

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS

4.0 INTRODUCTION

The data on social and personal resources of subjects, their deviant behaviour and their motivation for delinquency were analyzed using the SPSS statistical programme. Data analysis was carried out using five main types of statistics

A. Descriptive Statistics

The delinquent subjects are described using the following parameters:

- (a) The magnitude of their deviant behaviour are expressed by the types of offences committed and their frequency of offending. These offences are rank-ordered to ascertain trends and patterns in delinquency.
- (b) Motivation for deviant behaviour through self-appraisal.
- (c) Their repertoire of coping behaviours.

B. Correlation Analyses

The following relationships were investigated:

- (a) Relationships among the different categories of offences committed.
- (b) Relationships among Deviant Behaviour and aspects of Perceived Parental Support.
- (c) Relationships among Deviant Behaviour and aspects of Peer-group Support.
- (d) Relationships among Deviant Behaviour and School Experiences.
- (e) Relationships among Deviant Behaviour and Concepts of Self.

- (f) Relationships among Deviant Behaviour and Modes of Coping Behaviour.
 - (g) Relationships among Deviant Behaviour and stages of Moral Development.
- C. **Stepwise Multiple Regression** to determine predictors of deviant behaviour.
- D. **t-tests**
- Analyses using t-tests were carried out to determine significant differences between the delinquent subjects and their controls with respect to the following social and personal resources:
- (a) Perceived Parental Support
 - (b) Peer-group Support
 - (c) School Experiences
 - (d) Concepts of Self
 - (e) Coping Behaviours
 - (f) Moral Development
- E. **Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test** to determine significant differences between delinquent subjects and their non-delinquent siblings with respect to the correlates of deviant behaviour.

4.1 **DEVIANT BEHAVIOUR OF ADOLESCENTS**

To determine the frequency of offending, the offences were classified into five categories: Crimes against Property, Crimes against Persons, Status Offences, Drug and Liquor Law Violations, and Offences against the Public Order. The subjects were asked to indicate the frequency of committing each offence by responding whether it was never, once only, several times or many

times. In the computation, the responses were given values one to four (1 for never and 4 for many times) so that the mean for each offence could be calculated and their ranking determined. Table 4.1 displays the frequency of offending, mean and ranking for each of the offences.

4.1.1 Crimes against Property

Theft of Articles valued less than RM 10, between RM 10 to RM 50, and more than RM 50 were committed frequently by 49.2 per cent, 42.9 per cent and 54.0 per cent of the delinquent subjects respectively (Table 4.1). These thefts ranked fifth, sixth and seventh respectively. The percentage of the subjects who had never committed Bicycle or Motor cycle thefts was 41.3 per cent. Car thefts were least frequent as 73 per cent were not guilty of such an offence and it ranked 25th. Petty thefts were obviously more common than vehicle thefts. Burglary was committed several times by 22.2 per cent of them while 36.5 per cent had committed it many times.

Vandalism, which is common in schools, was committed several times by 34.9 per cent of the delinquents while another 34.9 per cent reported it many times. It ranked at the eighth place. Only 6.3 per cent admitted committing Arson many times although 22.2 per cent chose "several times" thus putting it at the 24th position.

Table 4.1

Frequency of Offending (%) by Delinquent Subjects

Offences	Frequency of Offending				Mean	Rank
	Never	Once Only	Several Times	Many Times		
Crimes against Property						
Theft of Articles valued Less Than RM10	15.9	6.3	28.6	49.2	3.11	5
Theft of Articles valued Between RM10 - RM 50	12.7	9.5	34.9	42.9	3.08	6
Theft of Articles valued More Than RM 50	22.2	7.9	15.9	54.0	3.02	7
Bicycle Theft	41.3	15.9	28.6	14.3	2.16	21
Motorcycle Theft	41.3	22.2	22.2	14.3	2.09	22
Car Theft	73.0	9.5	14.3	3.2	1.48	25
Burglary	20.6	20.6	22.2	36.5	2.75	11
Vandalism	25.4	4.8	34.9	34.9	2.79	8
Arson	55.6	15.9	22.2	6.3	1.79	24
Crimes against Persons						
Robbery	54.0	9.5	15.9	20.6	2.03	23
Attempted Murder	88.9	4.8	4.8	1.6	1.19	26
Assault	25.4	15.9	34.9	23.8	2.57	15
Status Offences						
Smoking	7.9	1.6	11.1	79.4	3.62	1
Truancy	9.5	4.8	27.0	58.7	3.35	3
Defying Parents	28.6	12.7	41.3	17.5	2.48	19
Defying other Adults	19.0	11.1	44.4	25.4	2.76	10
Running Away from Home	30.2	17.5	30.2	22.2	2.44	20
Drug and Liquor Law Violations						
Selling Drugs	41.3	6.3	11.1	41.3	2.52	17
Taking Drugs	44.4	4.8	7.9	42.9	2.49	18
Buying Liquor	22.2	15.9	22.2	39.7	2.79	8
Taking Liquor	28.6	7.9	23.8	39.7	2.75	11
Offences against the Public Order						
Possession of Dangerous Weapons	23.8	11.1	31.7	33.3	2.75	11
Driving without License	11.1	0.0	15.9	73.0	3.51	2
Other Traffic offences	19.0	4.8	14.3	61.9	3.19	4
Gambling	30.2	14.3	22.2	33.3	2.59	14
Sexual Offences	36.5	7.9	20.6	34.9	2.54	16

(N=63) Percentage in bold is the highest for the offence.

