and they consider the process whereby a youth is labelled delinquent (Lemert, 1951; Becker, 1963). A young person is 'delinquent' because of the labelling reaction by society and moral authorities (such as teachers, police, courts, and mass media).

These varied definitions of delinquency have affected the form of research. Those who have defined delinquency as illegal acts usually selected some type of official record or institutionalisation as the criterion of delinquency and a sample of non-institutionalised youths as the control group (Linden and Hackler, 1973; Zimring, 1981). In these investigations, juveniles in the general population were assumed to be nondelinquent even if they had committed undetected but serious delinquent acts.

Awareness of these distinctions in considering research results is essential, as is the linkage of appropriate operational definitions of delinquency with the different usages of the concept. Defining delinquency solely as an illegal act, for example, creates a problem, because the legal definition of what constitutes a delinquent act may alter from time to time following changes in the law or in recording policy. It also ignores any delinquent behaviour which does not result in official processing.

As stated in Chapter Two, in this thesis delinquent behaviour refers to a continuum of behaviours among youths. Delinquency refers to violations of laws by persons younger than a specified legal age (which may vary between jurisdictions) and may include acts (such as running away from home or school) that are not considered criminal when committed by adults (Shoemaker, 1990), but attention in this study will also focus on behaviour which is legal, drawing
on sociological definitions of delinquency that go beyond legal definitions to see delinquency as a socially and culturally derived term (Schlebusch, 1979).

Where behaviour is in contradiction with the value demands of a dominant culture in which a youth lives, such behaviour may be regarded as delinquent without necessarily breaking the law. In this sense, a delinquent act is not simply illegal. The advantage of such an approach is that a comprehensive understanding of the causes of such behaviour may in turn lead to an understanding of the process whereby young people are socially characterised as delinquent.

This study has also interpreted delinquency in behavioural terms and referred to patterns of behaviour, defining undesirable conditions (e.g. low socio-economic status, and family disruption) that can lead to such behaviour. I have used a list of items which are not all illegal and which would therefore not necessarily lead to a criminal conviction. The items cover a large variety of behaviours to include truancy from school or home, being out at late hours, vandalism, and many other acts.

The self-report delinquency scale contains sixty individual delinquent behaviours. Subjects indicated how often during the past two years they had committed each act. The following forced-choice responses were available to students for each of these questions: never (coded as 0), once or twice (1), several times (2), and a lot (3). This scale was made so as to ensure that a broad range of delinquent acts of varying levels of seriousness could be represented. These acts were divided into two categories, one of mild delinquency, consisting of seven individual items, and one of serious delinquency which comprised nine individual items. The mild delinquency items were: cheating in exams; being suspended from school; skipping classes and school; running away from home;
drinking alcohol; going out after 10 pm without your family; and cheating on public transport fares.

The serious delinquency items were: destroying public property; stealing school property; stealing other property; taking a car without permission; gambling for money; breaking into a house or building when you knew you were not supposed to; threatening to hurt or injure someone; assaulting strangers; and beating somebody up so badly that they had to be hospitalised.

These delinquency items and this method of coding have been used in other studies of juvenile delinquency (Johnson, 1979; Giordano et al.; 1986; Kwok and Lau 1989; Ngai-Ying and Lau, 1992). Because the delinquency scale is applied to different types of delinquent behaviour ranging from mild to serious, the issue of weighting items becomes important. If all items in the delinquency scale are given equal weight, this will be problematic. This can be overcome either by noting correlations between delinquency items or between the items on the one hand and the total delinquency score on the other. In the following chapter, correlations between delinquency items, between delinquency items and the total score, and the reliability of scales through split half and coefficient alpha (Cronbach) will be presented. The internal consistency correlation will be used essentially as a measure of homogeneity, which helps to characterise the behaviour domain or trait sampled by the test, and this degree of homogeneity has some relevance to its validity.

I developed these items and the corresponding classification from a review of several validated measures of delinquency (Elliott et al., 1985; Simons et al., 1991; Simons et al., 1989; Hindelang, Hirschi, and Weis, 1981). Categorisation was based on agreements between these researchers and the use of operational definitions developed and modified by myself. Items were selected from these scales on the basis of their reference to the two degrees of delinquent behaviour.
Mild delinquency was analysed separately from serious delinquency because it has been suggested that social control may have a greater effect on mild delinquency than on serious delinquency (Krohn and Massey, 1980; Agnew, 1985).

5-7 Validity and reliability

A crucial question with surveys of this kind is how accurate and consistent are the responses of those surveyed? It is necessary to determine the validity and reliability of measurements in empirical studies of delinquent behaviour, because both the nature of the group (delinquent youth) and the phenomenon (delinquent behaviour) are complex. Validity refers to the extent to which an empirical measurement reflects the real meaning of the concepts under study (Nachmias and Chava-Nachmias, 1976). Reliability is an indication of the extent to which a measure contains variable errors, that is, errors that differ from individual to individual during any one measuring instance, and that vary over time for a given individual measured twice by the same instrument (Nachmias and Chava-Nachmias, 1976). Several efforts were made to increase the reliability and validity of responses.

5-7-1 Validity

Validity is concerned with what one is measuring and what one thinks one is measuring. In relation to delinquent behaviour, there are many sources of information, such as police, the courts, friends, victims, teachers, and observation. Therefore, it is necessary to choose a limited set of information on which to base decisions about validity. Although official statistics have a high degree of validity, they do not measure all delinquent acts. For this reason, many
sociologists of delinquency see it as important to establish the validity of self-report techniques as an alternative for measuring such behaviour. There are several methods for measuring validity, each of which is concerned with a different aspect of measurement. For measuring the validity of this study, I use content validity and construct validity.

Content validity takes two forms: face validity and sampling validity. Face validity is the subjective evaluation of the researcher as to whether the survey contains sufficient and appropriate measures correlating to the items under study. At this stage the validity of the instrument relies on our skills and the judgment of others. Therefore, we need to validate the instrument further by using other tests. Nevertheless, face validity serves a significant function in the process of constructing and formulating measuring instruments.

In this study, I sought to measure the validity of "delinquency" in relation to background variables by using a questionnaire consisting of various statements. After constructing the questionnaire, I reviewed each statement in order to assess the extent to which its content is related to delinquency. In order to construct a valid instrument, after determining the key variables of the three major theoretical perspectives chosen, and reviewing the literature, appropriate items were extracted both from the literature and previous questionnaires. This stage has an important role because "content validity is built into a test from the outset through the choice of appropriate items" (Anastasi, 1988, p. 141).

Sampling validity refers to whether given situations or behaviours are adequately sampled by the measuring instrument in question. That is, does the content of the instrument adequately represent the content population of the phenomenon being measured? In this study, sampling validity applies to relationships between official definitions of delinquent behaviour that have been used by sociologists of delinquency, and self-report measures. In this case,
the goal of self-report research is to construct a measure of delinquency identical to the measure of delinquency explicit in official definitions (e.g. stealing something refers to theft of property; threatening to hurt or injure someone refers to threatened assault against the person). It is true that such a content population is theoretical and not empirical, but its benefit is that it requires an awareness of all the items that are known to belong to the content population.

Construct validity refers to relating a measuring instrument to an overall theoretical framework in order to determine whether the instrument is tied to the concepts and theoretical assumptions that are employed. In order to demonstrate construct validity, I must show that there is a strong relationship between the items of the questionnaire and the various aspects of my theoretical framework, because I claim that, on the basis of theoretical reasoning, I have constructed a delinquency scale as a dependent variable and organised questions about independent variables. This questionnaire consists of statements that relate to the central assumptions of three major theories of delinquency. This kind of validity is very important, because empirical testing of the theory must use as dependent variables only those forms of delinquency specified by the theory. In this stage, I checked my questionnaire with the common aspects of the overall theoretical framework I have selected in order to determine whether the instrument is tied to these concepts and assumptions.

5-7-2 Reliability

Reliability may be defined as the level of stability of the measuring device over time (Borg, 1989). The reliability coefficient has been used to cover several aspects of score consistency. Measures of test reliability make it possible to estimate what proportion of the total variance of test scores is error variance. An
important factor influencing the size of a reliability coefficient is the group size and the phenomena on which reliability is measured.

There are several approaches for determining test reliability including Test re-test; item analysis (correlation matrix); split-half; and coefficient alpha. Since the population of the study was not large enough to divide them into two split halves, and implement the test twice, and since administering test re-test was not possible, item analysis, split-half, and coefficient alpha methods seemed appropriate for this study. In other words, these reliability tests measure the reliability of the questionnaire by utilising a single administration of a single form (Anastasi, 1988). Therefore, for testing the reliability of this study, a correlation matrix between items of each scale of independent and dependent variables was measured. Split-half reliability was also used, as was coefficient alpha (Cronbach).

A correlation matrix is a refined statistical technique for analysing the interrelationships of items. For example, if 30 items in a questionnaire have been used in order to measure the delinquent behaviour of high school students, the intercorrelations between items of this delinquency scale will be computed. Items which have low correlations with the sum total of items will be omitted.

Split-half reliability refers to the fact that from a single application of a questionnaire it is possible to arrive at a measure of reliability by various split-half procedures. Two scores are obtained for each person by dividing the test into comparable halves. Split-half reliability provides a measure of consistency with regard to content sampling. This type of reliability coefficient is sometimes called a coefficient of internal consistency when only a single form is required. Questionnaire items can be divided in many different ways, but a procedure that is adequate for most purposes is to find the scores on the odd and even items of
the test. Most sociologists of delinquency have used this kind of reliability coefficient in self-report surveys (Elliott and Voss, 1974; Bachman et al., 1978).

5-8 Statistical procedures

In order to analyse the data, I will use both descriptive statistics (e.g. frequency distribution) and inferential statistics (e.g. T-test, analysis of variance, simple regression and multiple regression).

In descriptive statistical techniques, I classify numerical data. When using frequency distribution as one of the techniques, I have a two-column table to summarise a set of data. One column shows the distinct score value in the data set and the other column shows the number of times that each score value occurs in the data set.

By using inferential statistical techniques, I am going to find bivariate relationships (e.g. the relationship between family size and juvenile delinquency). The proportions of bivariate relationships can become positive or negative, linear or curvilinear, and strong or weak. I will use the chi-square test as one of the inferential statistical techniques to show the relationship between two variables in this study. Chi-square can be used when variables are categorical in nature, such as the relationship between parents' educational levels and the levels of delinquency (low, middle, and high). A probable table is a two-dimensional table that can be defined by the levels of two categorical variables. I used a T-test to observe mean differences on delinquency between different subgroups.

A one-way analysis of variance as an inferential statistical technique is performed to determine if there is any significant difference between different subgroups (e.g. delinquency by area of residence). To give a clearer picture of
the effects of language background and socio-economic status on delinquency, a two-way analysis of variance will also be done. This approach is appropriate because of its capability for examining the interactive effects of language background and socio-economic status as two independent variables. Analysis of variance involves a test statistic referred to as the "F ratio" that compares the variations in delinquency scores for different subgroups.

Other inferential statistical techniques which will be used are simple regression and multiple regression. Regression analysis is a method which can be used to analyse the variability of delinquent behaviour as a dependent variable on one or more independent variables (e.g. attitudes towards parents and school). The multiple correlation coefficient shows how the predicted degrees of delinquent behaviour correlate with the actual values of independent variables. In order to more systematically evaluate the relative contributions of each major independent variable, a stepwise multiple regression will be run whereby each variable will be entered into the regression equation, thereby determining its unique contribution in relation to other variables. A multiple regression or multivariate model allows us to examine the effects of several variables simultaneously on delinquency. Such analyses have been recommended and used by previous delinquency theorists and researchers who have used an integrated theoretical approach (Shoemaker, 1990; Segrave and Hastad, 1985). They help to determine the relative influence of different factors, especially where these are drawn from varying theoretical positions (Shoemaker, 1990). Moreover, this statistical technique can measure the proportion of variance in delinquency contributed by each variable of strain, subculture, and social control theories as well as combinations of them.
5-9 Method of administration

After selection of the four high schools, meetings were held with the principals at each school. At these meetings, school principals, administrative staff, and teachers were told the aims, method and applications of the survey. They were reassured that no individuals or schools would be identified, and were promised detailed anonymous feedback on their students' responses. A basic procedure was eventually negotiated for conducting the survey in each school.

After obtaining permission from the schools and parents, students who volunteered to participate were administered the questionnaire. First of all, the aims and nature of survey were explained to the students, emphasising that it was voluntary. All students were also assured that their responses would remain confidential and anonymous and were encouraged to ask the administrator for assistance in understanding items. The questionnaire was administered in four high schools over a four month period in 1994.

Only those students who had obtained parental permission and voluntarily agreed to complete the questionnaire were allowed to participate. Administration of the questionnaire took from thirty to fifty minutes. All students had ample time to complete the questionnaire. Arrangements were made for teachers to remain outside the classrooms during the administration period and to allow as much time as needed for all of the students to complete the questionnaire. In this process, the sample was reduced from 600 to 480, as shown in Table 5.1.

In order to obtain parental permission for the study, a letter was sent to all students' parents. The information about the two primary characteristics of the students (language background and sex) was obtained prior to sending these letters, from existing documents in the schools.
The respondents were divided into two groups. The majority of them participated in the study voluntarily, with parental permission. A minority refused to participate, mainly because of lack of parental permission. A small number of students who voluntarily participated in the study answered only the very first questions, including those about language background and sex. Therefore, the respondents were classified into three groups namely, fully completed, partly completed, and refusals. The last two groups (partly completed and refusals) were combined as refusals in Table 5.1.

### TABLE 5.1

Comparison of respondents and non-respondents on subgroup characteristics (n=600)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Interviewed</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Refused</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>244</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.33</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>293</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESB Students</td>
<td>362</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.33</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>458</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESB Students</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 5.1, the sample was reduced from 600 to 480 students, because 120 students or their parents refused to participate in the research.

#### 5-10 Limitations

Sample surveys are not without their difficulties, but at present they remain one of the best instruments for studying juvenile delinquency. There are, however, limitations as in all studies based on the survey method and the self-report technique of data collection.
This study is limited to sixteen major types of behaviour committed by youths in the age group between 11 and 17 years of age. It can not be assumed that a group of self-report delinquency items is representative of all general delinquency dimensions. In order to address this limitation, I have chosen valid delinquency items that have been developed and used by previous researchers in the area of juvenile delinquency (Gibson, 1971; Johnson, 1979; Elliott et al., 1985; Giordano et al., 1986; Seydlitz 1991; Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986; Wong and Lau, 1993).

