Globethics Repository



Family, Peer Group and Adaptation of Delinquent Behavior

This page was generated automatically upon download from the Globethics Repository. More information on Globethics see https://www.globethics.net. Data and content policy of Globethics Repository see https://repository.globethics.net/pages/policy.

Item Type	Article
Authors	Imran Haider, Syed;Khan Mahsud, Nasim
Publisher	Qurtuba University
Rights	With permission of the license/copyright holder
Download date	2026-11-09 03:14:23
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12424/188074

Family, Peer Group and Adaptation of Delinquent Behavior

Syed Imran Haider[*] & Nasim Khan Mahsud[**]

Abstract

High number of juvenile prisoners in Pakistani prisons shows the high crime rate among juveniles. This area needs a lot of attention and work to do. Using interview schedule technique this paper explores the causes of crimes among juveniles. Main focus was given to the backgrounds of juvenile prisoners especially presence of criminal behavior or imprisonment in their friends or families. This survey based study was conducted on juvenile prisoners in Central Prison Rawalpindi, Pakistan in summer 2009. All 102 juvenile prisoners of age from 8 years to 18 years in juvenile ward of Rawalpindi prison were interviewed. Information regarding socio-economic conditions of family, crime history of family members and friends, and their crime learning process, was collected to analyze the causes of their delinquent behavior. The analysis was done in the form of percentages and frequency distributions. The Chi-Square test was used to test the relation between variables. The study shows that, dropout from education, broken homes, worse economic conditions, and delinquent friends and family members play crucial role in adaptation of criminal behavior among juveniles in Pakistan. Furthermore, the situation is worsened because of delayed justice, and prison conditions.

Keywords: Family, Peer Groups, Delinquent Behavior, Juvenile Prisoners

Introduction

This study was aimed to find out the factors which lead children to deviate from the societal norms and laws. It is tried to understand the deviant behavior of the Pakistani children behind the bars. The study was focused on Jail inmates in Adiala Jail Rawalpindi, Pakistan. To

[*] Syed Imran Haider, Lecturer, Department of Sociology, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad, Pakistan. Email: imranwvi@gmail.com

[**] Nasim Khan Mahsud, Lecturer, Department of Sociology, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad. Pakistan

understand any behavior it is necessary to study the motives and the reasons behind it. Therefore, it was tried to focus on the lives of the children and dig out the factors responsible for their deviant behavior.

Reports of children committing crimes occasionally appear as the top stories on mass media. However, the serious efforts to understand their backgrounds and the factors which have brought them in conflict with the law are missing. In many cases they might not even have committed any crime. The treatment of juvenile offenders and prison conditions they encounter after arrest are also another area which needs to be highlighted. The realm of children in conflict with the law is an aspect of child rights that historically has remained uncharted territory in Pakistan. There are a number of laws and constitutional guarantees for the protection of the rights of children accused or convicted of criminal conduct but their proper implementation is still a big question mark.

Age of Criminal Responsibility

The minimum age of criminal responsibility varies greatly from country to country. In this modern era still there is no clear international standard regarding the minimum age of criminal responsibility. In Pakistan this age is seven years which is one of the lowest in the world. The juvenile justice system ordinance 2000 for the first time in Pakistan defines a child as a person who at the time of commission of crime is of the age from 7 years to 18 years and will be treated different to adult offenders and will not be awarded punishment of death. This being a federal law and the most recent legislation on the subject implies that it has superseded to all other relevant laws.[1]

Children are subjected to degrading and inhuman punishments and conditions in prisons such as extreme overcrowding, malnutrition, physical and mental abuse, lack of medical care and legal advice. In March 2002 there were 4521 prisoners of age less than 18 years in Pakistani prisons and 284 of them were only in Rawalpindi prison.[2]

The conditions in jails are very bad for young children. These are serving as the training centers for criminals. In its report Human rights watch include that children accused of committing criminal offences in Pakistan are routinely tortured and children share their cells with adults.[3]

The question arises that, why these children commit crime and why they deviate from the societal norms, answers, may be many that, due to poverty or due to any social, psychological or emotional reason, any way we have to understand their deviant behavior to control it**.** This present study focuses to find out effect of interaction with criminals on

the chances of violation of norms and law and it is tried to explore the learning process of criminal behavior.