4.1.2 Crimes against Persons

Robbery was committed many times by 20.6 per cent of the delinquent subjects but 54 per cent, had not participated in this form of deviant behaviour, which is more daring than burglary as it involves a direct confrontation with the victim. Attempted Murder was scarce among them with only one or 1.6 per cent attempting it many times. The vast majority, 88.9 per cent, claimed that they had never been involved with it. This offence was last in the ranking. More than half of the delinquent subjects reported having assaulted others, thus placing it at the fifteenth position. Among them 34.9 per cent reported it as "several times" while 23.8 per cent, "many times". They may have included fist fighting.

4.1.3 Status Offences

Many of the disciplinary problems in schools are status offences. Among this category of offences, smoking was the most frequent; 79.4 per cent of the subjects reported having smoked many times. Smoking ranked first among all the offences under study. Truancy ranked third. About 41.3 per cent of the delinquent subjects defied their parents several times and 44.4 per cent had several times defied other adults including teachers and neighbours. Only 30.2 per cent had ran away from home several times and the offence occupied the 20th place.

4.1.4 Drug and Liquor Law Violations

Although 44.4 per cent who did not take drug is the highest percentage, most of the delinquent subjects were involved in substance use with 42.9 per cent reported taking drugs many times. A slightly lower

percentage of them, that is, 41.3 per cent admitting selling drugs many times. These offences ranked 18th and 17th respectively. Among the subjects, 39.7 per cent reported having bought liquor many times while 39.7 per cent reported taking liquor many times. These two offences ranked eighth and eleventh respectively.

4.1.5 Crimes against Public Order

Weapons were carried by 33.3 per cent of the subjects many times, placing it at the eleventh place. Seventy-three per cent of the delinquent subjects had driven many times without a valid driving license and 61.9 per cent admitted committing other traffic offences many times. These two offences ranked second and fourth respectively. As high as 33.3 per cent, reported being involved in gambling many times. Although 36.5 per cent of the delinquent subjects were never involved in sexual offences, the offence ranked 16th with 34.9 per cent reported committing it many times.

4.2 MOTIVATION FOR DEVIANT BEHAVIOUR

To ascertain the strain that motivated adolescents towards delinquency, subjects were asked to explain their deviant behaviour by requiring them to indicate their motives from a given list of 34 of them. They were to choose the circumstances that best described the situation leading to the offence used as their juvenile court referral. The ten most common motives chosen by more than 40 per cent of the delinquent subjects are shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2
Motives Delinquent Subjects Gave for
Committing Offence

Motives for Offence	Percentage
I had no money	55.6
I just wanted to have fun	54.0
I lost my head	52.4
I was forced	49.2
Friends asked me to go along	47.6
I followed friends	46.0
Others always say I am bad	46.0
I was pressurized	46.0
I was bored at that time	44.4
I have reached a dead end	44.4
(N=63)	

The motives selected give an indication of their felt strain resulting from unmet needs. *I had no money*, indicated lack of material needs while *I just wanted to have fun*, *I lost my head*, *I was forced*, *Friends asked me to go along*, *I followed friends*, *Others always say I am bad*, *I was pressurized*, *I was bored at that time* and *I had reached a dead end* are all the results emotional needs.

4.3 COPING BEHAVIOUR OF DELINQUENT SUBJECTS

The delinquent subjects indicated how frequently they employed the coping behaviour to handle general life stressors along a 5-point scale. Table 4.3 shows the percentages of delinquent subjects in each of the five categories. The range of frequency is given values 1 to 5 to compute the mean values of each coping-behaviour. The coping behaviour is then ranked according to these mean values.

Among the coping behaviours identified as problem-focused, *Organize My Life and What I Have to Do* ranked third, was always used by 38.1 per cent of them while *Try to Make My Own Decision* ranked sixth, was always used by 38.7 per cent of the respondents. In contrast, 41.3 per cent of the delinquent subjects never *Talk to Parents About it* and it was ranked lowest among their repertoire of coping behaviours. The coping behaviour *Pray to God* was sometimes used by only 37.1 per cent of them and was at the fifth placing.

Among the coping behaviours classified as emotion-focused, 39.7 per cent of the delinquent subjects never *Get Angry and Yell at People* which was ranked 11. The coping behaviour *Talk to Friends about How I feel* was always used by 33.3 per cent of the subjects and was ranked fourth. *Complain to Friends and Family* was sometimes used by 34.9 per cent of the subjects and ranked ninth. However, 32.8 per cent of the delinquent subjects never *Cry alone* and this coping behaviour ranked tenth.