This study is also limited to youth in the Illawarra region. Consequently, it is not possible to say to what extent the findings will be representative of delinquency in other regions of New South Wales, or in other Australian states.

Finally, the method of self-reporting delinquency is limited in that it assumes respondents will give honest answers about their delinquency involvement.
CHAPTER SIX

Results of the Data Analysis

6.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results from my survey of the relationships between delinquency, as measured by self-reported delinquency, and family socio-economic status. It has also measured the strength of socialization practices in the family, school, and among peers in explaining juvenile delinquency. The relationships between delinquency and age, sex, area of residence, and language background as demographic variables were also measured.

The questionnaire referred to a wide range of behaviours which have been known to frequently occur among youths in the Illawarra region. It was expected that everyone in the population study could be characterised by an item at least once, and this expectation was fulfilled in the analysis of responses to the questionnaire.

The results presented are based on data collected through questionnaire from respondents (480 out of 600) aged 11-17 years (means age=14.26, SD=1.78, SE=.081, and variance=3.158). The sample contains approximately equal numbers of males (51%) and females (49%). Of these, 227 students lived in the city or a large town, 145 lived in the suburbs, 96 in small towns, and 12 in rural areas.

Initially, a scaled score of delinquency for the total sample was employed to analyse the effects of background variables on delinquency. Then, a classification of delinquency as mild or serious was applied and the relationships between them and background variables studied. Finally, ESB youths and
NESB youths as two separate language subgroups were compared to determine whether differences between them in relation to delinquent behaviour exist.

The answers for each delinquency item were classified on a scale from 0 to 3 as a measure of the number of offences in which each respondent had been involved. This measurement has been used in recent years by Osgood, Johnston, O'Malley, and Bachman (1988) and Tygart (1992). I classified delinquency items into two categories, mild and serious. All percentages are rounded, and figures are correct to two decimal places.

The initial phase of the data analysis examines the bivariate associations of the independent variables with delinquent involvement. Second, and more importantly, the extent to which each major independent variable improves our prediction of delinquent behaviour was analysed.

In order to assess the significance of combining strain, subculture, and social control theories, the data analysis will seek to:

1- determine in detail the interrelationships between items and total scores of each scale of independent and dependent variables;

2- determine the association of each of the independent variables with delinquent behaviour;

3- measure the relative strength of the three theories in accounting for variance in delinquent behaviour;

4- determine whether a combination of key variables derived from the three theories increases the amount of explained variance in delinquent behaviour;

5- determine the interactive influence of several types of independent variable on delinquent behaviour (e.g. interactive influence of socio-economic status and language background on delinquent behaviour); and
6- determine the amount of variance explained in delinquent behaviour by demographic and autobiographical variables (e.g. sex and language background) when all key variables drawn from strain, subculture, and social control theories are controlled, using stepwise multiple regression equations.

6.2 Reliability

In order to determine the reliability of delinquency scaled scores, attitude scaled scores toward migrants, as well as family variables, school-related factors, and peer approval intercorrelations between the delinquency items have been measured. Split-half and coefficient alpha methods also seemed appropriate for this study, as they both measure the reliability of the questionnaire by utilising a single administration of a single form (Anastasi, 1988). Split-half reliability determines whether the halves of a test are measuring the same quality or characteristic. In order to examine the internal consistency of responses to all items in five scales (attitudes towards parents; attitudes towards school; peer influences; attitudes towards migrants; and delinquent behaviour), coefficient alpha (Cronbach) has been used as a generalised formula and the results considered. The results were as follows:

**TABLE 6.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
<th>X7</th>
<th>X8</th>
<th>X9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1- Spend free time with parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2- Enjoy being with parents</td>
<td>.91*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3- Discuss problems with parents</td>
<td>.86*</td>
<td>.82*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4- Describe parents' relationships</td>
<td>.83*</td>
<td>.82*</td>
<td>.80*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5- Describe parents' attitude to you</td>
<td>.80*</td>
<td>.80*</td>
<td>.77*</td>
<td>.73*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6- Degree of freedom at home</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X7- Your parents smack or hit you</td>
<td>-.47*</td>
<td>-.50*</td>
<td>-.47*</td>
<td>-.48*</td>
<td>-.52*</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X8- Disobey your parents</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>-.40*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X9- Total scaled score</td>
<td>.92*</td>
<td>.92*</td>
<td>.88*</td>
<td>.87*</td>
<td>.89*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P<.01    ** P<.05
Table 6.1 shows the relationships between items on attitudes towards parents with each other. The results show that the relationships between each item are significant with each other (p<.01, p<.05). The correlation coefficients of Table 6.1 confirm the reliability of this scale. These results will be fully discussed in analysing delinquency later in this study. By implementing the alpha Cronbach formula, the reliability values of this scale reported as .79.

**Table 6.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1- Discuss personal problems with teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2- Like school in general</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3- Teachers treat their students fairly</td>
<td>.76*</td>
<td>.79*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4- School staff treat the students fairly</td>
<td>.77*</td>
<td>.82*</td>
<td>.76*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5- Your teachers respect you</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6- Total scaled score</td>
<td>.91*</td>
<td>.92*</td>
<td>.88*</td>
<td>.88*</td>
<td>.79*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P<.01

In Table 6.2, a correlation matrix was calculated to determine the strength of the relationships between each item of attitudes towards school with other items on this attitude scale. The results show that the relationships between all items are

**Table 6.2.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Alpha coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.74*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P<.01
significant with each other (p<.01). According to the results of alpha coefficient measurement, the internal consistency of this scale is confirmed at .74.

**TABLE 6.3**

*Attitude scaled items toward peers: Intercorrelations (n=480)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1- Discuss personal problems with friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2- Spend free time with friends</td>
<td></td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3- Enjoy being with friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>.90*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4- At school, classmates are concerned about you</td>
<td></td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>.82*</td>
<td>.87*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5- Outside school friends are concerned about you</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6- Total scaled score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.77*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* P&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 6.3.1**

*Attitudes towards peers (Alpha coefficient)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Alpha coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.74*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.01

In general, the intercorrelations between peer-related items presented in Table 6.3 confirm the reliability of this scale. The correlations between each item are highly significant with each other (p<.01). It should be noted that the scale of attitudes towards peers showed good internal consistency (Coefficient alpha = .74).
This scale refers to the attitudes of students towards migrants. Specific questionnaire items for these (X1 to X13) are provided in the appendix (see appendix A, Questionnaire, Q15-Q27). Only one item (X10, Q24) did not correlate to other items and it was omitted in the analysis. Table 6.4 shows that the intercorrelations between all other items are significant (p<.05, p<.01). The reliability for the scale of attitudes towards migrants was adequate (coefficient alpha = .76).
TABLE 6.5

Correlation matrix of delinquency items in the sample (n=480)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
<th>X7</th>
<th>X8</th>
<th>X9</th>
<th>X10</th>
<th>X11</th>
<th>X12</th>
<th>X13</th>
<th>X14</th>
<th>X15</th>
<th>X16</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X7</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X8</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X9</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X10</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X11</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X12</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X13</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X14</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X15</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X16</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 6.5.1

Delinquent behaviour (Alpha coefficient)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Alpha coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.85*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.01

The items in Table 6.5 (X1-X16) represent delinquency scaled scores (provided in the appendix). The table shows the results from a series of correlations in which each of the items was correlated against the other. Items interrelated in the range of approximately 0.2 to 0.7. Correlation coefficients indicate that all delinquency items are positively intercorrelated (p<01). This confirms the reliability of the delinquency scale for the questionnaire. The split-half reliability of this scale was also calculated by Guttman's formula (Guttman, 1945) and the
reliability was about $r=0.8$. Using the alpha Cronbach formula in Table 6.5.1, the reliability values of this scale reported as .85.

### TABLE 6.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mild</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Total scaled scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>67*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total scaled scores</td>
<td>.88*</td>
<td>.94*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P<.01

On the basis of the questionnaire material, delinquency items have been divided into two categories of offence: mild delinquency and serious delinquency. Correlation coefficients are generally high (.67, .88, and .94) and all are significant beyond (p<.01).

According to these correlation coefficients, we can conclude that all delinquency items which have been used in this study are relatively homogeneous items and they have a common relation to background variables. Based on these results, it can be concluded that it is legitimate to treat this scale of delinquency as a proper measure of delinquent behaviour for this population of youths.

The Cronbach's alpha reliability estimates that the internal consistency of the scales were adequate to excellent, ranging from .74 to .85 in the total sample.

A complete intercorrelations matrix of the all independent variables and the three dependent variables (mild, serious, and total delinquency) was measured (see Table 6.40 in Appendix B). Generally speaking, Table 6.40 shows the results from a series of correlations in which each of the items in the scales of attitudes towards parents and school was positively correlated against the other and negatively correlated against dependent variables. Only two items in the
scale of attitudes towards parents (your parents smack or hit you; disobey your parents) positively correlated against the dependent variables. This table also shows each of the items in the scale of attitudes towards peers positively correlated against both the other and dependent variables. Items in the scale of attitudes towards peers negatively correlated against items in the scales of attitudes towards parents and school. Only two items in the scale of attitudes towards parents positively correlated against items in the scale of attitudes towards peers (your parents smack or hit you; disobey your parents).

The correlations between all items in the scales of attitudes towards parents, school, migrants, and peers (as independent variables) against all items of the scale of delinquency (as dependent variable) were also measured (see Tables 6.41 and 6.42 in Appendix B). Correlation coefficients between independent variables and the dependent variable are also presented in Tables 6.41 and 6.42. The results in these tables demonstrate that almost all dependent variables are associated with delinquent behaviour. The results of Tables 6.40, 6.41, and 6.42 confirm the reliability of the scales for the questionnaire.

6.3 Delinquency by demographic variables

The primary variables used in this analysis are measures of self-report delinquency and demographic characteristics. The demographic variables include sex, age, area of residence, and language background. Language background is divided into two groups for the purpose of analysis: English speaking background (ESB) and non-English speaking background (NESB). Data analysis began with measurement of the association between demographic variables and juvenile delinquency. In this section, the sample is first stratified by sex, age, area of residence, and language background (independent variables), and delinquency scaled scores as dependent variables.
In this stage of data analysis, descriptive statistics were used to describe and summarise single variables in order to demonstrate the number of cases that fall into each category. Survey data was organised and grouped according to the responses given.

**TABLE 6.7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESB</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>75.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESB</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>24.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.7 shows that about 20 per cent of students in the sample are NESB immigrants (this refers to both first and second generation NESB immigrants to Australia).

**TABLE 6.8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (Less than 8)</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>33.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle (8-14)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>32.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (More than 14)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>33.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 6.8, the respondents are classified into three groups according to their total score of 16 items of delinquency: less than 8 for low, 8-14 for middle, and more than 14 for high delinquent behaviour. The percentages of the three groups demonstrate the normal distribution of the population of the study.

**TABLE 6.9**

Significant difference of scaled delinquency scores by sex (n=480)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delinquency</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (Less than 8)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>52.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle (8-14)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>29.92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>36.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (&gt;14)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>53.28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ df=2 \quad X^2=107.66 \quad P<.001 \]

Table 6.9 shows the percentage of males and females admitting delinquency items included in the questionnaire. I classified students into three groups according to the scores obtained from the total scaled delinquency scores. A significant difference is present between males and females in the levels of delinquent behaviour (p<.001).

Now, I present the proportion of the females' contribution to the total index of delinquent acts (mild delinquency and serious delinquency) in comparison with males. In Table 6.10, I show a comparison between males and females with regard to the previously mentioned divisions of delinquent behaviour.
TABLE 6.10

Means and T-test on delinquency by sex in the sample (n=480)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delinquent act</th>
<th>Male df</th>
<th>Mean (n=244)</th>
<th>Female df</th>
<th>Mean (n=236)</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>T Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mild Delinquency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run away from home</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.7:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped classes and school</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.7:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended from school</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2.2:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunk alcohol</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.2:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gone out after 10 pm without family</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.2:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheated in exams</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.3:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheated on transport fares</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.7:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.4:1</td>
<td>7.09*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serious Delinquency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destroyed public property</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>4.0:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen school property</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>4.0:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen other property</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>3.3:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken a car without permission</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.8:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken into a house or building</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>8.3:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened to hurt or injure someone</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>3.9:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaulted strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>6.1:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaten somebody so as to be hospitalised</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>21.3:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambled for money</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2.2:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>3.4:1</td>
<td>14.79*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P<.01
In Table 6.10, the means and standard deviations of the 16 items, for males and females, are shown. In this table, the basic delinquency items have been grouped into two categories: mild delinquency and serious delinquency. These items and a corresponding classification have been used in other studies of juvenile delinquency (Johnson, 1979; Leung and Lau, 1989; Wong, and Lau, 1993).

There are significant differences between the means of mild and serious delinquency in most items for both males and females. Students are more likely to commit mild delinquency than serious delinquency. The table indicates that the ratio of males who commit serious delinquent acts in comparison with females is 3.4 to 1, but for mild delinquent acts this proportion is reduced to 1.4 to 1.

While the serious delinquency items yield a relatively large male: female ratio, there is greater variation found in the item level comparisons. The highest ratios are for having 'beaten somebody so as to be hospitalised' (21.3:1), 'broken into a house or building' (8.3:1), and 'assaulted strangers' (6.1:1).

In contrast, for the seven mild delinquency items, in six items the differences in the extent of male and female delinquency are minimal (the ratio is less than two to one). In other words, it is clear that the pattern of much self-reported delinquent activity is similar for males and females.

Although these findings confirm the hypothesis that there are significant differences in delinquent behaviour by sex, there is also a clear tendency for females to commit or be involved in mild delinquent behaviour to the same extent as males. The two categories of mild and serious delinquency (as set out in Table 6.10) will be used for analysis in relation in independent variables in the remainder of this study.
Table 6.11 shows types of delinquency according to age. The variation of different types of delinquency by age structure of the respondents is clearly demonstrated, with delinquency means tending to peak in the higher age groups.

### TABLE 6.11

Means and standard deviations of delinquency scaled scores by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mild delinquency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Serious delinquency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 6.12

Correlation coefficients of age and delinquency (n=480)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delinquency Categories</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mild Delinquency</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Delinquency</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency (total scores)</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlation coefficients between age and delinquency are presented in Table 6.12. This table demonstrates that age is positively associated with delinquent behaviour (p<.001). It can be seen that correlation coefficients for mild delinquency (R=.50) and delinquency in general (R=.50) are relatively higher than for serious delinquency (R=.41).