Objectives

Main objectives of the study were,

- To explore the factors leading children to deviate from societal norms and to commit crime.
- To find out effect of presence of crime in the family on the learning of deviant behavior.
- To find out effect of criminal friends on the chances to violate norms and law.

For the present study, the Rawalpindi prison was selected. This is one of the largest in the region. In the jail there is a separate ward for juveniles where there are three rooms (barracks) which were very much over crowded, 102 young prisoners were kept in these with no distinction as to age and type of crime. Cleanliness of this ward was reasonable and that was the responsibility of inmates to clean it. Most of them were suffering due to non availability of proper legal aid.

This was a survey study based on face to face interviews of juvenile prisoners through detailed structured and pre-coded interview schedule. The data is gathered by interviewing all 102 male juvenile prisoners, from age of 7 to 18 years, at central prison Rawalpindi. Every child was interviewed separately and that was assured to him that his identity and personal information will be kept secret.

Theoretical Background

Explanations of criminal behavior focus on biological, Psychological, Social and economic factors. Biological and Psychological theories assume that criminal behavior results from underlying physical or mental conditions that distinguish criminal from non-criminals. These theories yield insight into individual cases, but they do not explain why crime rates vary from place to place and from one situation to another Sociological theories seek to explain criminal behavior in terms of the social environment. In general, explanations of criminal behavior have been dominated by sociological theories. These theories focus on lack of opportunities and the break down of the conventional value system in urban ghettos, the formation of subculture whose norms deviate from those of the middle class, and increasing inability of social institutions to exercise control over behavior. In different times many theories, explaining deviant behavior and its causes, were presented by different

sociologists. The following sociological approaches explaining deviant behavior were cited before this study.

The Anomie Theory of Emile Durkheim: Durkheim explained many problems on the basis of an increasing division of labor. As the jobs of individual workers become more and more specialized, they can no longer keep a system of shared understandings and rules. According to Durkheim, Solidarity declines and class conflicts arise under such circumstances. The whole society was disorganized because no common rules existed for regulating it. He called this situation anomie.[4]

Strain Theory: Like Durkheim, Robert Merton related the crime problem to anomie. But Merton's conception of anomie differs some what from Durkheim. The real problem, he argued, is created not by sudden social change but by a Social structure that holds out the same goals to all of its members without giving them equal means to achieve them. Strain theory assumes that people are law-abiding, but under great pressure they will resort to crime; disparity between goals and means provides that pressure. [5]

Labeling Theory: The intellectual roots of labeling theory can be traced to the work of Charles Horton Cooley, William .I. Thomas and George Herbert Mead. In focusing on the ways in which social interactions create deviance, labeling theory declares that the reaction of other people and the subsequent effects of those reactions create deviance. Once it becomes known that a person has engaged in deviant acts, he or she is segregated from conventional society, and a label such as "thief" or "junkie" is attached to the transgressor. This process of segregation creates "out siders" or out casts from society, who begin to associate with others who also have been cast out and then they act according to their labels.

Another group of social thinkers always tried to explain criminal behavior in relation with culture. That is explained in following theories.

Culture Conflict Theory: According to Thorsten Sellin, conduct norms-those norms that regulate our daily lives-are rules that reflect the attitudes of the groups to which each of us belongs. Their purpose is to define what is considered appropriate or normal behavior and what inappropriate or abnormal behavior is. Sellin argues that different groups have different conduct norms and that the conduct norms of one group may conflict with those of another. Individuals may commit crimes by conforming to the norms of their own group if that group's norms conflict with those of the dominant society. According to this rationale,

the main difference between a criminal and non criminal is that each is responding to different sets of conduct norms.[6]

Differential Association Theory: In 1939 Edwin Sutherland introduced differential association theory. It is a learning theory which focuses on the processes by which individuals come to commit criminal acts. According to Sutherland, criminal behavior is learned in the same manner as any other behavior. He states that crime is learned through social interaction with criminals or crime favoring definitions. In addition his idea of intimate contacts suggests that learning may be best facilitated within familiar and family groups.