Avoidance-focused coping *Joke and Try to be Funny* was the coping behaviour always used by 47.6 per cent of them and was the coping behaviour most common among the delinquent subjects. Another avoidance-focused coping, *Do Strenuous Physical Activity* was always used by 40.3 per cent of the delinquent subjects and ranked second. Although 38.1 per cent sometimes used denial as a form of avoidance in *Tell Myself that the Problem is Not Important*, 38.1 per cent rarely avoided dealing with problems by *Sleeping a Lot*.

Table 4.3
Coping Behaviour of Delinquent Subjects

Coping Behaviours	Frequency					Mean	Rank
	Never	Rarely	Some Times	Often	Always		
Problem-focused Coping							
Organize My Life and What I Have to Do	12.7	20.6	19.0	9.5	38.1	3.40	3
Try to Make My Own Decision	17.7	22.6	14.5	6.5	38.7	3.26	6
Talk to Parents About it	41.3	25.4	23.8	4.8	4.8	2.06	12
Pray to God	1.6	27.4	37.1	9.7	24.2	3.27	5
Emotion-focused Coping							
Get Angry and Yell at People	39.7	20.6	33.3	3.2	3.2	2.10	11
Talk to Friends About How I Feel	14.3	14.3	28.6	9.5	33.3	3.33	4
Complain to Friends and Family	17.5	23.8	34.9	14.3	9.5	2.75	9
Cry Alone	32.8	23.0	31.1	1.6	11.5	2.36	10
Avoidance-focused Coping							
Joke and Try to Be Funny	4.8	15.9	22.2	9.5	47.6	3.79	1
Sleep a Lot	14.3	38.1	19.0	12.7	15.9	2.78	8
Tell Myself that the Problem is Not Important	17.5	22.2	38.1	6.3	15.9	2.81	7
Do Strenuous Physical Activity	11.3	8.1	21.0	19.4	40.3	3.69	2

(N=63) Percentage in **bold** is the highest for the item.

4.4 RELATIONSHIP AMONG THE OFFENCES

Correlation analyses were carried out among the offences from all the five categories to ascertain their relationships. Kendall's Tau was used because although the responses were in categories, they had underlying continuity as in a Likert Scale. Correlation coefficients lower than 0.30 indicated low correlations, 0.30 to 0.69 indicated moderate correlations, while those higher than 0.70 are considered high correlations. Since the sample size

is big, correlation coefficients of values 0.21 and higher are all significant at the 0.05 level. The correlation matrices are shown in Tables 4.4 to 4.13.

Table 4.4
Correlation Matrix: Crimes against Property with Crimes against Persons

Crimes Against Persons	Crimes against Property								
	Theft of Articles Valued Less Than RM 10	Theft of Articles Valued Between RM 10 to RM 50	Theft of Articles Valued More Than RM 50	Bicycle Theft	Motorcycle Theft	Car Theft	Burglary	Vandalism	Arson
Robbery	.21	.47	.51	.47	.44	.45	.46	.39	.38
Attempted Murder	.03	.05	.02	.12	.22	.33	.13	.02	.07
Assault	.23	.41	.38	.23	.28	.14	.33	.41	.41

In Table 4.4, the three violent crimes have moderate correlations with some of the property crimes. Moderate correlations of 0.38 to 0.51 are obtained between Robbery and the following offences: Thefts of articles valued between RM10 to RM50 and more than RM50, Bicycle Theft, Motorcycle Theft, Car Theft, Burglary, Vandalism and Arson. Assault is moderately related to theft of articles valued between RM10 to RM50, theft of articles valued more than RM50, Burglary, Vandalism and Arson; the magnitude of the correlation ranges from 0.33 to 0.41. Correlation between Attempted Murder and Car theft gave a correlation value of 0.33 that is considered moderate in this study. Both these offences are considered major offences and were least common among the delinquent subjects.

The correlation between Robbery and Theft of Articles valued less than RM10 is low at 0.21. Correlation coefficients involving Attempted Murder are low; 0.02 to 0.22 for all property crimes except for Car Theft as mentioned earlier. Assault has low correlation coefficients of 0.14 to 0.23 with Theft of Articles Valued Less than RM10, Bicycle Theft, Motor cycle Theft and Car Theft.

Forty-five correlation coefficients were obtained between Crimes against Property and Status Offences and shown in Table 4.5. There are only three correlation coefficients whose magnitude exceeded 0.60 and these are for status offences Truancy and Running Away from Home, with property crimes Theft of Articles Valued between RM10 to RM50 and Theft of Articles Valued More Than RM50. Smoking is moderately correlated with many of the property crimes. Moderate correlation coefficients between 0.34 and 0.46 are obtained between Smoking and the following offences: Theft of articles valued less than RM 10, between RM 10 to RM 50 and more than RM 50, Bicycle Theft, Burglary and Vandalism.

Truancy has moderate correlations with all the property crimes except for Car Theft. The moderate correlation coefficients are from 0.33 to 0.62.

Defying Parents has moderate correlation coefficients between 0.30 and 0.34 with the offences Theft of Articles valued between RM10 to RM50, Motorcycle Theft and Vandalism. Defying other Adults has moderate correlation coefficients of 0.30 to 0.47 with all property crimes except for Car Theft whose correlation coefficient is only 0.26. Running Away from Home

also has moderate correlation coefficients of 0.32 to 0.64 with property offences except for Car Theft whose correlation coefficient is 0.21.