**TABLE 6.13**

Means and standard deviations of delinquency scaled scores by age and sex (n=480)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22.10</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22.03</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P<.05

Table 6.13 shows a significant difference between males and females according to delinquency means (p< .05). The variation of delinquency means by the age of respondents is clearly shown for both males and females. Delinquency means tend to peak in the higher ages groups (16 and 17 years) for both males and females.
Table 6.14 presents a significant difference between NESB youths and ESB youths ($F=30.98$, $p<.05$). The results demonstrate that NESB youths admitted a significantly ($p<.05$) higher proportion of offences than ESB youths. It is expected that after adjustment for a series of social and contextual factors, particularly the socio-economic status of parents, these associations will be reduced. The implications of these findings for the interpretation of differences in language background and migrant status in rates of offending will be examined in the next part of this chapter by use of a two-way analysis of variance.
### TABLE 6.15

Differences between types of residential area according to mild delinquency means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F-test urban vs. suburb</th>
<th>F-test urban vs. town</th>
<th>F-test urban vs. rural</th>
<th>F-test suburb vs. town</th>
<th>F-test suburb vs. rural</th>
<th>F-test town vs. rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban area</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>25.21*</td>
<td>32.78*</td>
<td>3.58*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small town</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural area</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 95%

### TABLE 6.16

Differences between types of residential area according to serious delinquency means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F-test urban vs. suburb</th>
<th>F-test urban vs. town</th>
<th>F-test urban vs. rural</th>
<th>F-test suburb vs. town</th>
<th>F-test suburb vs. rural</th>
<th>F-test town vs. rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban area</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>25.29*</td>
<td>20.96*</td>
<td>3.44*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small town</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural area</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 95%
Tables 6.15 and 6.16 show the relationship between types of residential area and mild delinquency and serious delinquency. According to these tables the delinquency mean in urban areas is considerably higher than those for suburbs, small towns and rural areas. The means in these last three types of residential area are very close to each other. Thus, the data firmly establishes support for the hypothesis that urban youths in this sample report significantly more involvement in delinquent activity than youths who do not live in urban areas.

The results so far demonstrate significant sex, age, residential area, and language background differences in the amount of delinquent behaviour reported.

A variation in the amount of delinquent behaviour between males and females was observed (see Table 6.10), which suggests that gender is a determining factor in the explanation of juvenile delinquency. The results also confirm that the proportion of females committing mild delinquency is much greater than for serious delinquency. According to Hirschi's (1969) social control theory, these differences may be due to differences in the socialization of males and females which involve different patterns of accepted behaviour.

One of the most consistent and basic findings is that delinquent behaviour tends to peak in the aged 15 years and over (see Table 6.11). According to Hirschi, this is because parental control on delinquent behaviour may be reduced in the late teenage years. Therefore, involvement in delinquent behaviour was distributed unequally among age groups, but the data showed little difference between males and females in the relationship between delinquent behaviour and age structure (see Table 6.13).

In relation to third demographic issue, the data showed a significant difference between ESB and NESB youths according to their delinquency means (see Table 6.14). In order to explore this difference, the following section examines
the interactive effects of language background and socio-economic status on delinquent behaviour.

Finally, the results demonstrated a variation in the amount of delinquent behaviour between youths living in urban areas and youths from other areas (see Table 6.15). Most early delinquency theories suggested that urban delinquency rates can be considerably higher than other areas of residence (e.g. Shaw and McKay, 1942), and the results of this study confirm this proposition.

6.4 Language background, family socio-economic status and delinquency

Socio-economic status was hypothetically used as the basic explanation for juvenile delinquency. Parental occupation and level of education were used as two major indices of socio-economic status in relation to juvenile delinquency in this study, so it is necessary to describe how they performed this function before analysing, comparing, and measuring the correlation between socio-economic status and delinquency in the language subgroups.
### Table 6.17

Percentage distribution of parental education levels in the language subgroups (n=480)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>ESB Father</th>
<th>ESB Mother</th>
<th>NESB Father</th>
<th>NESB Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>6.91 (n=25)</td>
<td>6.63 (n=24)</td>
<td>9.32 (n=11)</td>
<td>14.41 (n=17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle high school</td>
<td>37.29 (n=135)</td>
<td>45.58 (n=165)</td>
<td>33.05 (n=39)</td>
<td>38.98 (n=46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of high school</td>
<td>24.03 (n=87)</td>
<td>21.55 (n=78)</td>
<td>32.20 (n=38)</td>
<td>20.34 (n=24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical college</td>
<td>16.02 (n=58)</td>
<td>13.26 (n=48)</td>
<td>10.17 (n=12)</td>
<td>14.41 (n=17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/CAE</td>
<td>15.75 (n=57)</td>
<td>12.98 (n=47)</td>
<td>15.25 (n=18)</td>
<td>11.86 (n=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00 (n=362)</td>
<td>100.00 (n=362)</td>
<td>100.00 (n=118)</td>
<td>100.00 (n=118)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Father: $X^2=5.52$ df=4 $p=.24$  
Mother: $X^2=.742$ df=4 $p=.12$

Table 6.17 presents the percentage distributions of formal education levels for parents in each subgroup in the study. The levels of education were grouped into five categories from low to high, from those who attended only primary school to those who attended a university or CAE. Although at primary school level there is a considerable difference between NESB women and ESB women, differences in education levels of the two language subgroups for both males and females were not significant in general.
The size of the sample in Table 6.18 has been reduced from 480 students to 431 because of the number of unemployed and retired parents. I counted only employed men and women. In order to group the occupations I used the Australian Bureau of Statistics' Australian Standard Classification of Occupations (ASCO), introduced in Department of Employment and Industrial Relations (1983).

There are significant differences in occupational status between NESB migrants and the other subgroup for both sexes (p<.001). Most ESB women fall into two occupational groups: 35% of employed ESB women were clerks whereas only...
7% of NESB women were clerks. 29% of employed NESB women were labourers, yet in this class of occupation ESB women accounted for only 10%. Labourers and related workers include 20% of employed NESB men and about 5% of ESB men, clearly indicating the differences mentioned previously.

**TABLE 6.19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Groups</th>
<th>ESB</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father's education</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>2.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's occupation</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>37.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's occupation</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>17.21**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant ** P<.05

To construct Table 6.19, education level was scored from 1 to 5. Those who attended primary school scored the lowest level (score 1) while those who attended university/CAE scored the highest (score 5). Occupations were scored from 1 to 8. On this basis, labourers and related workers were the lowest level (score 1) while managers and administrators were the highest (score 8).

Table 6.19 presents the mean and standard deviation distributions of formal education levels and occupation levels for parents in both language subgroups in the study. Table 6.19 shows that there are no considerable differences between ESB students and NESB students according to means of parents'
education, but the means of occupation scores for ESB families were higher than for NESB families (p<.05).

In order to understand the contributions of parental occupation and language background in explaining juvenile delinquency, a two-way analysis of variance as an appropriate statistical technique was performed. In this procedure, language background and parental occupation have been accounted as independent variables and delinquency as the dependent variable. This statistical technique has been employed so that the effect of independent variables as well as the interaction between them and delinquency can be examined.

### TABLE 6.20

Two way ANOVA between language background and father's occupation (independent variables), and delinquency (dependent variable) (n=431)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-test</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>language background</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>407.93</td>
<td>407.93</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>.0100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occupation level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1828.28</td>
<td>914.14</td>
<td>16.43</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>541.95</td>
<td>270.98</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>.0050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within group</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>23649.61</td>
<td>55.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.20 indicates that language background is significantly related to delinquency (F [7.33]=407.93, p<.05). There is also a significant relation to delinquency according to the level of father's occupation (F [16.43]=914.14,
The interaction between father's occupation and his language background is significantly related to delinquency (F [4.767]=270.98, p<.01).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-test</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1544.10</td>
<td>1544.10</td>
<td>23.22</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>437.08</td>
<td>218.54</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.0400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>391.85</td>
<td>195.93</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within group</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22207.63</td>
<td>66.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.21 again shows that there is a significant relation between delinquency and language background (F [23.22]=1544.10, p<.001). There is also a significant relation between delinquency and mother's occupation (F [3.29]=218.54, p<.05). Table 6.21 also indicates that there is a significant relation between mother's occupation and language background on the one hand, and delinquency on the other (F [2.95]=195.93, p<.05).

Occupation is usually affected by the level of education. My results show that parents in the two language subgroups were located in different occupational levels, whereas the parental education levels were generally equal. In other words, greater proportions of NESB families are employed in lower levels of work than their educational achievements would suggest. This shows that
NESB families suffer an inequality in the labour market which does not allow them to attain the same occupational levels as ESB people.

Therefore, I would argue that language background may not be directly related to delinquency because, regardless of differences in language background, when an individual suffers socio-economic disadvantage increased delinquency will result.

The indices of socio-economic status, such as parental occupation, parents' education and unemployment, were related to self-reported delinquency, and the relationships were strong, generally in the direction predicted by both strain and subculture theories. According to the results reported in Tables 6.17-6.25, the attempt to show that delinquent behaviour is related to socio-economic status, as a major index of both strain and subculture theories, has been relatively successful.

In order to measure the association between language background and socio-economic status with delinquent behaviour, a two-way analysis of variance was used to test the significance of the differences among delinquency means according to both language background and socio-economic status. But in order to determine the extent to which the relationship between language background and delinquent behaviour could be explained by the correlation of socio-economic status and language background, a test was necessary to determine the amount of variance in delinquency by language background after controlling for socio-economic status and other independent variables. This type of test can be carried out by using multiple regression analysis, and the following variables were included (see Tables 6.38 and 6.39): Socio-economic status; attitudes towards parents; attitudes towards school; peer approval; attitudes towards migrants; sex; negative labelling at school; negative labelling outside school; and family disruption.
Although NESB youths reported higher delinquent behaviour than ESB youths (see Table 6.14), results in Tables 6.17-6.25 suggest that the differences between NESB and ESB youths might reflect socio-economic differences rather than simply language differences (see Tables 6.20 and 6.21). It has been well established that on a range of indicators such as the number of family members in the workforce and parental occupation, NESB youths tend to be reared in homes which suffer relative socio-economic disadvantage. It has also been well established that such disadvantages are associated with increasing delinquent behaviour (Merton, 1938; Cohen, 1955; Coward and Ohlin, 1960). Therefore, it could be argued that the higher delinquent behaviour among NESB youths is a reflection of the differences in socio-economic status between ESB and NESB youths. To sustain this argument we need to measure the association between language background and delinquent behaviour while controlling for socio-economic status and other independent variables, using a multiple stepwise regression. After controlling for socio-economic status and other independent variables, I found that language background did not add any amount of variance explained in delinquent behaviour (see Tables 6.38 and 6.39 below). In other words, the inclusion of language background in the multiple regression equations does not explain any additional variance in delinquent behaviour beyond that explained by socio-economic status and the variables drawn from social control theory. Therefore, variations in delinquent behaviour are better explained by the effects of socio-economic status than by any difference in language background.
According to Table 6.22, there is a difference between ESB women and NESB women in terms of their occupational circumstances. A greater proportion of NESB women were unemployed (42% compared to 26% for ESB women).
TABLE 6.23
Correlation coefficient of number of family members in paid workforce and delinquency (n=480)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delinquency categories</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mild Delinquency</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Delinquency</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Delinquency</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01

Correlation coefficients yielded significant relationships between the number of family members in paid work and delinquency (p < .01). According to Table 6.23 there is a negative correlation between the number of family members in the labour market and delinquency. That is, the more family members were involved in the labour market, the less delinquent behaviour occurred.

TABLE 6.24
Percentage distributions of delinquency levels by parents in shift work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level Of Delinquency</th>
<th>Parents in shift work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>27.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>25.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>46.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=147)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Father: N=431  $X^2=29.81$  df=2  p<.001  
Mother: N=342  $X^2=6.90$  df=2  p<.05
About one third of the fathers of students in the sample worked shifts. The proportion for mothers was about 12 per cent. Table 6.24 shows that there is a significant relationship between parents in shift work and delinquency.

**TABLE 6.25**  
Percentage distribution of delinquency levels by parents' education levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Delinquency</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>27.62</td>
<td>26.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=58)</td>
<td>(n=33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>41.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=60)</td>
<td>(n=52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>43.81</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=92)</td>
<td>(n=40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=210)</td>
<td>(n=125)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents' education levels</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>38.24</td>
<td>36.27</td>
<td>25.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=39)</td>
<td>(n=76)</td>
<td>(n=37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>46.83</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>17.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=59)</td>
<td>(n=45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>43.81</td>
<td>25.49</td>
<td>17.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=92)</td>
<td>(n=40)</td>
<td>(n=26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=210)</td>
<td>(n=125)</td>
<td>(n=145)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Father: N=480  $X^2=37.57$  df=4  p<.001  
Mother: N=480  $X^2=32.00$  df=4  p<.001

The results in Table 6.25 reveal that the levels of parents' education and delinquency are significantly related (p<.001). Most students who admitted high level of delinquency came from families in which both parents had attended only primary school or middle high school. In contrast, those who admitted low delinquency level had parents who had attended technical college or university/CAE. Therefore, the hypothesis can be confirmed that juvenile delinquency correlates with the levels of parental education.
Generally speaking, the data demonstrated a significant relationship between socio-economic factors and delinquency. Delinquent behaviour was associated with the number of family members in the workforce, parents being in shift work, parental occupation, and the educational attainments of parents.

In conclusion, it has been shown in Tables 6.17-6.25 that the arguments of strain and subculture theories, which have attempted to explain delinquent behaviour in terms of socio-economic status, have generally been supported. Both theories have also been successful in explaining delinquent behaviour in terms of different language background, because differences in the amount of delinquent behaviour between ESB and NESB youths can be linked to the higher socio-economic status of ESB youths. Despite the fact that there is a significant relationship between delinquent behaviour and socio-economic status, and that many delinquency theorists have used class as a major causal variable (Cohen, 1955; Cloward and Ohlin, 1960), socio-economic status does not explain all delinquency. To provide greater explanation, different theories need to be drawn upon. Therefore, in the next section of this chapter I will test elements drawn from social control theory.