According to him people come into contact with "definitions favorable to violation of laws" and "definitions unfavorable to violation of laws". The ratio of these definitions- criminal to non criminal- determines whether a person will engage in criminal behavior.[7] Since Sutherland presented his theory, researchers have tried to determine whether the principles of differential association lend themselves to empirical measurement.

Theoretical Framework

This present study was conducted to test the idea of differential association in Pakistani society. The propositions and assumptions of this theory were considered the basic guideline to specify the theoretical framework of the study. This theory is based on nine propositions. Theoretical framework of this study was to test following two propositions of this theory.

(i) Criminal behavior is learned. Before doing any act or showing any behavior it is compulsory to learn it first or interact with it.
(ii) The principal part of learning of criminal behavior occurs with in intimate personal groups. Families and friends have the most influence on the learning of deviant behavior.

Hypotheses were as under:

- More the presence of crime within the intimate friends, more the chances of violating norms and committing crimes.
- More the presence of crime within the intimate relatives, more the chances of violating norms and committing crimes.

Literature Review

James short tested a sample of 126 boys and 50 girls at a training school and reported a consistent relationship between delinquent behavior and frequency, duration, priority and intensity of interactions with delinquent

peers.[8] In a test Albert Reiss and A. Lewis Rhodes (1961) found that the chance of commuting a delinquent act depends on whether friends commit the same act. [9]

Among the researchers who continued to question the association was Travis Hirschi. He commented that "if socioeconomic status is unrelated to delinquency then consistency requires that 'socioeconomic' status be removed from the dictionary of delinquency theory and research".[10]

When Charles Tittle and his colleagues attempted to clarify the relationship between social class and crime by analyzing thirty five empirical studies, they conclude that class is not now and has not been related to criminality in the recent past.[11]

Adults have also been the subjects of differential association studies. Charles Tittle asked two thousand residents of New Jersey, Oregon, and Iowa such questions as how many people whom they know personally had engaged in deviant acts and how many were frequently in trouble. He also asked the residents how often they attend church. His differential association scale correlated significantly with such crimes as illegal gambling, income tax cheating and thefts. [12]

The findings of Bruce G. Link support criminological labeling theory. Once the sane individuals were labeled schizophrenic, they were unable to eliminate the label by acting normally. Even when they supposedly had discovered the label stayed with them in the form of "schizophrenic in remission" which implied that future episodes of the illness could be expected.[13]

In a study, Skinner and Fream demonstrate that measures of differential association, differential reinforcement and punishment, depictions and sources of invitation are significantly related to computer crime.[14]

Jillani, Anees argues that the study of criminal behavior suggests that criminals are formed by society and not born that way. Economic disadvantages, limited education and employment choices available to young people render them more likely to come into contact with the justice system, in addition to this the lack of a stable family life is also a big reason. [15] According to Alfred Adler, if you trace the life of a criminal, you will almost always find that the trouble began in his early family life.

Jillani, Anees further emphasizes in its study of juvenile prisoners, that family disorganization, resulting from desertion, death of a parent and divorce of parents, is a significant cause of illegal activities of juveniles. Multiple problem families, which are usually large, having

history of crime and headed by parents of poor health and low or irregular incomes, are also held to generate criminal behavior.[16]

Methodology

This study of juvenile prisoners was carried out in summer 2009 at central prison Rawalpindi, Pakistan. In this part the following sections describe locale, the method, the sample and the interview schedule of this study.

Area of Study

In Pakistan there are total 76 prisons. These prisons are widely scattered in different areas of country. Table 2.1 shows the province wise distribution of prisons in Pakistan.

Table 2.1: Province wise distribution of prisons in Pakistan

Province	Number of prisons
Punjab	29
NWFP	21
Sindh	16
Balochistan	10

Source: Waiting For The Sunrise 2003, SPARC

According to the offices of the inspectors General (IG) of police of the four provinces of Pakistan the number of juvenile prisoners in all provinces in the years 1975, 1985, 1993 and 2002 is as shown in table 2.2.