Table 4.5
Correlation Matrix: Crimes against Property with Status Offences

Status Offences	Crimes Against Property								
	Theft of Articles Valued less Than RM 10	Theft of Articles Valued Between RM 10 to RM 50	Theft of Articles Valued More Than RM 50	Bicycle Theft	Motorcycle Theft	Car Theft	Burglary	Vandalism	Arson
Smoking	.35	.46	.43	.34	.26	.17	.40	.43	.25
Truancy	.36	.61	.62	.42	.50	.27	.48	.51	.33
Defying Parents	.23	.30	.24	.24	.32	.26	.23	.34	.19
Defying other Adults	.33	.47	.39	.31	.30	.26	.40	.30	.20
Running Away from Home	.39	.58	.64	.40	.32	.21	.58	.42	.40

Smoking has low correlation coefficients of 0.26, 0.17 and 0.25, with the offences Motorcycle Theft, Car Theft and Arson respectively. Defying Parents has low correlation coefficients of 0.19 to 0.26 with the offences Theft of Articles valued Less Than RM10, Theft of Articles valued More Than RM50, Bicycle Theft, Car Theft, Burglary and Arson. Truancy has higher correlation coefficients with property crimes than Smoking.

Table 4.6
Correlation Matrix: Crimes against Property with
Drug and Liquor Law Violations

Drug & Liquor Law Violations	Crimes Against Property								
	Theft of Articles Valued Less Than RM 10	Theft of Articles Valued Between RM 10 to RM 50	Theft of Articles Valued More Than RM 50	Bicycle Theft	Motorcycle Theft	Car Theft	Burglary	Vandalism	Arson
Selling Drugs	.28	.52	.57	.35	.50	.40	.50	.37	.42
Taking Drugs	.28	.47	.54	.27	.43	.39	.41	.40	.34
Buying Liquor	.36	.63	.66	.44	.52	.32	.54	.42	.40
Taking Liquor	.34	.60	.65	.52	.49	.31	.58	.43	.46

Table 4.6 shows a total of 36 correlation coefficients obtained between Crimes against Property, and Drug and Liquor Law Violations. Low relationships are those between the offence Theft of Articles valued less Than RM 10 and both of the drug offences, and between Bicycle Theft and Taking Drugs. Moderate correlation coefficients were obtained between Selling Drugs and all the other property crimes. Similarly, correlation coefficients between Taking Drugs and all the other property crimes are moderate. Both the offences Buying and Selling Liquor are moderately correlated with all property crimes.

Table 4.7

Correlation Matrix: Crimes against Property with Offences against the Public Order

Offences Against Public Order	Crimes against Property								
	Theft of Articles Valued Less Than RM 10	Theft of Articles Valued Between RM 10 to RM 50	Theft of Articles Valued More Than RM 50	Bicycle Theft	Motorcycle Theft	Car Theft	Burglary	Vandalism	Arson
Possession of Dangerous Weapons	.38	.52	.48	.30	.40	.20	.39	.39	.29
Driving without License	.26	.31	.33	.19	.27	.21	.21	.35	.22
Other Traffic offences	.27	.31	.33	.24	.21	.19	.23	.32	.20
Gambling	.42	.52	.52	.37	.37	.32	.36	.45	.29
Sexual Offences	.11	.45	.47	.21	.38	.29	.32	.46	.43

A total of 45 correlation coefficients are obtained between Crimes against Property and Offences against the Public Order (Table 4.7).

Possession of Dangerous Weapons is moderately related to all the offences under Crimes against Property with the correlations ranging from 0.30 to 0.52 except for Car Theft and Arson where the correlations are low. Driving without a License is moderately correlated with the offences Theft of Articles valued between RM10 to RM50, Theft of Articles valued More Than RM50 and Vandalism. The magnitude of the correlation ranges from 0.31 to 0.35. Driving without a License has low correlation coefficients of 0.21 to 0.27 with

the offences Theft of Articles valued less Than RM10, Bicycle Theft, Motorcycle Theft, Car Theft, Burglary and Arson.

Other Traffic Offences have moderate correlation coefficients of 0.31 to 0.33 with the offences Theft of Articles valued between RM10 to RM50, Theft of Articles valued More Than RM50 and Vandalism. This offence has low correlation coefficients of 0.21 to 0.27 with the offences Theft of Articles valued less Than RM10, Bicycle Theft, Motorcycle Theft, Car Theft, Burglary and Arson.

Gambling is moderately related to all the property crimes with correlation coefficients ranging 0.32 to 0.52. Gambling has a low correlation coefficient of 0.29 with Arson. Sexual offences correlated moderately with crimes against property with correlation coefficients 0.32 to 0.47 except for Theft of Articles valued less than RM10, Bicycle Theft and Car Theft. The correlations of sexual offences with these thefts are low as their correlations coefficients are 0.11, 0.21 and 0.29 respectively.