### 6.5 Delinquency by family structure and school-related variables

The basic assumption of the social control perspective is that the individual is free to break the law and that no social class motivation is required to commit delinquent behaviour. The major variables which social control theory uses to explain why some of us are more likely to engage in delinquent behaviour are the strength of our ties to the family and to school. Ties to school and family bind us to the conventional social system, and someone's relationship with these institutions might be damaged if they were involved in delinquent behaviour. The indicators of ties to the conventional system I have selected are attitudes
towards parents and school. In this study, both of these have been hypothesised to be negatively related to delinquent behaviour.

6.5.1 Delinquency and family structure

In this part of the data analysis, juvenile delinquency is to be examined in terms of the attitudes of students towards parents, family stability, and family size. The results are described with regard to each of the major questions raised by this study.

Simple correlation has been used to measure the relationship between the number of family members in the workforce as an independent variable and delinquency as the dependent variable. Also, differences in delinquency according to the levels of parents' education was tested using a chi-square test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delinquency categories</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mild Delinquency</td>
<td>-.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious delinquency</td>
<td>-.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total delinquency</td>
<td>-.49*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.01

The relationships between attitudes towards parents and delinquency are presented in Table 6.26. This table shows that attitudes towards parents are negatively associated with mild delinquency and serious delinquency (p<.01).
### TABLE 6.27

**Correlation coefficients of delinquency by family size (n=480)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delinquency categories</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mild Delinquency</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious delinquency</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total delinquency</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No significance

Table 6.27 shows that there is no significant relationship between family size and delinquency. The correlation coefficients between family size and mild delinquency, serious delinquency, and delinquency in general are small ($r=.08, .06$, and .08).

### TABLE 6.28

**Means and standard deviations of delinquency by family disruption**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intact family</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken home</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>480</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 6.28 and 6.29 show the difference between students who came from intact families and broken homes, according to their delinquency means. The variation of delinquency means by the family stability of respondents is clearly demonstrated in these tables. In general the findings of Tables 6.28 and 6.29 show that significant differences exist for delinquency when related to family disruption. Students who came from broken homes admitted high levels of delinquency in comparison with students from intact families.

The results presented in Tables 6.26 and 6.27 concern the nature of parent-child relationships and parental relationships. The second issue regarding family influences on delinquent behaviour is the effect of family stability (see Tables 6.28 and 6.29). As stated in Chapter Two, social control theory predicts that attachment to family and family stability can be the most important factors in delinquency prevention. Nye (1958), for example, is replete with various forms of positive attachment to parents being associated with lower reported delinquency. The results of Tables 6.26 and 6.27 tend to support the social control propositions that affection for, and involvement with, parents are associated with less delinquent behaviour.
6.5.2 Delinquency and school-related variables

School-related variables include factors such as attitudes towards teachers and school staff, and the level of schooling a youth wishes to attain. The level of significance and relationship between these factors and delinquent behaviour were measured independently. It was hypothesized that juvenile delinquency would be related to these school-related variables.

**TABLE 6.30**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delinquency categories</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mild Delinquency</td>
<td>-.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious delinquency</td>
<td>-.51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total delinquency</td>
<td>-.54*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.01

The relationships between attitudes towards school and delinquency are presented in Table 6.30. This table shows that attitudes towards school are negatively associated with delinquency (p<.01).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Delinquency</th>
<th>Desired Schooling</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Teach/</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.52 (n=3)</td>
<td>14.50 (n=19)</td>
<td>33.04 (n=38)</td>
<td>55.32 (n=104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.09 (n=12)</td>
<td>31.30 (n=41)</td>
<td>43.48 (n=50)</td>
<td>29.26 (n=55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.39 (n=31)</td>
<td>54.20 (n=71)</td>
<td>23.48 (n=27)</td>
<td>15.43 (n=29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00 (n=46)</td>
<td>100.00 (n=131)</td>
<td>100.00 (n=115)</td>
<td>100.00 (n=188)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 110.41 \quad df = 6 \quad p < .001 \]

Table 6.31 shows that significant differences exist between delinquency levels and the level of schooling a youth wishes to attain (p < .001). About two-thirds of students who admitted a high number of delinquent acts only wished to attain a low level of schooling (year 10). In contrast, 55 per cent of students who admitted a low number of delinquent acts wanted to attain a high level of schooling (university). In this latter category, the percentage of students who admitted a high number of delinquent acts was 15 per cent.
Table 6.32 shows the delinquency means of students according to those who were negatively labelled (sworn at or called bad names) in school and those who were not. Delinquency means for those who reported negative labelling at school are higher than for others. About two-fifths of NESB students reported that they had been sworn at or called bad names in school. This proportion was reduced to about one-third for ESB students.

### Table 6.33

Two way ANOVA between language background and negative labelling at school (independent variables), and delinquency (dependent variable) (n=480)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-test</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language background</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1396.15</td>
<td>1396.15</td>
<td>29.90</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative label</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9320.57</td>
<td>9320.57</td>
<td>199.63</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>602.41</td>
<td>602.41</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within group</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>22224.34</td>
<td>46.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.33 shows a significant correlation between delinquency and negative labelling at school ($F_{[199.63]}=9320.57$, $p<.001$). The correlation between negative labelling at school and language background on the one hand, and delinquency on the other was also significant ($F_{[12.90]}=602.41$, $p<.001$).

The results of Tables 6.30-6.33 assign some relevance to the role of the school in generating delinquent behaviour. According to social control theory, attachment to teachers and school staff, and desires or plans for future educational success, are factors that decrease delinquent behaviour through increasing the individual's stake in conformity (Johnson, 1979). Hirschi (1969) and Hindelang (1973) also report greater delinquency among youths with negative school-related attitudes. The results of this study have found similar associations (Tables 6.30-6.33). It is important, therefore, that low school attachment deserves a place in any integrated explanation of delinquency.

### 6.6 Delinquency and peer influence

A positive correlation between juvenile delinquency and peer approval was hypothesized. It was also expected that weakness in parent-child relationships, parental relationships, and relations between teachers or school staff and children would have a positive association with both peer group influence and increased delinquency. It was also hypothesized that both male and female delinquency rates would be associated with peer influence.
TABLE 6.34

Mean scores, standard deviations, and T-tests on attitudes towards parents, school and peer approval by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Male (n=244)</th>
<th>Female (n=236)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes towards parents</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>24.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes towards school</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>11.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer approval</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>12.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .001
** Not Significant

Table 6.34 presents T-test comparisons between male and female students. The groups were significantly different in their attitudes towards parents and school at p<.01. In contrast, there was no significant difference between males and females in their delinquency means due to the influence of peers.

TABLE 6.35

Correlation coefficients between peer approval and delinquency (n=480)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delinquency categories</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mild Delinquency</td>
<td>.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious delinquency</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total delinquency</td>
<td>.26*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.01

The relationships between peer influence and delinquency are presented in Table 6.35. This table shows that, as anticipated, relationships with peers were
positively correlated with delinquency (p<.01). Significance between the delinquency index and approval by peers supported my previous hypothesis that delinquency was positively correlated with peer approval.

TABLE 6.36

Delinquency means by negative labelling outside school and language background (n=480)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language background</th>
<th>negative labelling outside school</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESB</td>
<td>14.19 (n=125)</td>
<td>9.49 (n=237)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESB</td>
<td>21.59 (n=39)</td>
<td>13.42 (n=79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15.95 (n=164)</td>
<td>10.47 (n=316)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.36 shows the delinquency means of both ESB students and NESB students who were sworn at or called bad names outside school, in comparison with those who were not. Generally, those who were negatively labelled outside school committed more delinquent acts than others. These differences were greater for NESB students than for ESB students.
TABLE 6.37

Two way ANOVA between language background and negative labelling outside school (independent variables), and delinquency (dependent variable) (n=480)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-test</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>language background</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2539.23</td>
<td>2539.23</td>
<td>42.72</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative label out side School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3281.06</td>
<td>3281.06</td>
<td>55.20</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>238.27</td>
<td>238.27</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.0458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within group</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>28291.27</td>
<td>59.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.37 shows a significant correlation between delinquency and negative labelling outside school (F [55.20] =3281.06, p<.001). It also indicates significant correlations between language background and negative labelling outside school on the one hand, and delinquency on the other ( F [4.01] =238.27, p<.05).

6.7 Rank ordering of the total correlations of major independent variables with delinquency

In this section of data analysis, a multiple stepwise regression was used to examine the combined effects of all key independent variables, and the separate effects of each independent variable by controlling the other independent variables. This statistical technique enables the researcher to determine the relative variations in delinquency scores which are explained by independent variables (Kerlinger, 1973). By using this technique, I can systematically evaluate the relative contributions of important variables in the explanation of delinquency, and to measure whether there is a cumulative effect of several variables on delinquent behaviour, in order to identify those variables which should be included in combined theory of delinquency.
At this stage of the data analysis, I want to be sure that each major independent variable makes a statistically significant contribution to the predictable variance of mild delinquency and serious delinquency. Most importantly, I want to predict as much variance in the dependent variable as is possible from the composite of independent variables. This process is complicated by the fact that the independent variables may be correlated with each other and consequently each predict the "same" part of the variation in the dependent variable. For example, attitudes towards parents and attitudes towards school as two independent variables drawn from social control theory may correlate with each other.

Independent variables in the regression equation were attitudes towards parents, school, and migrants, with peer approval and socio-economic status as interval variables, while the other five nominal variables (sex, language background, family disruption, negative labelling at school, and negative labelling outside school) were transformed into dummy variables, and then applied with mild delinquency and serious delinquency as the dependent variables. The independent variables were selected according to the hypothesis in Chapter Two and three that all of these factors would contribute to the explanation of juvenile delinquency.

Each independent variable was entered into the regression equation in order to determine its unique contribution in relation to the other nine. The order in which the independent variables are entered into the equation has no impact on the outcome because each variable is treated as though it were the last variable to be entered. The stepwise regression procedure selected the strongest independent variable in the first stage and at each stage a new variable is added to the equation. Using an F test, significant variables were determined.
Multiple regression analysis was used separately for mild delinquency and serious delinquency, because it was expected that any independent variable might be a best predictor in explaining only one of the two types of delinquency. For example, sex may explain more variance in serious delinquency than in mild delinquency. The results of the two separate stepwise regression equations are presented in Tables 6.38 and 6.39.

### TABLE 6.38

**Results of stepwise multiple regression analysis of mild delinquency (n=431)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step number</th>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Variance added (%)</th>
<th>Beta*</th>
<th>F-values**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Attitudes towards parents</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>174.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attitudes towards school</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>131.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Negative labelling at school</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>114.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>90.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Attitudes towards migrants</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>70.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Socio-economic status</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>68.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Peer approval</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>60.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Negative labelling outside school</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>53.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Language background</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>48.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Family disruption</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>43.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Standardized regression coefficient

** All F values are significant at p<.05
**TABLE 6.39**  
Results of stepwise multiple regression analysis of serious delinquency  
(n=431)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step number</th>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Variance added (%)</th>
<th>Beta*</th>
<th>F-values**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>197.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attitudes towards school</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>191.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Negative labelling at school</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>157.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Attitudes towards parents</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>134.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Socio-economic status</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>110.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Attitudes towards migrants</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>95.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Peer approval</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>83.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Negative labelling outside school</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>74.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Language background</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>68.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Family disruption</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>61.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Standardized regression coefficient

** All F values are significant at p<.05

The independent variables were introduced into the regression equation summarised in Table 6.38 and 6.39 in the order in which they increased the explained variance in delinquency. The rank ordering of variables in terms of their predictive strength for mild delinquency is: attitudes towards parents; attitudes towards school; negative labelling at school; sex; attitudes towards migrants; socio-economic status; peer approval; negative labelling outside school; language background; and family disruption, while the respective
predictive strengths for serious delinquency are in: sex; attitudes towards school; negative labelling at school; attitudes towards parents; socio-economic status; attitudes towards migrants; peer approval; negative labelling outside school; language background; and family disruption.

In explaining mild delinquency, the first step identified attitudes towards parents as the best single predictor of delinquency. The correlation between the fitted delinquency, predicted from attitudes towards parents, and observed delinquency is 0.54. The proportion of delinquency variance that can be predicted by this single variable regression equation is 0.29. The F-to-enter thereby implies that the proportion of predictable variance (regression mean square) is greater than would be expected by chance (F[174.93], p<.01). Whereas, in serious delinquency, the best single predictor is sex and the proportion of delinquency variance that can predicted by this single variable is 0.32 (F[197.46], p<.05).

The highest beta coefficient relevant to delinquent behaviour was associated with gender (.56), with male subjects having higher serious delinquency. According to the results of Tables 6.38 and 6.39, it can be concluded that females are much less likely to commit serious delinquency, such as property and aggressive offences, in comparison with mild delinquency. F-ratios for sex are significant at the level of .05. Comparing the results in Tables 6.38 and 6.39, it can be concluded that gender differences becomes more pronounced when specific offences are examined.

Table 6.38 and 6.39 show for both mild delinquency and serious delinquency, attitudes towards school and negative labelling at school as two school-related variables are the second and third strongest predictors of delinquency (with having the significant betas). These two school-related variables add 15 per cent to the explained variance in mild delinquency and 21 per cent in serious
delinquency, while the fourth strongest predictor of serious delinquency is attitudes towards parents ($F[134.99], p<01$). This variable adds 2 per cent to the explained variance in delinquency with having a significant beta (see Table 6.39). Based on social control theory's propositions, such findings confirm that youths who are low on parental and school attachment may at risk for committing delinquent behaviour.

The next step in the analysis is to see if both strain and subculture theories are able to predict delinquency among youths from different socio-economic backgrounds. Tables 6.38 and 6.39 also show a significant relationship between socio-economic status and both mild delinquency ($F[68.23], p<.05$) and serious delinquency ($F[110.26], p<.05$). Socio-economic variables add 1 per cent to the explained variance in mild delinquency and 2 per cent in serious delinquency.

The relationship between attitudes towards migrants or cultural differences and delinquency is significant for both mild delinquency ($F[70.90], p<.05$) and serious delinquency ($F[95.55], p<.05$), adding 2 per cent to the explained variance in mild delinquency and 1 per cent in serious delinquency. As expected, involvement with peers is associated with participation in delinquent behaviour, and the results of Tables 6.38 and 6.39 show such relationships are significant. Although there is a significant relationship between peer approval and delinquency, the effect of this variable is small and adds only 1 per cent of variance in both mild delinquency and serious delinquency.