Table 2.2: Province wise distribution of juvenile prisoners

Year	Punjab	Sindh	KPK	Balochistan	Total
1975	1799	847	530	190	3366
1985	3097	1601	651	354	5703
July 1993	2582	1367	904	484	5337
December 2002	3760	535	527	157	4979

Source: State of Pakistan children 2001, SPARC.

This study is limited to one prison because of economic, time and area constraints. For this study central Rawalpindi prison was selected because this prison was easy to access due to its nearness from author's city Islamabad. This prison is one of the biggest prisons of Pakistan. Due to its nearness from federal capital and economic activity of its city Rawalpindi, Both are heterogeneous societies, prisoners in this jail are

from many different areas of Pakistan. So this prison can be considered the best representative sample of the population under study.

Conceptualization

Following is the operationalization of major concepts, used in this research.

Juvenile. A child of the age from 8 to 18 years.

Charge. Crime of conviction.

Family. Parents, Brothers, and sisters.

Relatives. First cousins, Uncles, Aunts, and Neighbors.

Close Friend. A friend for which respondent himself says that he/she is my close friend.

Delinquent act. Any act or behavior liable to conviction.

Following is the conceptualization of the concepts used in hypotheses:

The most important concept used is the concept of intimate relation or intimacy of relationship. According to Sutherland intimacy of any relationship depends upon frequency, duration, priority and intensity of interaction. According to him these have positive relation with intimacy but it is very difficult to measure intimacy on these scales accurately specially to measure priority and intensity. In case of juveniles all these, frequency, duration, priority and intensity are high in their interaction with their family and the friends. Parents, brothers and sisters first cousins and uncles are considered family of these children. In this specific study family and friends of children are considered their intimate relations

Methods

This research used both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Keeping in mind the aim of the study survey method was selected to conduct this research. That was decided to approach juvenile prisoners in prison and detailed face to face interviews of such juveniles were taken by the author himself. Every interview was taken separately and that was assured to every respondent that his identity and personal information will be kept secret and will not be misused. All the data collection was completed in 15 days in the month of July.

Sampling

Universe: Due to accessibility and feasibility reasons the study was limited to only one prison. All the prisoners below the age of 18 years were the universe of present study.

Population: All the juvenile prisoners of 7 years to 18 years of age in the juvenile ward of Rawalpindi prison were considered the target population of study.
Sample**:** Since the size of the sample was small and accessible so complete population was studied. The number was 102 juvenile prisoners which all were interviewed.

Tool
As described earlier, the tool of data collection was structured interview schedule.

The Interview Schedule
The interview schedule comprised of two main sections and a total of 37 questions, 11 and 26 questions were asked in section I and Section II respectively. The interview schedule was comprised of both close ended and open ended questions

Results and Discussion

Demographic Analysis of juvenile prisoners
In this part situational sketch of Respondents and their history on the basis of data gathered is described.

Backgrounds of juvenile prisoners
The juvenile prisoners at Rawalpindi prison were from many different areas of Pakistan. 20 prisoners were from Rawalpindi and Islamabad, 35 were from the other areas of Punjab 18 children were Afghani 17 were from NWFP, 8 children were from FATA and other 4 were from Karachi. So the sample was comprised of almost all areas of Pakistan

Age, Education and occupation
Age of respondents was ranging from 8 to 18 years. Mean age of the sample was 16 years. Table 3.1 shows that 02 juvenile prisoners were below the age of 11 years and 28 other prisoners were of the age more than 11 years but less than 15 years. The age of remaining 72 juvenile prisoners was ranging from more than 15 to 18 years. This shows that the ratio of crime is low in age less than 15 years. The exposure of as young children to the formal jails is making them properly trained criminals. So there should be some alternate system to deal with juvenile delinquents.