Robbery has moderate correlation with the offences Truancy, Defying others and Running Away from Home (Table 4.8). The correlations are values of 0.37 to 0.50. The correlation of robbery with Smoking and Defying Parents is low as the magnitude of their correlation is 0.28 and 0.22 respectively.

Assault shows moderate correlations with the offences Smoking, Truancy, Defying other Adults and Running Away from Home. The correlation coefficients are from 0.35 to 0.44. Correlation coefficient between

Assault and Defying Parents is low being only 0.17. Attempted Murder has low correlation with all the status offences under study.

Status offences have higher correlation coefficients with both Robbery and Assault compared to Attempted Murder because all the correlation coefficients are low for Attempted Murder.

Table 4.8
Correlation Matrix: Crimes against Persons with Status Offences

Status Offences	Crimes against Persons		
	Robbery	Attempt Murder	Assault
Smoking	.28	-.09	.41
Truancy	.41	.02	.44
Defying Parents	.22	.10	.17
Defying Other Adults	.37	.09	.38
Running Away from Home	.50	.05	.35

Table 4.9 shows that the correlations of Robbery and Assault with all the offences under Drug and Liquor Law Violations are moderate. The correlations range from 0.38 to 0.49 although Robbery has slightly higher correlation coefficients compared to Assault. Attempted Murder on the other hand, has very low correlations with drug and liquor offences.

Table 4.9
Correlation Matrix:
Crimes against Persons with Drug and Liquor Law Violations

Drug & Liquor Law Violations	Crimes against Persons		
	Robbery	Attempted Murder	Assault
Selling Drugs	.46	.20	.38
Taking Drugs	.48	.00	.41
Buying Liquor	.49	.09	.41
Taking Liquor	.48	.02	.39

Table 4.10
Correlation Matrix: Crimes against Persons with
Offences against the Public Order

Offences Against Public Order	Crimes against Persons		
	Robbery	Attempted Murder	Assault
Possession of Dangerous Weapons	.31	.11	.48
Driving without License	.26	-.08	.34
Other Traffic Offences	.30	-.20	.26
Gambling	.43	-.08	.36
Sexual Offences	.48	-.01	.55

Correlation between Crimes against Persons and Offences against Public Order are shown in Table 4.10. Robbery is moderately related to offences Possession of Dangerous Weapons, Other Traffic Offences,

Gambling and Sexual Offences; the correlations range from 0.30 to 0.48. The correlation between Robbery and Driving without a License is low and it is only 0.26. Assault is moderately related to the offences Possession of Dangerous Weapons, Driving without License, Gambling and Sexual Offences. The correlations are from 0.34 to 0.55. Assault however has a low correlation with Other Traffic Offences and the correlation 0.26. Attempted Murder has very low correlations with all the offences against public order.

The correlation between Status Offences, and Drug and Liquor Law Violations are presented in Table 4.11. Moderate correlations are obtained between drug offences and the status offences Smoking, Truancy, Defying Other Adults and Running Away from Home. The correlations are from 0.32 to 0.49. Among the status offences, Truancy has higher correlation coefficients. Liquor offences have higher correlation coefficients with the status offences Smoking, Truancy, Defying other adults and Running Away from Home, than drug offences. Correlation coefficients are from 0.40 to 0.59. Defying Parents has low correlation coefficients with all the offences under the Drug and Liquor Law Violations. Correlation coefficients are from 0.22 to 0.27.

Table 4.11
Correlation Matrix: Status Offences with Drug and Liquor Law Violations

Drug & Liquor Law Violations	Status Offences				
	Smoking	Truancy	Defying Parents	Defying Other Adults	Running Away From Home
Selling Drugs	.32	.49	.22	.34	.48
Taking Drugs	.38	.47	.24	.42	.43
Buying Liquor	.42	.54	.26	.46	.59
Taking Liquor	.42	.51	.27	.40	.53

Table 4.12
Correlation Matrix: Status Offences with Offences against the Public Order

Offences Against Public Order	Status Offences				
	Smoking	Truancy	Defying Parents	Defying Other Adults	Running Away From Home
Possession of Dangerous Weapons	.45	.49	.18	.39	.41
Driving without License	.36	.37	.20	.22	.22
Other Traffic Offences	.41	.37	.16	.29	.28
Gambling	.44	.56	.26	.43	.48
Sexual Offences	.42	.47	.24	.34	.37

Table 4.12 again shows that among the status offences, Truancy has higher correlation coefficients. Both Smoking and Truancy correlate

moderately with all the offences against public order, the correlations range from 0.36 to 0.49. Defying Other Adults has moderate correlations with the offences Possession of Dangerous Weapons, Gambling and Sexual Offences. Similarly, Running Away from Home has moderate correlations with these offences against public order. Their correlation coefficients range from 0.34 to 0.48. Low correlation values are obtained between Defying Parents and all the offences against public order. Both the status offences Defying other Adults and Running Away from Home have low correlations with traffic offences. The correlation coefficients range from 0.16 to 0.29.