Although negative labelling outside school, language background, and family disruption (as independent variables) have a significant relationship with both mild and serious delinquency (as dependent variables), according to the multiple stepwise regression analysis they have not added to the amount of variance which has been determined by other independent variables in the equation.
When the ten variables are included in the regression equation, the amount of explained variance in delinquent behaviour increases to about 50 per cent for mild delinquency and 59 per cent for serious delinquency by seven of ten variables. An issue facing the integrated theoretical approach of delinquent behaviour is the question of which factors to use as representations of theories used in this study and how much of total observed delinquency variance explained is acceptable when we use an integrated theoretical approach. Social control theory, for example, has four propositions (discussed in Chapter Two), with several categories within each proposition. Therefore, it was impossible to include all major components of strain, subculture, and social control theories, because a very large questionnaire would have been necessary, in order to account for the influence of each variable, or set of variables drawn from these three theories. One way researchers have dealt with this issue is to limit the number of variables thought to be representative of each theoretical statement being considered (Shoemaker, 1990; Segrave and Hastad, 1985; Johnson, 1979). In such instances, the percentage of variance explained in delinquent behaviour might be reduced to about half, so that if this amount of variance is explained it is considered acceptable by some researchers who have used an integrated theoretical approach (Segrave and Hastad, 1985; Agnew, 1991).

As a result of this stepwise regression procedure, all ten independent variables can be seen to have a significant relationship with delinquency. R square increases for seven independent variables from step one to step seven. It can therefore be concluded that youths with the following characteristics were more likely to be involved in delinquent behaviour: males; negative attitudes towards school, parents, and migrants; higher peer approval; negative labelling at school; and low socio-economic status. Although, the relationships between negative labelling outside school, language background, and family disruption, and delinquent behaviour are significant, the apparent relationships between such
independent variables and delinquent behaviour may be shared with a common set of independent variables.

In general, the results reported in Tables 6.38 and 6.39 support the major propositions of the three theories selected. The data indicate a negative relationship between socio-economic status and delinquent behaviour, supporting the major propositions of both strain and subculture theories. In support of social control theory, the stepwise multiple regression indicates a negative association between attitudes towards parents and school, and delinquency.

The results in Tables 6.38 and 6.39 indicate that although all key variables drawn from strain, subculture, and social control theories account for significant amounts of variance in delinquency, social control theory appears to be the best single predictor of delinquent behaviour.

6.8 Conclusion

In this chapter I have questioned whether a combination of theories is required to explain delinquent behaviour. Strain and subculture theories as two of the most popular theories of delinquency were tested, and it was found that the variables used in these theories were clearly related to delinquency involvement. The results also confirm Hirschi's (1969) social control proposition that the more youths have been respected by their parents and teachers, the more they will accept conventional rules and the more they accept such rules, the less likely they are to commit delinquent behaviour. In contrast, those who lack attachment to parents and teachers, who have not internalised conventional norms, are less likely to obey conventional rules.
The study examined the hypothesis that juvenile delinquency is mainly a function of family socio-economic status, family structure, school-related variables, peer approval, and cultural differences. Different statistical methods were used to measure the major conceptual variables developed from the theoretical approach outlined in Chapter 2, an approach which allows for evaluation of multivariates resulting from the interrelationship of the background variables and delinquency.

Some specific hypotheses about demographic factors (age, sex, language background, and area of residence) and self-reported delinquency were tested. In general, the results show that females reported less delinquent behaviour than males in all items. The types of delinquent act committed by females also tended to differ somewhat from those committed by males. The findings also show that delinquency is related to age and area of residence.

The considerable difference in occupational status between NESB families and ESB families has been explored. While the results found no significant differences between the two language subgroups in terms of parents’ education, there is a significant difference according to family socio-economic status.

In the last stage of the analysis, a stepwise regression was used. The results show that youths with negative attitudes towards school, family, and migrants, who have higher peer approval, and whose family occupy a low socio-economic status, were more likely to report involvement in delinquent activities.
CHAPTER SEVEN

Discussion

7.1 Introduction

The most important result of this study has been to advance our understanding of the relationship between language background, socio-economic status and juvenile delinquency. Since language background and socio-economic status have both been recognised as important correlates of juvenile delinquency, it is important to assess their respective importance.

Three main parameters have generated the framework of this research. First was the description of delinquency in terms of age, sex, residential area, and language background as demographic characteristics of the sample. Second was measuring the effect of language background and family socio-economic status on delinquent behaviour, and third was an evaluation of the importance of these major independent variables in relation to delinquent behaviour.

The previous chapter reviewed the main findings of this study in relation to these three objectives. In this chapter, analysis of the major findings will attempt to link the empirical results to the theoretical discussions raised earlier in this thesis. Finally, findings related to these three objectives will be summarised, prior to exploring their overall implications for theory, intervention and policy.
7.2 Review of main findings

This thesis has focused on the links between background variables and delinquent behaviour. The results were obtained by administering an anonymous questionnaire to 480 male and female high school students aged 11-17 years in the Illawarra region in autumn 1994. It was evident from the self-report data gathered that all youths in the sample were involved in at least one item of delinquent behaviour during the past two years.

Several statistical techniques were employed for different purposes in this study, including chi-square test, T-test, one-way and two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and simple correlations. These incorporated measures of the major conceptual variables specified by the original theoretical framework. In order to evaluate more systematically the relative contribution of each major independent variable in the explanation of juvenile delinquency, a stepwise multiple regression was employed. Multiple regression was also used to examine and sort out the simultaneous effects of different background variables on delinquency.

As far as the first objective of this study is concerned, the initial phase of the data analysis examined associations between age, sex, residential area and language background as major demographic variables, and delinquent behaviour. This revealed that males reported committing a greater number of delinquent acts than females. Although this was true in general, when delinquency items were classified into two categories -mild and serious- this study found a greater tendency for females to be involved mild delinquency. The results therefore show that the type of delinquency is important in explaining female delinquency. Neither Nye's nor Hirschi's theories indicated the type of delinquency. These authors simply designed and tested their theories on a single measure of delinquency, but the results of this thesis show the inadequacy of such an approach.
Variation in delinquent behaviour according to the age structure of respondents has also been demonstrated. As age increases, the involvement in delinquency increases. As regards area of residence and delinquency, the findings confirm the hypothesis that students living in urban areas admitted significantly greater involvement in delinquent behaviour than those in other residential areas. The findings also demonstrated that NESB respondents consistently committed higher levels of delinquent behaviour than ESB youths, but further analysis of this result will be made below.

In relation to the second objective, the research explored whether language background is an important factor in the explanation of juvenile delinquency, as it is usually associated with socio-economic status as a central focus of theoretical attention. Mean differences in occupational status and levels of education between NESB parents and ESB parents provided evidence for explaining juvenile delinquency when the two language subgroups were compared. Differences in the delinquent behaviour of ESB youths and NESB youths can be explained on the basis of family socio-economic status. This finding is important because there is no prior research which reveals the impact of family socio-economic status on juvenile delinquency in different language subgroups in the Illawarra region.

The final phase of the data analysis examined the contribution of family socio-economic status, attitudes towards parents, school, and migrants, peer approval, sex, negative labelling at school, negative labelling outside school, language background, and family disruption as major independent variables in predicting delinquent behaviour. More importantly, the extent to which a combination of the several major independent variables can improve our predictions of delinquency was explored. Among these independent variables, the best predictor of mild delinquency was attitudes towards the family, and second was attitudes towards school (see Table 6.38), while the best predictor of serious
delinquency was sex, followed by attitudes towards the school (see Table 6.39), then negative labelling at school, family socio-economic status, attitudes towards migrants, and peer approval, respectively. On the basis of my findings, 50 per cent of variation in mild delinquency and 59 per cent of variation in serious delinquency can be explained by these independent variables. These findings suggest that a combination of sociological theories of delinquency can provide a better explanation than any single theory.

7.2.1 Demographic variables and delinquency

One of the demographic variables which has been implicated as a major contributor to variation in delinquent behaviour is age. The self-report data demonstrated significant age differences in the amount of delinquent behaviour reported. Specifically, of three age groups examined (11-13, 14-15, and 16-17), the frequency of self-report delinquency increased with increasing age. Such differences are larger for serious delinquency than for mild delinquency (see Table 6.11). One of the most consistent and basic findings in this self-report study is that delinquency tends to peak in the late teenage years (15 years and over). This may be significant because it has been suggested that the influence of parental attachment and parental controls on delinquency may also differ according to age (Empey, 1982; Hirschi, 1969; LaGrange and White, 1985).

The age pattern revealed in this study matches that in the official statistics. According to the Office of Juvenile Justice in NSW, during 1993 about two thirds of delinquents in NSW and the Illawarra were 15 years old and over. In another self-report study, Elliott and Voss (1974) found an increase in the frequency of serious as well as mild types of delinquency with age among high school students. A number of other studies have shown that delinquent
behaviour tends to peak around the age of 16 or 17 and then levels off (Haskell and Yablonsky, 1974; Jensen and Rojek, 1980; LaGrange and White, 1985).

Social control theory suggests that the willingness to engage in deviant behaviour is distributed unequally across age groups because the costs of apprehension are different for persons of different ages (Hirschi, 1969). The finding of a relationship between age and delinquency addressed the efficacy of age as a determinant of level of risk for delinquent behaviour. The pattern of results suggests that when youths were divided into three levels, distinctions emerge according to delinquent behaviour, and this has implications for prevention planning.

The second demographic issue raised in this study concerns the variation in delinquency rates between males and females. The results of this study show that there are large differences in the frequency of behaviour by gender. Males report a much higher involvement in delinquent activity than girls. The ratio of males to females over 16 items of delinquency is in a range of 1.2:1 to 21.3:1 (see Table 6.10).

There are clear and major differences between males and females in the types of delinquent behaviour they report (see Tables 6.10, 6.38, and 6.39). For all delinquency items, there are significant differences between males and females according to the means of scaled delinquency scores (p<.05), and the proportion of females committing delinquent behaviour is less than for males. The results showed that the male-female ratio for mild delinquency is 1.4 to 1, and for serious delinquency 3.4 to 1. The gender ratio becomes more pronounced when specific offences are examined. In some offence categories, the ratio of males to females is greater than 6 to 1 (e.g. assaulting strangers). While this indicates that males tend to commit offences more frequently than females, the findings also confirm that the proportion of females committing mild delinquency is much greater than
for serious delinquency. The highest ratio is for having 'beaten somebody so as to be hospitalised', an item of serious delinquency (21.3:1), while for 'suspended from school', an item of mild delinquency, it is 1.2:1 (see Table 6.10). This study therefore shows a weaker and more complex relationship between sex and delinquency than is generally acknowledged in official data.

In the United States, the 1978 Uniform Crime Reports indicated that the overall gender ratio in delinquency was less than 3.6:1 (U.S. Department of Justice, 1979). Self-report studies, on the other hand, suggest that the overall ratio is much lower, falling somewhere between 1.5:1 and 2.5:1 (Hindelang, 1971; Elliott and Voss, 1974; Jensen and Eve, 1976; Cernkovich and Giordano, 1979; Johnson, 1979; Thornton et al., 1987). The findings in this thesis provide some evidence of a gender bias in delinquent behaviour. In relation to sex/age and delinquency, an interesting trend in the results is the similarity for males and females in the association between delinquent behaviour and age structure (see Table 6.13).

Patterns of female offending can be a reflection of the social context in which they take place and thus cannot be understood without reference to the wider social structure, including the growth of the women's movement, changing gender roles, and their influence on female crime and delinquency. Recent explanations of the increase in female delinquency have linked it to gender-egalitarian (feminist) orientations. As expected, gender-egalitarian orientations are found to be more important for girls than boys in determining aspirations and subsequent behaviour (McDonough, 1986).

The third demographic issue raised in this study concerns the apparent variation in delinquency rates between youths living in urban areas and youths from other areas (p<.05). The result shows that both the mild and serious delinquency means in urban areas are higher than those for suburbs, small towns and rural
areas (see Tables 6.15 and 6.16). Most delinquency theories and research suggest that urban rates are considerably higher. My results indicate that urban youths reported significantly more frequent involvement in delinquent activity than youths in other residential areas. Perhaps the heterogeneous population of urban communities provides a context for delinquent behaviour, whereas youths outside urban areas were less involved in delinquent activities because of wider networks of personal relationships and informal systems of social control.

These results support early empirical studies of the geographical distribution of delinquency (Shaw and McKay, 1942). These studies observed that delinquency in Chicago tended to be high in low status urban areas characterised by wide population diversity and instability of group norms and standards of behaviour.

7.2.2 Family socio-economic status, language background and delinquency

Determining the effects of family socio-economic status and language background, and the interaction between these two independent variables, on delinquency is the second main objective of this study. This research introduced language background as a key variable in relation to juvenile delinquency in order to discover whether there was an association between language background and delinquency and whether this depended on other background variables.

This study found no considerable differences between ESB youths and NESB youths according to the level of parents' education, but socio-economic status, measured by parents' occupation, was higher for ESB families than for NESB families. The means of fathers' educational scores, for example, for both groups are about 3 (see Table 6.19). Also there was a difference between these two
language subgroups according to their occupational circumstances. The means of fathers' occupational scores for ESB youths is about 4, and for NESB youths is about 3 (see Table 6.19). Also, a greater proportion of NESB women were unemployed (42% compared to 26% for ESB women), which suggests a continued disadvantage for NESB migrants.

The results demonstrates that there are significant relationships between parental occupations, the levels of parental education, parents' job situation, the number of family members in the workforce, and parents in shift work as indices of socio-economic status and delinquency (see Tables 6.20 to 6.25). Much of the theorising and research on juvenile delinquency assumes that delinquent behaviour is linked to socio-economic status (e.g. Merton, 1938; Cohen, 1955; Form, 1985). The influence of parents on the child is in turn seen as strongly determined by the parents' socio-economic status. Martin (1981) suggested that working class parents, in contrast to middle class parents, are more authoritarian with their children, more controlling, and more insistent on obedience in day-to-day interactions. Working class parents are assumed to be less tolerant of children making their own decisions and are less likely to reason with a child. According to these assumptions, socio-economic status would be an important predictor of delinquent behaviour because of its effect on other family variables. For example, it can affect the social situation of the family and aggravate both parental relationships and parent-child relationships. The youth who is living at a low socio-economic standard might also be more vulnerable to committing delinquent behaviour.