Table 3.1: Age of juvenile prisoners

S. No.	Age	Frequency	Percent
1	upto 11 years	2	1.96
2	more than 11 to 15 years	28	27.45
3	more than 15 to 18 years	72	70.58
	Total	102	100.0

Results of the study show that 32.4 percent respondents were illiterate and 24.5 percent were below primary which means they started school but dropped out before completing even their primary level. 29.4 percent juvenile prisoners were having education level below Matric which again shows that though they started having education but due to certain reasons they might fall in bad company and committed certain crime in early ages which also become a hurdle in their education. 10.7 percent juvenile prisoners have more than Matric level of education. This is very less as compared to under Matric or illiterate juvenile prisoners. This shows that if youth engaged in education there will be less chance to commit crime. It was found that 2.9 percent juvenile prisoners were Hafiz-e-Quran which is again very low and this further emphasizes that involvement of youth in any education can reduce their chances of becoming criminal.

Findings of the study show that only 21.6 percent respondents were student and 70.6 percent were working children before coming to jail. This shows that early exposure to practical life and its difficulties can make the behavior of juveniles more delinquent and on the other hand their delinquent behavior can be a result of absence of proper parental care. Other 7.8 percent respondents were doing nothing so they also might be some job seekers or in any other way exposed to street. These findings show that early and indecent exposure of a child to street increases chances of delinquency. Details are given in table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Occupations of juveniles

Sr. No.	Occupation	Frequency	Percent
1	Student	22	21.6
2	Working	72	70.6
3	None	08	7.8
	Total	102	100.0

Economic condition of Families

Results regarding economic conditions of families show that most of the juveniles were from poor families. Details show that 5.9 percent juvenile prisoners reported their family income less than 1000 rupees per month

which shows the extreme poverty, and 14.7 percent and 29.4 percent reported their family income from 1001 to 2500 and from 2501 to 5000 respectively only 24.5 percent reported their monthly family income more than 5000 rupees. This finding shows that either the juvenile delinquency is only among lower class juveniles or the delinquents from strong socioeconomic backgrounds are protected from imprisonment. This finding also supports the Amnesty International report that almost all of children who are imprisoned in Pakistan come from the poor families. [17]

Charge and time spent in prison

The results of table 3.3 shows that 24.5 juvenile prisoners were charged for murder this big fraction of juveniles charged for murder show the presence of such violent crimes among juveniles. Other 27.5, 2.0, and 26.5 percent juveniles were charged for theft, robbery and narcotics respectively. These all crimes are directly income generating activities that shows that the major cause behind the criminal behavior of juveniles is desire to get quick and more money. This might be a reason of structural strain due to unequal distribution of wealth and resources. Another crime of juveniles was Zina (Rape) and 5.9 percent were charged for that. The reported reason for that was curiosity as a result of watching pornographic pictures and movies.

Table 3.3: Crime wise distribution of juveniles

Sr. No.	Charge	Frequency	Percent
1	Murder	25	24.5
2	Theft	28	27.5
3	Robbery	02	2.0
4	Narcotics	27	26.5
5	Zina	06	5.9
6	Any other	14	13.7
	Total	102	100.0

Data shows that 14 prisoners were imprisoned for less than a month and 50 were imprisoned for less than six months and other 25 juvenile prisoners were imprisoned for more than six months and less than one year, 11 and 2 juvenile prisoners were imprisoned for 1 to 5 years and more than 5 years respectively.

Crime history of respondents

In this study, 51% juvenile prisoners reported they have committed that crime first time which shows, before coming to jail they were not proper

criminals and were caught during their first offence. 20.5 percent juveniles reported their previous involvement in same crime which means there were juvenile prisoners who are in a habit of delinquent activities and presence of children who have committed the crime for first time with these can make them confirmed criminal. 28.5 percent respondents reported that they did not commit any crime but were arrested due to any friend or relatives involvement in criminal activities which means friendship of delinquent friends can become either a cause of criminal behavior or such circumstances. 90.2 percent juvenile prisoners were imprisoned for the first time and only 10 percent reported that they were imprisoned before also which shows that 11 juvenile prisoners were those who committed that act before but not imprisoned so most of the juvenile prisoners were not regular criminals.