Table 4.13
Correlation Matrix: Drug and Liquor Law Violations
With Offences against the Public Order

Offences against Public Order	Drug & Liquor Law Violations			
	Selling Drugs	Taking Drugs	Buying Liquor	Taking Liquor
Possession of Dangerous Weapons	.49	.51	.55	.48
Driving without License	.24	.29	.28	.29
Other Traffic Offences	.23	.32	.30	.36
Gambling	.49	.55	.55	.48
Sexual Offences	.49	.58	.55	.55

Table 4.13 shows that Possession of Dangerous Weapons has moderate correlations with all drugs and liquor offences with coefficients 0.48 to 0.55. Similarly, both Gambling and Sexual Offences have moderate correlations with all the drugs and liquor offences with correlation of 0.48 to 0.58. Driving without License however, has low correlations with these offences and their correlation coefficients are from 0.24 to 0.29. Other Traffic Offences have

low correlations with Selling Drugs, but moderate correlations with other drug and liquor offences. Compared to traffic offences, public offences such as weapon-carrying, gambling and sexual offences have higher correlations with drug and liquor offences.

Table 4.14
Rank Order of Correlation among Offences

Correlation between Categories of Offences	Total No. of Correlations	No. of Moderate Correlations (per cent)	Rank
Crimes against Property & Crimes against Persons	27	14 (51.9)	9
Crimes against Property & Status Offences	45	31 (68.9)	4
Crimes against Property & Drug and Liquor Law Violations	36	33 (91.7)	1
Crimes against Property & Offences against Public Order	45	27 (60.0)	7
Crimes against Persons & Status Offences	15	7 (46.7)	10
Crimes against Persons & Drug and Liquor Law Violations	12	8 (66.7)	5
Crimes against Persons & Offences against Public Order	15	8 (53.3)	8
Status Offences & Drug and Liquor Law Violations	20	16 (80.0)	2
Status Offences & Crimes against Public Order	25	16 (64.0)	6
Drug and Liquor Law Violations & Offences against Public Order	20	15 (75.0)	3

Table 4.14 is a summary of Tables 4.4 to 4.13. It lists out the total number of correlations between any two categories of offences, and the percentage of moderate correlations. The percentage of moderate correlations forms the basis of their ranking.

Between Crimes against Property and Crimes against Persons, 14 or 51.9 per cent are moderate correlations with correlation coefficients 0.30 to 0.69, while 13 or 48.1 per cent are low correlations. Among the 45 correlations obtained between Crimes against Property and Status Offences, 32 or 71.1 per cent are moderate correlations while 13 or 28.9 per cent are low. From a total of 36 correlations obtained between Crimes against Property, and Drug and Liquor Law Violations, 33 or 91.7 per cent are moderate with correlation coefficients 0.31 to 0.66 while only three or 8.3 per cent are low with correlation coefficients 0.27 to 0.28. Between Crimes against Property and Offences against the Public Order, 27 or 60.0 per cent are moderate correlations while 18 or 40.0 per cent are low correlations. Only seven or 46.7 per cent out of a total of 15 correlations between Crimes against Persons and Status Offences are moderate while eight or 53.3 per cent are low. Eight out of a total of 12 correlations between Crimes against Persons, and Drug and Liquor Law Violations are moderate. Between Crimes against Persons and Offences against Public Order, eight or 53.3 per cent out of a total of 15 correlations are moderate while seven or 46.7 per cent are low. Among the correlations obtained between Status Offences and Drug and Liquor Law Violations, 16 or 80.0 per cent are moderate while four or 20 per cent are low. From a total of 25 correlations between Status Offences and Offences against Public Order, 16 or 64 per cent are moderate while nine or 36 per cent are low. A total of 15 or 75 per cent of the correlations between Drug and Liquor Law Violations, and Offences against Public Order are moderate while 5 or 25 per cent are low.

The three top ranking correlations are those between Crimes against Property, and Drug and Liquor Law Violations; Status Offences and Drug and Liquor Law Violations; and Drug and Liquor Law Violations, and Offences against Public Order. It is noteworthy that all the three correlations involved Drug and Liquor Law Violations, offences that are used as the criterion variable in many studies involving Deviant Behaviour.

4.5 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEVIANT BEHAVIOUR AND RESOURCES

To answer the question of whether social and personal resources are related to the magnitude of deviant behaviour exhibited by the delinquent subjects, correlation analyses among all the offences and the items measuring the resources were carried out using Kendall's Tau.

4.5.1 Perceived Parental Support

There are four aspects to Perceived Parental Support: Emotional Support, Informational Support, Social Support and Economic Support. Correlation analyses were carried out using all the items measuring the various aspects of perceived parental support and all the 26 offences under study. The four correlation matrices in Tables 4.15, 4.16, 4.17 and 4.18 show correlation coefficients ranging from 0.00 to -0.32. Negative values implied that as Perceived Parental Support increases, deviant behaviour of the delinquent subjects, as measured by the offences committed, decreases.

a. Emotional Support

All the correlation values are low (Table 4.15). The item *Mother is Understanding* when compared to the item *Father is Understanding* has

higher correlation coefficients with 15 of the 26 offences. However, the item *Feel Wanted by Father* when compared to the item *Feel Wanted by Mother* has higher correlation coefficients with 15 of the 26 offences.