This study found that the interaction between parental occupations and language background was significantly related to delinquency (see Tables 6.20 and 6.21). The findings in this thesis show that, regardless of language background, most youths who reported high levels of delinquency came from families in which both parents had attained low educational levels. Previous
research has shown a high level of delinquent behaviour among youths whose parents had a low level of education (Kulek et al., 1968; West, 1973). In turn it is assumed that education is a basic circumstance for differences in socio-economic status in modern societies because it often extends occupational possibilities and will often increase the living standards of the person. That poverty causes delinquency among some minority groups has been widely accepted by researchers (Samuel, and Faustino-Santos, 1991). For example, in the United States, the high delinquency among blacks is attributed to their poor socio-economic status rather than to their race (Samuel, and Faustino-Santos, 1991).

The results from the analysis suggest that the importance of language background for delinquency has been highly exaggerated in the popular thesis linking language background to delinquency. These results argue for an alternative explanation for relatively high rates of delinquency among NESB youths. The most general conclusion from the present data is that there are important differences between language groups in the way socio-economic status impacts on delinquency. Regardless of differences in language background, when an individual suffers from socio-economic disadvantage, increased delinquency will result.

When language background is implicated in delinquency within this sample of youth from low socio-economic status families, delinquency increased. In contrast, when both parents are employed and at least one of them was in a high level of occupation, delinquency was reduced. Therefore, in explaining delinquent behaviour the economic dimensions of migrant families may be more important than language background-related variables (e.g. cultural conflict).

Finally, the results show that about half of the students who reported high levels of delinquency, had both parents in shift work (see Table 6.24). The results
consistently support the view that delinquent behaviour is related to whether parents are engaged in shift work, particularly in the case of women. It can be concluded from the results that the absence of women from full time work in the home as wives and mothers gives rise to some social problems for youths, as such women are unable to take great responsibility for the rearing of their children. Low occupational status of parents, low education levels and long term unemployment are all factors that affect the social environment of the family. Such factors can affect parental relationships and parent-child relationships and the outcome of this process can lead to increased delinquent behaviour.

7.2.3 The relative contributions of variables to delinquency

A stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to assess the relative contributions of important variables in explaining delinquency. Tables 6.38 and 6.39 show that of the variables in this multiple regression equation, sex, school-related variables, and attitudes towards parents had the strongest relationship with self-reported delinquency. But together, all the variables in the regression equation accounted for a substantial amount of variation in self-reported delinquency (50% for mild delinquency and 59% for serious delinquency). The first task was to estimate and test the variables derived from strain, subculture, and social control theories on the prediction of self-reported delinquency. Next, the utility of the integrated theoretical approach in predicting different delinquent outcomes was tested and evaluated. These two general tasks guided the analysis and interpretation of results.

Young people were asked their attitudes to parental relationships, parent-child relationships, disobedience of parents, parental punishment and deprivation of freedom, and to their teachers, staff and friends. The combined effect of the child-parent relationship and attitudes to school was tested, along with the
relative role of cultural conflict. The data demonstrates that several variables, asserted or implied by the previously mentioned theories, were in fact related to delinquent behaviour.

The correlations within family variables are moderately high (see Table 6.1). This means that family variables generally are significantly associated with each other. The correlation is generally in the range .3 to .8, and many of the correlation coefficients are significant at the .001 level of significance. The pattern of correlations accords with the view that different measures of family variables are interrelated, and that different school variables are associated with each other (see Table 6.2).

Although of the variables drawn from three theories (strain, subculture, and social control), attitudes towards school and parents explain the greatest amount of variance in delinquency, stepwise regression analysis indicated that the amount of explained variance in delinquency increased when other variables derived from all three theories were combined.

It is important to reiterate that variations in offending may be related to variations in the strength of a youth's bond to school and family, which in turn means less loyalty to peers (Heimer and Matsueda, 1994). These findings confirm the basic hypothesis that a tendency to commit delinquent acts was linked to weak bonding with the family and school as two important social institutions (Hirschi, 1969). The findings show that positive attitudes and feeling towards parents, teachers, and school staff were inversely related to delinquent behaviour.

This study found a significant difference between delinquency levels and the level of schooling a student wished to attain. About two-thirds of students who admitted a high number of delinquent acts only wished to attain a low level of schooling. In contrast, 55 per cent of students who admitted a low number of
delinquent acts wanted to attain a high level of schooling (see Table 6.30). It can be argued that those students who are not motivated to learn in school, who perform poorly, and who become alienated from school, are less likely to be controlled by the school organisation and more likely to affiliate with delinquents and alienated students. The reference groups for these students are other students who are more likely to be involved in delinquent activities.

I now return to family variables which were hypothetically used as the basic explanation for juvenile delinquency. The family is considered to be very important in influencing the everyday life of youths. Social relations, behaviour patterns and reactions to surrounding society are often affected by the interaction between youths and their families, and the results showed that delinquency was indeed related to variables such as family socio-economic status, parent-child relationships, physical punishment, and family disruption.

In the family process literature, I identified a set of structural background factors relevant to an understanding of both family functioning and delinquency. Over the past decades, theorists and researchers have concentrated their attention on the role of the family (Nye, 1958; West and Farrington, 1977; Hirschi, 1969, 1977), and such concerns led me to use extensive family variables, such as parent-child and child-parent involvement and parental supervision, parent-child and child-parent rejection, physical punishment, marital conflict and parental absence. Family relationships are stressed by Hirschi's (1969) social control theory as an important factor in delinquent behaviour. He emphasised the fact that "delinquents are less likely than non-delinquents to be closely tied to their parents is one of the best documented findings of delinquency research" (Hirschi, 1969, p. 85). The typical conclusion from this position is that the quality of parent-child relationships (often termed the strength of parent-child attachment) matters most in determining the behaviour of children (Hindelang, 1973).
Family disruption was found to be related to self-reported delinquent behaviour. In general the findings showed that significant differences exist between delinquency levels and family disruption, especially for students in broken homes (p<.001). Most students from broken homes admitted high delinquency in comparison with students from intact families (see Tables 6.28 and 6.29). These results are supported by other surveys which found that a broken home is related to delinquent behaviour, particularly where the father is absent (Biller, 1974; Stern et al., 1984; Farnworth, 1984; Veneziano and Louis-Veneziano, 1992; Chilton and Markle, 1972; Smith and Walters, 1878).

The association between family cohesion and delinquent behaviour may be explained in a number of ways. The most common suggestion is that family breakdown can reduce the quality of parent-child relationships, which in turn increases the likelihood of delinquent behaviour. More importantly for this study, there is evidence which suggests that coming from a broken home creates difficulties for the child at school (Zakariyia, 1982). When a child is troubled by the situation at home and lacks the support and assistance of parents, each of a number of possible consequences of family breakdown may independently produce delinquent behaviour.

The family structure of Australian society has changed in the last twenty years. Between 1970 and 1991, there was an increase in the number of people living alone or in one parent families, and a decrease in family size. In 1991, the median age of first marriage was 24.5 years for women and 26.7 years for men, about 3 years older than the median ages 15 years earlier (Castles, 1993, p. 24). Between 1976 and 1991, the number of divorced women increased by 217% and the number of divorced men by 215% (Castles, 1993, p. 26).

In the past few decades, Australian society has been confronted by massive changes in attitudes, values, norms, and behaviour in relation to families because
of a declining fertility rate, rises in divorce and living alone, increased acceptance of homosexuality, and couples choosing to be childless. In 1987, 114,113 persons married and 39,725 divorced in Australia (Year Book Australia, 1989). Evidence also shows that in 1984 the number of marriages was 108,655, while the number of divorces was 43,012 (ABS, 1986), while over 800,000 children below the age of 15 were living in single-parent families in 1987 (Year Book Australia, 1989).

Family stability is considered to be important in explaining juvenile delinquency. In Australia in 1986, 33 per cent of men and 24 per cent of women aged 15 years and older, had never been married (Year Book Australia 1989). Australian men had a divorce rate of 7 per cent and women a rate of 8 per cent (Year Book Australia, 1989).

Family disruption is often a primary cause of socio-economic disadvantage, especially where it results in the formation of single parent families. Ross and Whiteford (1990) found that, in 1986, 82 per cent of Australian single parent families (excluding Aboriginal families) with three or more children had incomes below the poverty line. In the Sydney metropolitan area, over half of the poor families counted in the 1986 census were single parent families. Of the very poor female headed single parent families in Sydney in 1986, 42 per cent had two or more children (Horvath et al., 1989).

In relation to peer approval and delinquency, the data shows that delinquent behaviour is positively associated with peer influences. Relationships with peers were positively correlated with delinquency (see Table 6.35). Elliott et al., (1985), Rodriguez and Weishurd (1991), and Pabon et al., (1992) have all used the social control model on the premise that youths left to their own influences without important controls, such as the family, will more likely get into trouble whether or not they learn delinquency in a peer group.
In the social relations of the child, the relationship with the parents comes first and then the relationship with peers. It is possible that weak ties with parents may contribute to greater friendship networks elsewhere. There is also a basically different structure of interaction between the child and parents or peers. Peer culture can have a disruptive influence on the parent-child relationship. The child may learn conflicting and deviant norms, which parents have little chance to counter. An example is the conflicts that are likely to arise with second generation migrants, where the culture of the parents and the culture of the host society show noticeable variations.

The findings of this study appear to support control theory because they reveal that several dimensions of family, school, and peer relations were related to delinquency involvement, in particular that parental attachment and controls, and attachment to school are useful in explaining juvenile delinquency. It is important to understand why attitudes towards teachers and school can explain more variance in delinquency than other factors. Perhaps it is because school bonding is qualitatively distinct from family and peer bonding. While family and peer relationships are by definition effective, immediate, and interpersonal, school relationships are more impersonal, future-oriented, and competitive (Cernkovich and Giordano, 1992).

### 7.3 Theoretical significance

I began by considering briefly the historical background of theories of delinquency, and have used central concepts from strain, subculture, and control theories in order to explain delinquent behaviour among both males and females. I then discussed in detail these three major theoretical orientations, and my study was based on the assumption that each theory has concentrated on certain processes that play a role in generating delinquent behaviour. I now turn to the
central question of this thesis: do the variables derived from selected theories explain differences in delinquency between male and female ESB and NESB youths according to family socio-economic status and attitudes towards parents, school, migrants and peer approval? The theories presented in this study attempted to illustrate how groups or social institutions such as family, school, and peer may develop and motivate delinquent behaviour, as well as how socio-economic status might give opportunities for committing delinquency.

The results of this study support the major propositions of strain, subculture and social control theories in explaining both male and female delinquency. In regard to subculture theory, delinquent behaviour is positively associated with peer approval. Concerning social control theory, strong parental relationships, close parents-child relationships, and attachment to school are negatively associated with delinquent behaviour. Socio-economic status as a central element of strain theory is negatively associated with delinquent behaviour.

School-related variables and parent-child relationships, as major elements of social control theory were the best predictors for explaining delinquent behaviour in the sample. That is, social control theory emerged as more clearly supported than the other theories. Data on family and school-related variables might lend more support to social control theory because the effects for family and school-related variables are greater than for other variables. This is supported by some literature on delinquency (Fagan and Wexler, 1987; White et al., 1987). It is possible that the failure to understand the complexity of the relationship between parents and children may account for the low explanatory power of such variables.

Sociological theorists have sought to explain juvenile delinquency in modern societies as a result of encounters with urbanisation, industrialisation, and migration. From the various sociological approaches to delinquency, social
control, strain, and subculture theories or a combination of two or all of them have been used for the principal current sociological explanations of delinquency (Empey, 1982; Colvin and Pauly, 1983; Pearson and Weiner, 1985; Buikhuisen and Mednik, 1988; Cernkovich and Giordano 1992).

This research established that both macro and micro theories of delinquency are important in the study of delinquency. There is a significant relationship between socio-economic factors and delinquency. Delinquency was related to the number of family members in the workforce, parents in shift work, the levels of parental education, and parental occupation. These findings support the macro theories of delinquency. In relation to micro theories of delinquency, there is also a significant relationships between attitudes towards family and school and delinquency. Certainly, these are major accomplishments, and they help to construct a more meaningful understanding of delinquency.

Candidates for delinquency are those isolated from controlling social bonds (according to social control theory) or those experiencing social strain defined as the frustration of needs because of a discrepancy between aspirations and means for attaining them. Delinquent acts in this case are motivated by an attempt to eliminate that discrepancy (Merton, 1938; Cohen, 1955).

Social control theory assumes that vulnerability to delinquency is determined by variation in the strength of social controls (Nye, 1958; Hirschi, 1969). The control theorist assumes that conformity is dependent upon a bond between the individual and the social order. Consequently, when this bond is weakened, deviance becomes a potential outcome. In the delinquency literature, the primary objective of social control theory has been to specify the nature of the social bond which knits the individual to the fabric of society. This study adopts an approach to evaluate the strength of the bond through the combined influence of attachment to family, school and peers. In the sample, a strong inverse
relationship is evident between attitudes to parents and school, and delinquency. Only family size does not prove to be statistically significant. Attitudes towards school are most strongly associated with delinquent behaviour in this analysis, which provides support for a social control interpretation of delinquency.

The results of this study generally support social control theory, and are consistent with initial expectations. They support results reported in the social control literature. The correlations between attitudes towards parents and teachers and delinquent behaviour are significant, and similar findings are reported elsewhere (Jensen and Eve, 1976; Hagan et al., 1979; Johnson, 1979; Smith, 1979; White and LaGrange, 1987). Therefore, social control theory was found to be empirically justified.

Generally, males reported engaging in significantly more delinquent behaviour than females, although this was less true for mild delinquency. This suggests that females are more strongly bonded to their parents and schools than males, as such attitudes were negatively related to delinquent behaviour.

In spite of the fact that criminological theories have focused on male delinquency, the results in this thesis support the contention that existing theories of delinquency are equally applicable to females.

Both Ney's and Hirschi's social control theories did not indicate the type of delinquency they were designed to explain, although both authors tested their theories using delinquent behaviour in general, regardless of mild or serious delinquency. The results show in this study that the type of delinquency is important in relation to gender.

As was shown in Table 6.11, delinquency shows substantial variation with age, and tends to peak in the higher ages groups (16 and 17 years). However, official
data confirm that individuals abandon crime in late adolescence (Simon, 1993). In terms of delinquency theory, age variation can help to test delinquency theories constructed to explain other sources of variation, such as sex, language background, and socio-economic status. Since these other sources of variation can be explained in many ways, the adequacy with which relevant theories explain age variation may help us to distinguish among them.