Knowledge of some one else who committed the same crime

Results of interviews show that 54.8% respondent were having, knowledge of some one else who committed same crime before their crime committing. Other 43% reported that they don't know any one who also committed the same crime the difference between both is not significant but the number of juvenile prisoners was high among children who know some one which means knowledge of some one engaged in criminal activities can increase the chances of becoming deviant. This finding supports the findings of Travis Hirschi, that boys with delinquent friends are more likely to become delinquent and results of another study by, Albert Reiss and A .Lewis Rhodes were also supportive to this finding.[18]

Crime was committed alone or accompanying with some one

64.6 percent respondents reply that they committed crime accompanying with some one and other 23.3 finding show that they accompanied by their close friends or relatives. The findings show that only 6.7 percent of juvenile prisoners reported history of some crime in brothers which is not a significant number, other 9.8% and 33.3% reported same crime in cousins and friends respectively which is very high number and shows that behaviors of juveniles and presence of crime in those can become a cause of criminal behavior of juveniles. Crime history in fathers, neighbors and others was very low.

Crime history of friends and relatives

49 percent respondents confirm the presence of same crime in friends or relatives and other 51 percent reported that no one in their families have committed the crime. This shows that the juvenile prisoners with or

without crime in family are almost same. So previous studies of Travis Hisschi and Albert Riess declared that delinquent juveniles are always from criminal background. But on the basis of our findings we can not conclude the same. are also of same findings. Detail of crime and police arrest in family history is shown in following two tables number 3.4 and 3.5.

Table 3.4: Presence of same crime in family or friends

Sr. No.	Any friend/relative commit same crime	Frequency	Percent
1	Yes	50	49.0
2	No	52	51.0
	Total	102	100.0

Findings in table 3.5 shows that in 37.2% juvenile prisoners there was a history of arrest in family or relatives and in remaining there was no such evidence. From this we can conclude, the history of arrest in family is not very high in juvenile prisoners and which does not support Sutherland's differential association theory.

Table 3.5: History of arrest in friends or family

Sr. No.	Any friend or relative arrested	Frequency	Percent
1	Yes	38	37.2
2	No	60	58.8
3	No response	04	3.9
	Total	102	100.0

Testing the hypotheses statistically

The chi-square test was used to test the hypotheses of the study. The detail is discussed in following paragraphs.

Relation between Knowledge of a person committing same crime and different crimes of respondents

To test the presence of any relationship between knowing criminal and committed crimes chi-square test was used and due to very low frequencies of juveniles with the charge of Zina and Robbery, these two categories were merged to "any other" category in all statistical testing.

Table 4.1: Relation between Knowing criminals and different crimes

Response	Yes	No	Total
Murder	12	13	25

Theft	17	11	28
Narcotics	18	9	27
Any other	12	10	22
Total	59	43	102

Calculated $\chi 2 = 2.05$; Tabulated $\chi 2 = 7.82$

The degree of freedom (df) is (R-1)(C-1) or 3. With 3 df the critical value for rejection of the null hypothesis is 7.82 at .05 level and 11.34 at .01 level as indicated from the table of the chi-square sampling distribution. Obtained chi-square value of 2.05 does not equal or exceed either critical value. The decision, therefore, is to reject the research hypothesis so we can conclude that there is no association between knowing criminals and committed crimes.

Table 4.2: Relation between direct interactions with committed crime and different crimes

Response	Yes	No	Total
Murder	4	21	25
Theft	9	19	28
Narcotics	13	14	27
Any other	8	14	22
Total	34	68	102

Calculated $\chi 2 = 6.15$; Tabulated $\chi 2 = 7.82$

The df is 3, with 3 df the critical value for rejection of the null hypothesis is 7.82 at .05 level and 11.34 at .01 level as indicated from the table of the chi-square sampling distribution. Obtained chi-square value of 6.15 does not equal or exceed either critical value. The decision, therefore, is to reject the research hypothesis so we can conclude that there is no association between interaction with same crime and committed crimes.