b. Informational Support

The correlations between informational support from parents and deviant behaviour are all low except for *Talk to Mother About What Bothers You* as shown in Table 4.16. This item is moderately correlated with Theft of Articles valued between RM10 to RM50, Theft of Articles valued More Than RM 50 and Truancy. Their correlation coefficients range from 0.30 to 0.32. In contrast, the item *Talk to Father About What Bothers You* has low correlation coefficients from -0.26 to -0.03 with all the offences. However, there are little differences between items *Father Can Help with Schoolwork* and *Mother Can Help with Schoolwork*.

c. Social Support

The items *Do Things Together With Mother* and *Do Things Together With Father* have low correlations with all the offences except for Vandalism and Truancy (Table 4.17). The item *Do Things Together With Father* is moderately correlated with Vandalism and Truancy. *Do Things Together With Father* when compared to *Do Things Together With Mother* has higher correlations with 16 of the 26 offences. Items *Father Enquires About Daily Activities* and *Mother Enquires About Daily Activities* have low correlations with all the offences. The paternal aspect of the support when compared to the maternal aspect has higher correlations with 19 of the 26 offences.

d. Economic Support

Educational levels of parents are indications of both Informational Support and Economic Support from parents. *Father's Educational Level* and *Mother's Educational Level* have low correlation with all the offences and they are shown in Table 4.18. For 16 of the 26 offences, the correlations between *Father's Educational Level* and the offences are higher than those of *Mother's Educational Level* and the offences.

4.5.2 Peer-group Support

The items measuring type of peer-group support are *Importance of Getting Good Grades in School*, *Number of Delinquent Peers*, *Time Spent With Friends After School Hours*, *Follow Friends With Plans for Deviant Activities*, and *Delinquency is Normal Among Adolescents*. Correlation analyses were carried out using all the items measuring peer-group support and the 26 offences.

Table 4.19 shows that the magnitude of correlations are from 0.01 to 0.58 suggesting that the correlations range from low to moderate. Only the item *Importance of Getting Good Grades in School* had negative correlation values with all the offences. Negative correlations indicate that those, whose peer-group support placed more importance on academic achievement, were less likely to be involved in deviant behaviour.

The item *Importance of Getting Good Grades in School* has low correlations with the offences Theft of Articles valued less than RM10, Theft of Articles valued more than RM50, Motorcycle Theft, Car Theft, Burglary, Vandalism, Arson, Attempted Murder, Assault, Smoking, Defying Parents,

Defying Other Adults, Selling and Taking Drugs, Possession of Dangerous Weapons, Driving without License, Other Traffic Offences, Gambling and Sexual Offences. The correlation coefficients range from -0.02 to -0.29 . The item *Importance of Getting Good Grades in School* has moderate correlation with the offences Theft of Articles Valued between RM10 to RM50, Bicycle Theft, Robbery, Truancy, Running Away from Home, and Buying and Taking Liquor with correlation values from -0.30 to -0.40 . Not only are these six offences moderately correlated with the importance of good grades, the negative sign suggests that those who place importance on grades commit few of these offences

Table 4.15
Correlation Matrix: Deviant Behaviour and Perceived Emotional Support
From Parents

Offences	Mother is Understanding	Father is Understanding	Feel wanted by Mother	Feel wanted by Father
Theft of Articles valued Less Than RM10	-.11	-.04	.00	-.10
Theft of Articles valued between RM10 – RM 50	-.12	-.10	-.05	-.11
Theft of Articles valued More Than RM 50	-.11	-.08	-.07	-.09
Bicycle Theft	-.06	-.00	.02	-.19
Motorcycle Theft	-.10	-.14	-.09	-.16
Car Theft	-.02	.01	-.05	-.14
Burglary	-.09	-.06	-.10	-.08
Vandalism	-.08	-.04	-.08	-.05
Arson	-.05	.00	-.17	-.09
Robbery	-.03	-.03	-.01	.02
Attempted Murder	.18	.06	-.11	-.23
Assault	.05	-.03	.04	.02
Smoking	-.14	-.06	-.02	.02
Truancy	-.04	-.07	.00	-.03
Defying Parents	-.16	-.04	-.16	-.15
Defying other Adults (teachers, neighbours etc.)	-.06	.00	-.07	-.04
Running Away from Home	.00	.02	-.03	.02
Selling Drugs	.01	.04	-.04	-.15
Taking Drugs	-.17	-.05	-.02	-.06
Buying Liquor	-.05	-.10	-.08	-.09
Taking Liquor	-.03	-.08	-.06	-.13
Possession of Dangerous Weapons	-.03	-.02	-.03	-.10
Driving without License	.02	-.03	.06	.02
Other Traffic Offences	.05	.08	.03	-.04
Gambling	-.06	.07	.07	.03
Sexual Offences	-.03	-.14	-.07	.04

Table 4.16
Correlation Matrix: Deviant Behaviour and Perceived Informational Support
From Parents