Subculture theory has sought the cause of delinquency in the conflicting subcultures of highly differentiated societies (Miller, 1958). The intervening cause, both necessary and sufficient, of delinquency is socialisation to subcultural values which can view as right conduct what the controlling legal system defines as crime or delinquency.

The results in this study confirm the argument that delinquency can be anticipated to result from strong strains (socio-economic disadvantages), weak controls, and peer approvals. Strain and control models are distinguished by what each omits from their explanation of delinquency. Strain models ignore variations in the strength of situational factors, believing that all children have been equally well socialised, have equally strong ties to the family and other social institutions, and have the same culturally defined wants. The very effectiveness of their socialisation and the strength of their cultural commitments are the source of their problems, for goal achievement is not equally accessible to all. What is assumed to differ is their structurally determined capacity to fulfil those wants, and nothing else.

In social control theory, there is little interest in what motivates the individual to deviate. Rather, the basic assumption of the theory is that most individuals would deviate if their bonds to conformity were loosened (Conger, 1976). This presupposition disturbs control theorists, who see considerable variation where strain theory assumes constancy. Not all children are equally well socialised or
have equally strong attachments to family, school or community. Therefore, say control theorists, not all children are equally committed to conformity, and not all milieus are equally effective in social control.

Nevertheless, a synthesis of the strain and control models works well. Control theorists cannot ignore strain, because its effect on delinquency is registered in socio-economic disadvantages. In other words, the effect of controls on delinquency is not independent of prior strain levels. On the other hand, strain theorists cannot ignore controls because they determine people's relative tolerance to various types and levels of strain.

The findings thus provide empirical support for all three theories of juvenile delinquency which have been used in this study. The results assert that the quality of family-child relationships, school-related variables, family socio-economic status and peer approval play a vital role in the explanation of juvenile delinquency. Although I have only focused attention on certain elements of strain, subculture, and social control theories, the analysis indicates that an integrated theoretical approach can provide a better understanding of juvenile delinquency, and the total variance in delinquency explained by this approach was relatively large. This suggests that further developments in these theories should not ignore the contributory elements of the others.

Some delinquency theorists (e.g. Johanson, 1979; Elliott, 1988) who have focused on an integrated approach to explain delinquent behaviour have rejected class-specific explanations, while others support them (e.g. Hagan and McCarthy, 1992; Segrave and Hastad, 1985). Significant interaction effects were observed for parental occupation and language background on delinquency (F<.001). When the statistical interaction effects are considered within the context of the delinquency main effects, there is some support for the hypothesis that families with a low socio-economic status are more dysfunctional than
others. This helps to confirm the role of macro theories of delinquency (e.g. strain theory) in the explanation of delinquent behaviour. The results of this thesis suggest the need to provide a broader conceptualisation in order to determine the relative importance of socio-economic status in delinquency theories.

Correlation coefficients, the results of analysis of variance, and use of the chi-square test supported the major tenets of strain, subculture and social control theories. Separate correlation coefficients showed that all variables derived from these theories were significantly associated with delinquency. Although variables derived from social control theory explained the greatest amount of variance, the results of multiple regression analysis indicated that the amount of explained variance in delinquency increased significantly when variables derived from all three theories were considered.

To conclude, the analysis indicates that an integrated theoretical approach can aid in the search for a better understanding of delinquency. Although I have only focused my attention on certain elements of strain, subculture, and social control theories, the findings reject the claims of each theory to exclusive validity, and suggests the need for an integration of macro and micro delinquency theories. That is to say, an integrated theory must be able to explain delinquent behaviour in terms of both wider structural origins and situational factors. Structural considerations should involve recognition of the intermediate elements that have been the domain of sociological criminology (e.g. ecological areas, distribution of occupational opportunities, subcultural location). It would also place these against the overall social context of inequalities in the labour market for NESB migrants.

Just as subcultural theorists have argued that subcultures are useful in explaining the different ways in which youths resolve the problems posed by a
dominant culture, so an adequate theory of delinquency must be able to explain the different events, experiences or structural developments that precipitate such acts.

Given my findings, I believe that a reassessment of macro theories of delinquency is warranted, because the potential explanatory power of underclass measures, as in Miller's subculture theory and Cohen's strain theory, are relatively limited and the explanatory power of social control theory should not be overlooked.

7.4 Recommendations for delinquency prevention

One of the prevention programs which has been employed by the NSW Child Welfare Department is that families who come to the notice of authorities and who are assessed as dysfunctional come under a system of 'preventative family supervision'. The main purpose of this is to manage the effects of a departmentally defined family pathology. Carrington (1993) found that the typical family in this case was one which experienced high unemployment and welfare dependency rates. One third of such families had a single parent, compared with the Australian average of 7 per cent. The average number of children in the families under supervision was six, compared with an Australian average of two. There were very few home owners among these families, most were tenants, and housing commission tenants in particular. Of the few parents who were employed, most worked in the secondary labour market in low-paid intermittent jobs. This supports my evidence that both family socio-economic status and family structure can affect delinquency. My results show that youths who come from broken homes are more at risk of delinquent behaviour than others. Therefore, agencies of juvenile justice should be aware of the stability of the home and socio-economic factors as criteria for legal intervention. That is,
policy should be based on the assumption that such characteristics often lead to delinquency.

The effects of school on delinquent behaviour were explored by this study (see Tables 6.38 and 6.39), and the results suggest that schools can have a very important role in intervention strategies for reducing delinquency. They seem to be most effective as institutions of intervention when they concentrate on delivering high-quality instruction that is considered meaningful and worthwhile by both teachers and students. Reforms focusing on improving the quality of school are the best contribution to delinquency prevention. The efforts of delinquency prevention must focus on changing the social climate of school settings in order to develop attachments between the school and the individual student, with the aim of replacing negative social relationships with positive ones. The management of truancy is a social responsibility for both schools and juvenile justice agencies, who have a social duty to adequately provide a positive educational environment for youths in order to reduce truancy.

The study found that delinquency was also related to peer influences (see Table 6.35). It is true that delinquent behaviour often occurs in groups, and both theory and empirical research show that delinquency is supported and encouraged within groups (Hirschi, 1969; Johnson, 1979; Akers et al., 1979). Therefore, attention to peer groups is very important for schools and for delinquency prevention programs. This research has presented some preliminary findings of a relationship between peer approval and delinquency that might help to guide the design of prevention and intervention services. Peer interventions to reduce the risk of delinquent behaviour are suggested by the observation that youths who engage in delinquent behaviour tend to spend their free time with friends, discuss their personal problems with friends, and to seek approval and concern from friends. These findings would support group treatment techniques in social work and counselling.
It possible to conclude that youths who do not succeed in establishing an appropriate social position in society may conform with peer delinquents. That is, that experiences of social and material deprivation can become a spur to delinquent behaviour. Peer group interventions can range from peer counselling through sensitivity training to the popular concept of guided group interaction in peer group culture. Such prevention programs can be widely used in schools. These programs must offer rewards that are both realistic and meaningful to delinquent youth, including peer acceptance of law-abiding behaviour.

This study confirmed the hypothesis that juvenile delinquency is related to socio-economic status and asked whether two language subgroups, ESB youths and NESB youths, could be distinguished by the extent of delinquent behaviour they commit. The interaction between language background and socio-economic status can be invoked as a basis for social policy proposals and as an explanation for current racial and social-class disparity in institutionalisation rates within the juvenile justice system.

Finally, I would suggest that attempts to prevent juvenile delinquency should involve strategies outside the criminal justice system, and that social organisations such as schools can play a vital role in this task. Decision makers should consider specific delinquency prevention programs for the general population of young people rather than programs solely for young offenders who have already been dealt with by the juvenile justice system.

7.5 Suggestions for further research

As with any research, there are limitations that should be addressed in future work. The findings reported here should provoke further research to overcome some of its practical limitations, and my analysis suggests several considerations.
In relation to areas of residence and delinquency, it is true that the sample may not be typical of the majority of urban youngsters who live in larger cities, and the relationship to delinquency may be even stronger in more urbanised areas.

This investigation was only an initial assessment of the influence of migrant socio-economic status, school-related variables, family structure and peer approval on delinquency, and much research on the relationship between the background variables and juvenile delinquency remains to be done. I anticipate that the future will see research on criminal behaviour develop in the direction of more comprehensive empirically based theories that focus on multiple causes.

Much of the research on the family and delinquency has focused on family structure and suggested that the broken home was a direct indicator of family dysfunction. Generally, the literature indicates a strong relationship between family variables and self-reported delinquency. My findings both support and qualify that assessment. The links between parent-child relationships, broken homes and delinquency were significant. But my findings also suggest that family research should focus on multiple dimensions of family life rather than any single factor. Therefore, the challenge for future research is to undertake a multivariate analysis that will systematically assess the role of family socio-economic status, family breakdown, and the quality of family-child relationships in delinquency across different population subgroups.

Future research needs to investigate the relationship between ethnic identity and delinquent behaviour. More fully justified explanations for the relationships between juvenile delinquency and background variables in relation to migrants, such as socio-economic status, cultural identity, and cultural conflict must await future studies in which cause-effect connections can be examined in detail.
7.6 Conclusion

Some important conclusions can be drawn from this investigation of juvenile delinquency. First, delinquency was related to demographic characteristics. Youths who are older, male, urban residents, and from an NESB background commit more initial delinquent acts than others. The self-report technique was useful in predicting delinquency for males and females in terms of both mild and serious delinquency, and the results substantiate the view that female delinquency is explicable in terms of the theories selected. Second, there was evidence that delinquency results largely from the impact of family socio-economic status, particularly in the case of NESB families. It is therefore important that research begins to understand the dynamic of the interaction of language background and socio-economic status on delinquency.

This study found that NESB youths are more likely to be negatively labelled both in school and outside school, and that this negative labelling by friends, teachers, and others was related to delinquency. Youths from the most socially disadvantaged backgrounds are the least bonded to conventional society and most exposed to the world of delinquency (Thornberry, 1987). Finally, a major finding was that attitudes towards school and parents were the most powerful predictors of delinquent behaviour.

These results lead to the conclusion that the proportion of female involvement in delinquent behaviour is considerable, particularly in the area of mild delinquency (see Table 6.10). This differs from official data, and the discrepancy may arise from the behaviour of agencies of social control.

Referral to any intervention program would differ on the basis of gender, because according to the results here, boys were more likely to commit serious delinquency, whereas girls tended to commit mild delinquency such as truancy and running away. Further research on gender differences in delinquent
behaviour is a necessary first step toward resolving the current debate concerning the role of gender in theories of delinquency. Such research can, in turn, provide a foundation for a theory that addresses the complexities of both gender-specific and general influences on delinquent behaviour.

The central conclusion of this study is that strain, subculture, and social control theories would appear to hold promise for understanding these relationships. All the major variables of these theories must be considered, those of social control theory at the micro-level, studying the effect of attachment to parents and school, and strain and subculture theories at the macro-level, for the consideration of family socio-economic status.

I have attempted to present a comprehensive theoretical approach to understanding juvenile delinquency, reviewing past theoretical efforts in order to build an integrated approach to delinquency theory. Criminology is characterised by its focus on both motivational factors (e.g. Merton, 1938; Cohen, 1955; Cloward and Ohlin, 1960) and situational factors (e.g. Nye, 1938; Hirschi, 1969) that are assumed to generate delinquent and criminal behaviour. But as this research has found, no single theory of delinquency would seem to be adequate. Rather, juvenile delinquency is linked to family socio-economic status as a social structural problem and family structure, school, and peer influence as situational problems. Recognition of this fact stresses the need for a multiple dimensional approach to the problem.

The important indicators which have been tested in this study should be carefully scrutinised by sociologists in order to review their thinking about youths and law breaking. In principle, the various perspectives in the sociology of deviance could be taken as complementary rather than contradictory, but this is generally not being done.
On the practical level, a strategy for addressing family and school as two important social institutions would appear to have some merit in the reduction of delinquency among young people in the Illawarra region. The provision of family and school supports may effect a reduction in delinquency through supporting positive parent-child relationships and fairer treatment of students by teachers and school staff. However, major gains in the reduction of delinquency will lie in the further development of strategies to affect the attitudes of youths to their family and school climates.

The questionnaire used in this study may be suitable for use elsewhere in New South Wales, and in Australia generally, as both reliability and validity were found to be sufficient to recommend the instrument for research purposes. This instrument may also prove to have applications beyond research if it is used appropriately.

Although the findings in this thesis support my hypothesis that strain, subculture, and social control theories were useful in the explanation of delinquent behaviour, social control theory measured in this way was a better predictor of delinquent involvement than either strain or subculture theories. But all variables were significant and useful in predicting the frequency of delinquent behaviour.
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APPENDIX A:

QUESTIONNAIRE
DIRECTIONS: Please read these notes carefully.

*This questionnaire is part of a research project on adolescent behaviour in the Illawarra region. Your answers will help to get a clearer picture of such behaviour.

*Do not write your name or anyone else's name on this paper. This research is entirely anonymous, and neither you nor your school will be identified.

*Your participation is voluntary. The more questions you can answer the better the information will be, but you do not have to answer all of the questions. Which ones you answer is up to you. You may refuse to continue with the questionnaire at any time.

*Read each question carefully before answering, then place a tick (with pencil) in the appropriate box.

1. Age: ............ years.

2. Sex: Male □ Female □

3. What year are you in at school?
   7 □ 8 □ 9 □ 10 □ 11 □ 12 □

4. How many people live in your household?
   1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 or more □

5. Which country were your parents born in?
   Father ............................  Mother ............................

6. Were you born in Australia?
   Yes □ No □ If not, which country ............................

7. If you were not born in Australia, do you feel that people who were born in Australia often exclude you from participating in their activities.
   a) Not at all □ c) A fair bit □
   d) A lot □ b) A little bit □
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8. **What language do you mostly speak at home?**
   
   a) English  
   b) Other  
   Please specify ...........................................

   **If you answered (b):**  
   Do you prefer to speak English at home?
   
   a) Yes  
   b) No  
   c) Don’t know

   **How much have your parents encouraged you to speak English at home?**
   
   a) Not at all  
   b) A little bit  
   c) Quite a bit  
   d) A lot

9. **Where have you mostly lived?**
   
   a) City or large town  
   b) Suburbs  
   c) Small Town  
   d) Rural area  
   e) Other

10. **What is the highest level of education that your parents attended?** (please tick one for your father and one for your mother)

   **Level**  
   a) Primary School  
   b) Middle High School  
   c) End of High School  
   d) Technical College  
   e) University/CAE  
   f) Other  
   g) Don’t know

11. **How many people in your household have paid employment?**

    1  
    2  
    3 or more
12. If you are a migrant, how many years have you lived in Australia?