Table 4.3: Relation between Crime in family and different crimes

Response	Family	Relative	None	Total
Murder	7	8	10	25
Theft	6	6	16	28
Narcotics	8	6	13	27
Any other	4	4	14	22
Total	25	24	53	102

Calculated $\chi 2 = 3.47$; Tabulated $\chi 2 = 12.59$

To apply the test statistics, due to very low frequencies the response categories of father, mother and brother were merged as family.
The df is 6, with 6 df the critical value for rejection of the null hypothesis is 12.59 at .05 level as indicated from the table of the chi-square sampling distribution. Obtained chi-square value of 3.47 does not equal or exceed critical value. The decision, therefore, is to reject the research hypothesis so we can conclude that there is no association between Presence of crime in family and committed crimes.

Table 4.4: Relation between same crimes committed by any friend or relative and different crimes of respondents

Response	Yes	No	Total
Murder	13	12	25
Theft	13	15	28
Narcotics	14	13	27
Any other	10	12	22
Total	50	52	102

Calculated $\chi 2 = 0.36$; Tabulated $\chi 2 = 7.82$

The df is 3, with 3 df the critical value for rejection of the null hypothesis is 7.82 at .05 level as indicated from the table of the chi-square sampling distribution. Obtained chi-square value of 0.36 does not equal or exceed either critical value. The decision, therefore, is to reject the research hypothesis so we can conclude that there is no association between presence of the same crime in intimate relation with committed crimes.

Table 4.5: Relation between Exchange of delinquent experiences and crimes.

Response	Often	Seldom	Never	Total
Murder	5	2	18	25
Theft	7	5	16	28
Narcotics	9	6	12	27
Any other	9	3	10	22
Total	30	16	56	102

Calculated $\chi 2 = 6.14$; Tabulated $\chi 2 = 12.59$

The df is 6 and with 6 df the critical value for rejection of the null hypothesis is 12.59 at .05 level as indicated from the table of the chi-square sampling distribution. Obtained chi-square value of 6.14 does not equal or exceed critical value. The decision, therefore, is to reject the

research hypothesis so we can conclude that there is no association between exchange of delinquent experience and committed crimes.

Table 4.6: Relation between passing of criminal tactics and techniques and different crimes

Response	Often	Seldom	Never	Total
Murder	5	2	18	25
Theft	7	5	16	28
Narcotics	9	6	12	27
Any other	9	3	10	22
Total	30	16	56	102

Calculated $\chi 2 = 6.14$; Tabulated $\chi 2 = 12.59$

The df is 6 and with 6 df the critical value for rejection of the null hypothesis is 12.59 at .05 level as indicated from the table of the chi-square sampling distribution. Obtained chi-square value of 6.14 does not equal or exceed critical value. The decision, therefore, is to reject the research hypothesis so we can conclude that there is no association between Passing of criminal tactics and techniques in friends and committed crimes.

Table 4.7: Relation between learning of crime and crimes committed

Response	Friends	Master	No Response	Total
Murder	9	2	14	25
Theft	10	6	12	28
Narcotics	10	5	12	27
Any other	8	3	11	22
Total	37	16	49	102

Calculated $\chi 2 = 2.31$; Tabulated $\chi 2 = 12.59$

The categories of relative and friends and none and no response were merged due to very low frequencies.

The df is 6 and with 6 df the critical value for rejection of the null hypothesis is 12.59 at .05 level as indicated from the table of the chi-square sampling distribution. Obtained chi-square value of 2.31 does not equal or exceed critical value. The decision, therefore, is to reject the research hypothesis so we can conclude that there is no association between different crime learning by different persons and committed crimes.

The statistical analysis shows that there is no relation between presence of crime in family or friends and learning of criminal behavior among juveniles. We can say on the basis of findings of the study that

poor economic conditions, inadequate parental care due to family disorganization, and poor social control system are the main causes of criminal behavior among juveniles. But the issue of crime learning of juveniles is still complex and uncovered.

Summary and Conclusion

The Problems in the sphere of juvenile delinquency in Pakistan are manifold and often complex. The major requirement is that the causes behind the delinquent behavior should be minimized upto possible level and the rights of children should be fully respected when they come into conflict with the law. It should be tried to increase the efficiency of all the social institutions.