.......... Years or .......... Months (if less than one year)

13. In school, do people swear at you or call you bad names?

a) No  [ ]  b) Yes  [ ]

If you answered (b): Who does this? (Do not write down names.)

(i) pupils  [ ]
(ii) friends  [ ]
(iii) teachers or staff  [ ]
(iv) others  [ ]

14. Outside school do people swear at you or call you bad names?

a) No  [ ]  b) Yes  [ ]

If you answered (b): Who does this? (Do not write down names.)

(i) pupils  [ ]
(ii) friends  [ ]
(iii) others  [ ]

---

What is your opinion about these statements?

15. Migrants are more likely to be involved in delinquent behaviour.

a) agree  [ ]
b) disagree  [ ]
c) Don't know  [ ]

16. Migrants should have the same political and social rights as other Australians.

a) agree  [ ]
b) disagree  [ ]
c) Don't know  [ ]

17. Migrants and other Australians should not be allowed to live together in the same neighbourhood.

a) agree  [ ]
b) disagree  [ ]
c) Don't know  [ ]
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18. Migrants in Australia should be free to maintain their own cultures.
   a) agree
   b) disagree
   c) Don't know

19. In Australia, people who were born in Australia behave better than those who were born elsewhere.
   a) agree
   b) disagree
   c) Don't know

20. I prefer to have a lot of classmates who were born in Australia rather than people born overseas.
   a) agree
   b) disagree
   c) Don't know

21. It is a good thing when migrants get equal treatment in job applications.
   a) agree
   b) disagree
   c) Don't know

22. Education and training courses that give migrants a better chance of success in Australia are a good thing.
   a) agree
   b) disagree
   c) Don't know

23. All Australians should be given equal opportunities whether they were born here or not.
   a) agree
   b) disagree
   c) Don't know

24. Migrants can not get a job as easily as other Australians.
   a) agree
   b) disagree
   c) Don't know
25. People who migrate to Australia should change their behaviour to be more like other Australians.
   a) agree
   b) disagree
   c) Don't know

26. Having lots of migrants in Australia causes lots of problems for Australia.
   a) agree
   b) disagree
   c) Don't know

27. A person who doesn't speak English has no right to expect to get ahead in Australia.
   a) agree
   b) disagree
   c) Don't know

28. Who are you living with now and what is their relation to you? (e.g. father, mother, stepfather, etc). Do not write down names.

   ........................................ ........................................
   ........................................ ........................................
   ........................................ ........................................

29. If you do not live with your original parents, can you tell me why?
   Because of:
   a) divorce
   b) separation
   c) death
   d) ran away
   e) other Please specify: .....................................................

30. What jobs do your parents do?
   a) Father........................................  b) Mother........................................
31. If you live with your original parents, what is your father's current job situation?
   a) Employed full-time  
   b) Employed part-time  
   c) Unemployed  
   d) In a training scheme  
   e) Retired  
   f) other Please specify:.................................

32. If you live with your original parents, what is your mother's current job situation?
   a) Employed full-time  
   b) Employed part-time  
   c) Unemployed  
   d) In a training scheme  
   e) Retired  
   f) other Please specify:.................................

33. If you do not live with your original parents, but with some other adults, what is their current job situation and what is their relationship to you? (Do not write down names)
   Relationship i)........................................ ii)......................................
   a) Employed full-time  
   b) Employed part-time  
   c) Unemployed  
   d) In a training scheme  
   e) Retired  
   f) other  
   Please specify:i)........................................ ii)......................................

34. Do your parents work shifts?
   Father a) Yes  
   b) No  
   Mother a) Yes  
   b) No  

35. How many days do your parents usually work each week?
   a) Father ..... days  
   b) Mother ..... days
36. **How often do you spend your free time with your parents?**
   a) Never 
   b) Occasionally 
   c) Quite often 
   d) A lot 

37. **How would you describe your parents' relationship with each other?**
   a) Very Good 
   b) Good 
   c) OK 
   d) Bad 
   e) Very Bad 
   f) Don't Know 

38. **How would you describe your parents' attitude to you?**
   a) Very Good 
   b) Good 
   c) OK 
   d) Bad 
   e) Very Bad 
   f) Don't Know 

39. **What degree of freedom do you have at home?**
   a) None 
   b) A little bit 
   c) A fair bit 
   d) A lot 

40. **How often do you really enjoy being with your parents?**
   a) Never 
   b) Occasionally 
   c) Quite often 
   d) A lot 

41. **How often do you discuss your personal problems with your parents?**
   a) Never 
   b) Occasionally 
   c) Quite often 
   d) A lot
42. At school, to what extent are your classmates concerned about you?
   a) None
   b) A little bit
   c) A fair bit
   d) A lot

43. Outside school, to what extent are your friends concerned about you?
   a) None
   b) A little bit
   c) A fair bit
   d) A lot

44. How often do you discuss your personal problems with your friends?
   a) Never
   b) Occasionally
   c) Quite often
   d) A lot

45. How often do your parents smack or hit you as a form of discipline?
   a) Never
   b) Occasionally
   c) Quite often
   d) A lot

46. How much schooling would you like to get eventually?
   a) Year 10
   b) Year 12
   c) Tech/TAFE
   d) University
   e) Other
   Why?

47. How often do you discuss your personal problems with your teachers?
   a) Never
   b) Occasionally
   c) Quite often
   d) A lot
48. How often do you think your teachers treat their students fairly?
   a) Never □
   b) Sometimes □
   c) Mostly □
   d) Always □

49. How often do you think the staff of your school treat the students fairly?
   a) Never □
   b) Sometimes □
   c) Mostly □
   d) Always □

50. To what extent do your teachers respect you?
   a) Not at all □
   b) A little bit □
   c) Quite a bit □
   d) A lot □

51. How often do you like school in general?
   a) Never □
   b) Occasionally □
   c) Quite often □
   d) A lot □

52. Outside school, how often do you spend your free time with your friends?
   a) Never □
   b) Occasionally □
   c) Quite often □
   d) A lot □

53. How often do you disobey your parents?
   a) never □
   b) Occasionally □
   iii) Quite often □
   iv) A lot □
54. How often do you really enjoy being with your friends?
   a) Never  
   b) Occasionally  
   c) Quite often  
   d) A lot  

55. How often in the past two years have you:
   a) run away from home:
      i) Never  
      ii) Once or twice  
      iii) Several times  
      iv) A lot  
   b) skipped classes and school:
      i) Never  
      ii) Once or twice  
      iii) Several times  
      iv) A lot  
   c) been suspended from school:
      i) Never  
      ii) Once or twice  
      iii) Several times  
      iv) A lot  
   d) drunk alcohol:
      i) Never  
      ii) Once or twice  
      iii) Several times  
      iv) A lot  
   e) gone out after 10 pm without your family:
      i) Never  
      ii) Once or twice  
      iii) Several times  
      iv) A lot
55. How often in the past two years have you:

f) cheated in exams:
   i) Never
   ii) Once or twice
   iii) Several times
   iv) A lot

   g) cheated on transport fares:
      i) Never
      ii) Once or twice
      iii) Several times
      iv) A lot

   h) destroyed public property:
      i) Never
      ii) Once or twice
      iii) Several times
      iv) A lot

   i) stolen school property:
      i) Never
      ii) Once or twice
      iii) Several times
      iv) A lot

   j) stolen other property:
      i) Never
      ii) Once or twice
      iii) Several times
      iv) A lot

   k) taken a car without permission:
      i) Never
      ii) Once or twice
      iii) Several times
      iv) A lot

   l) broken into a house or building when you knew you were not supposed to:
      i) Never
      ii) Once or twice
      iii) Several times
      iv) A lot
55. **How often in the past two years have you:**

m) threatened to hurt or injure someone:
   i) Never
   ii) Once or twice
   iii) Several times
   iv) A lot

n) assaulted strangers:
   i) Never
   ii) Once or twice
   iii) Several times
   iv) A lot

o) beaten somebody up so badly that he or she had to be hospitalised:
   i) Never
   ii) Once or twice
   iii) Several times
   iv) A lot

p) gambled for money:
   i) Never
   ii) Once or twice
   iii) Several times
   iv) A lot

***************
APPENDIX B:

LARGE TABLES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
<th>X7</th>
<th>X8</th>
<th>X9</th>
<th>X10</th>
<th>X11</th>
<th>X12</th>
<th>X13</th>
<th>X14</th>
<th>X15</th>
<th>X16</th>
<th>X17</th>
<th>X18</th>
<th>X19</th>
<th>X20</th>
<th>X21</th>
<th>X22</th>
<th>X23</th>
<th>X24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spend free time with parents</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy being with parents</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss problems with parents</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe parents' relationships</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe parents' attitude to you</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of freedom at home</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your parents smack or hit you</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disobey your parents</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes towards parents (total score)</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss personal problems with teachers</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like school in general</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers treat their students fairly</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School staff treat the students fairly</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your teachers respect you</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes towards school (total score)</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss personal problems with friends</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend free time with friends</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy being with friends</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.5</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.8</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, classmates are concerned about you</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside school friends are concerned you</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes towards peers (total score)</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild delinquency</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious delinquency</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency (total score)</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6.41

Correlation coefficients between independent variables and delinquency items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
<th>X7</th>
<th>X8</th>
<th>X9</th>
<th>X10</th>
<th>X11</th>
<th>X12</th>
<th>X13</th>
<th>X14</th>
<th>X15</th>
<th>X16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy being with parents</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss problems with parents</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe parents' relationships</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe parents' attitude to you</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of freedom at home</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your parents smack or hit you</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disobey your parents</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes towards parents (total score)</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss personal problems with teachers</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like school in general</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers treat their students fairly</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School staff treat the students fairly</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your teachers respect you</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes towards school (total school)</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss personal problems with friends</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend free time with friends</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy being with friends</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school, classmates are concerned about you</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside school friends are concerned you</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes towards peers (total score)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mild Delinquency**
- x1 Run away from home
- x2 Skipped classes and school
- x3 Suspended from school
- x4 Drunk alcohol
- x5 Gone out after 10 pm without family
- x6 Cheated in exams
- x7 Cheated on transport fares

**Serious Delinquency**
- X8 Destroyed public property
- X9 Stolen school property
- X10 Stolen other property
- X11 Taken a car without permission
- X12 Broken into a house or building
- X13 Threatened to hurt or injure someone
- X14 Assaulted strangers
- X15 Beaten somebody so as to hospitalise them
- X16 Gambled for money
**TABLE 6.42**

Correlation coefficients between the items of attitudes towards migrants' scale and the items of delinquency's scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
<th>X7</th>
<th>X8</th>
<th>X9</th>
<th>X10</th>
<th>X11</th>
<th>X12</th>
<th>X13</th>
<th>X14</th>
<th>X15</th>
<th>X16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrants are more likely to be involved in delinquent behaviour</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants should have the same political and social rights as other Australians</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants and other Australians should not be allowed to live together</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants in Australia should be free to maintain their own cultures</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who were born in Australia behave better than others</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to have a lot of classmates who were born in Australia rather than others</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a good thing when migrants get equal treatment in job applications</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training courses that give migrants a chance of success are a good thing</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Australians should be given equal opportunities whether born here or not</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants can not get a job as easily as other Australians</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants should change their behaviour to be more like other Australians</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having lots of migrants in Australia causes lots of problems for Australia</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who do not speak English have no right to expect to get ahead in Australia</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mild Delinquency**
- x1 Run away from home
- X2 Skipped classes and school
- X3 Suspended from school
- X4 Drunk alcohol
- X5 Gone out after 10 pm without family
- X6 Cheated in exams
- X7 Cheated on transport fares

**Serious Delinquency**
- X8 Destroyed public property
- X9 Stolen school property
- X10 Stolen other property
- X11 Taken a car without permission
- X12 Broken into a house or building
- X13 Threatened to hurt or injure someone
- X14 Assaulted strangers
- X15 Beaten somebody so as to hospitalise them
- X16 Gambled for money
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APPENDIX C:

PERMISSIONS
26 November 1993

Mr H Ahmadi
Department of Sociology
University of Wollongong

Dear Mr Ahmadi,

I am pleased to advise that the following Human Experimentation Ethics application has been approved:

Ethics Number: HE93/293
Project Title: Factors in Juvenile Delinquency in the Illawarra Region.
Name of Researchers: Mr H Ahmadi
Approval Date: 25 November 1993
Duration of Clearance: 31 July 1994

This certificate relates to the research protocol submitted in your application of 4 November 1993. It will be necessary to inform the Committee of any changes to the research protocol and seek clearance in such an event.

Please note that experiments of long duration must be reviewed annually by the Committee and it will be necessary for you to apply for renewal of this application if experimentation is to continue beyond one year.

Chairperson
Human Experimentation Ethics Committee

cc. Head, Department of Sociology
Dear Mr Ahmadi

Permission is granted for you to carry out your research on "Factors in Juvenile Delinquency in the Illawarra Region" providing the following conditions are met:

- the Principals of schools agree to the research being carried out;
- permission to include students in discussion groups is obtained from the parents prior to the discussions taking place;
- confidentiality of data is ensured;
- a short precis of the research findings which may be used in a regional publication with due acknowledgments is forwarded to:

  Assistant Director-General
  Department of School Education
  PO Box 1232
  WOLLONGONG NSW 2500

Please take a copy of this letter with you when you approach the Principal(s) involved. I trust that your research goes well and the results prove suitable to your needs.

Yours sincerely

Please see print copy for image

F W Cook
Acting/Assistant Director-General
South Coast Region

5/11/1994
Dear Parent

I am a Ph.D student at the University of Wollongong, investigating the behaviour of high school students in the Illawarra region.

To conduct this research, I need to gather some information from individual students by getting them to fill out a simple questionnaire.

So, I would be grateful, if you could kindly give your permission for your child to answer my questions. Permission has already been obtained from the NSW Department of Education.

No child will be identified in any paper or statement which results from the research, and nor will any school be identified. All results are kept absolutely confidential.

I thank you for your co-operation in this respect, and am looking forward to receiving your positive response.

With thanks

Habib Ahmadi