During this research, it was found that many children were suffering from the delay in final decisions of their cases. That is due to usual very slow processing of our justice system. Many children reports that their family don't know that they are in prison. One of the major causes found of juvenile delinquency were, poor socio-economic conditions of families and broken families. In some cases that was seen that the criminal act of children was supported by the family only due to comparatively less punishment and easy bail of juveniles. So such practices should be discouraged by the whole society. Presence of crime in family and friends was also a very important cause of delinquent behavior of children so to control juvenile delinquency we have to work for the whole society. Long stays of juveniles in prison, due to delay in decisions, interaction of juvenile offenders with adult criminals is causing another great problem. Which is, they become skilled and proper criminals by association with experienced criminals? Another problem cause by delay in decisions is that prisons are losing their role of deterrence. Most of the juvenile prisoners report that before coming to prison their perception about the prison was very difficult but it is not as much difficult place to live.

Notes & References

[1] Jillani Anees, *Waiting for the Sunrise*, Society for Protection of the Rights of Children (SPARC) (Islamabad: SPARC, 2003)
[2] Jillani Anees, *State of Pakistan Children 2001*, Society for Protection of the Rights of Children (SPARC) (Islamabad: SPARC, 2003)
[3] Human Rights Watch World Report (2002)
[4] E.Durkheim, *The Division of Labour in Society*. Trans. with introduction by George Simpson, (New York: The Free Press, 1964)
[5] Robert K. Merton, "Social Structure and Anomie", *American Review* 3. 1938: 672-782 in, Freda Adler, Gerhard O.W. Mueller and William S. Laufer, *Strain and Cultural Deviance Theories, Criminology*, (New York: McGraw Hill, 1991)
[6] Thorsten Sellin, "Culture Conflict and Crime, Bulletin" 41. Social Research Council, (New York: 1938).
[7] Freda Adler, Gerhard O.W. Mueller and William S. Laufer, Strain and Cultural Deviance Theories, Criminology, (New York: McGraw Hill, 1991).
[8] James S. Short, "Differential Association as a Hypothesis: Problems of Empirical testing, Social Problems", *Americal Sociological Review* 52. (1987) 826-840
[9] Albert J Reiss and Albert C. Rohodes, "The Distribution of Juvenile Delinquency in the Social class Structure", *American Sociological review* 26 (1961), in Freda Adler, Gerhard O.W. Mueller and William S. Laufer, *Strain and Cultural Deviance Theories, Criminology*, (New York: McGraw Hill, 1991) 124-125
[10] Travis Hirschi, *Causes of Delinquency*, (Berkley: University of California Press 1969) 67.
[11] Charles R. Tittle, Wane J. Villemiz and Douglas A. Smith, "The myth of Social Class and Criminality: An Empirical Assessment of the Empirical Evidence", *American Sociological Review* 43, (1978) 652
[12] Charles R. Tittle, *Sanctions and Social Deviance,* (New York Pager, 1980) in Freda Adler, Gerhard O.W. Mueller and William S. Laufer, *Strain and Cultural Deviance Theories, Criminology*, (New York: McGraw Hill, 1991)
[13] Bruce G. Link, "Understanding labeling effects in the area of mental disorders: An assessment of the effects of expectations of rejection", *American Sociological Review*, 52, (1987) 96 – 112.
[14] William F. Skinner, Anne M. Fream, "A Social Learning Theory Analysis of Computer Crime among College Students", *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, (1997) 34:495.
[15] Jillani, Anees, *Cries Unheard. Juvenile Justice in Pakistan*, (Islamabad: SPARC, 1999)
[16] Jillani Anees, *Waiting for the Sunrise, Society for Protection of the Rights of Children*, (Islamabad: SPARC, 2003).
[17] Amnesty International Report (1999)
[18] Albert J Reiss and Albert C. Rohodes, "The Distribution of Juvenile Delinquency in the Social class Structure", *American Sociological Review* 26

(1961), in Freda Adler, Gerhard O.W. Mueller and William S. Laufer, *Strain and Cultural Deviance Theories, Criminology*, (New York: McGraw Hill, 1991) 124-125