Offences	Talk to Mother About What Bothers You	Talk to Father About What Bothers You	Mother Can Help With School Work	Father Can Help
Theft of Articles valued Less Than RM10	-.14	-.24	-.10	.
Theft of Articles valued Between RM10 – RM 50	-.30	-.24	.00	.
Theft of Articles valued More Than RM 50	-.32	-.21	.07	.
Bicycle Theft	-.22	-.23	.00	.
Motorcycle Theft	-.18	-.18	-.03	.
Car Theft	-.08	-.02	.16	.
Burglary	-.24	-.25	.00	.
Vandalism	-.18	-.19	-.03	.
Arson	-.14	-.07	.13	.
Robbery	-.12	-.12	.07	.
Attempted Murder	.02	-.03	.09	.
Assault	-.16	-.17	.04	.
Smoking	-.29	-.19	.00	.
Truancy	-.30	-.26	.00	.
Defying Parents	-.23	-.19	-.16	.
Defying Other Adults (teachers, neighbours etc.)	-.18	-.11	-.08	.
Running Away from Home	-.25	-.21	.05	.
Selling Drugs	-.15	-.10	.10	.
Taking Drugs	-.16	-.07	.05	.
Buying Liquor	-.18	-.16	-.04	.
Taking Liquor	-.17	-.13	.02	.
Possession of Dangerous Weapons	-.17	-.18	.03	.
Driving without License	-.15	-.18	.00	.
Other Traffic Offences	-.12	-.10	.02	.
Gambling	-.22	-.21	-.05	.
Sexual Offences	-.19	-.08	.04	.

Table 4.17
Correlation Matrix: Deviant Behaviour and Perceived Social Support from Parents

Offences	Do Things Together With Mother	Do Things Together With Father	Mother Enquires About Daily Activities	Father Enquires About Daily Activities
Theft of Articles Valued Less Than RM10	-.09	-.18	.02	-.18
Theft of Articles Valued Between RM10 - RM 50	-.21	-.24	-.10	-.25
Theft of Articles Valued More Than RM 50	-.25	-.27	-.12	-.27
Bicycle Theft	-.15	-.18	-.09	-.15
Motorcycle Theft	-.14	-.16	-.09	-.18
Car Theft	-.21	-.18	-.19	-.15
Burglary	-.15	-.24	-.07	-.21
Vandalism	-.21	-.31	-.13	-.22
Arson	-.06	-.04	-.01	-.13
Robbery	-.13	-.19	-.08	-.16
Attempted Murder	-.11	-.02	-.18	-.10
Assault	-.12	-.10	-.01	-.12
Smoking	-.11	-.17	-.04	-.16
Truancy	-.26	-.30	-.13	-.27
Defying Parents	-.13	-.23	-.06	-.20
Defying Other Adults (teachers, neighbours etc.)	-.09	-.11	-.06	-.06
Running Away From Home	-.15	-.17	-.06	-.14
Selling Drugs	-.19	-.12	-.04	-.10
Taking Drugs	-.21	-.14	-.07	-.03
Buying Liquor	-.16	-.16	-.08	-.17
Taking Liquor	-.16	-.15	.03	-.07
Possession of Dangerous Weapons	-.12	-.07	-.01	-.11
Driving Without License	.01	-.07	.13	-.04
Other Traffic Offences	-.03	-.07	.11	.00
Gambling	-.22	-.20	-.19	-.17
Sexual Offences	-.18	-.21	-.12	-.13

Table 4.18
Correlation Matrix: Deviant Behaviour with Parents' Educational Level

Offences	Mother's Educational Level	Father's Educational Level
Theft of Articles valued Less Than RM10	-.18	-.19
Theft of Articles valued between RM10 - RM 50	-.19	-.23
Theft of Articles valued More Than RM 50	-.16	-.27
Bicycle Theft	-.28	-.27
Motorcycle Theft	-.17	-.09
Car Theft	-.05	-.02
Burglary	-.21	-.23
Vandalism	-.11	-.20
Arson	-.09	-.16
Robbery	-.25	-.29
Attempted Murder	-.12	.01
Assault	-.06	-.01
Smoking	-.08	-.15
Truancy	-.19	-.23
Defying Parents	-.21	-.16
Defying other Adults (teachers, neighbours etc.)	-.09	-.17
Running Away from Home	-.13	-.24
Selling Drugs	-.19	-.12
Taking Drugs	-.21	-.14
Buying Liquor	-.16	-.16
Taking Liquor	-.16	-.15
Possession of Dangerous Weapons	-.07	-.15
Driving without License	-.07	-.08
Other Traffic Offences	-.11	-.14
Gambling	-.16	-.23
Sexual Offences	-.14	-.15

Table 4.19
Correlation Matrix: Deviant Behaviour with Peer-group Support

Offences	Importance of Getting Good Grades in School	Number of Delinquent Peers	Time Spent With Friends After School Hours	Follow Friends With Plans For Deviant Activities	Delinquency is Normal Among Adolescents
Theft of Articles valued Less Than RM10	-.17	.19	.36	.36	-.06
Theft of Articles valued RM10-RM50	-.30	.37	.49	.51	-.02
Theft of Articles valued More Than RM50	-.27	.38	.48	.53	.06
Bicycle Theft	-.40	.36	.34	.40	.13
Motorcycle Theft	-.29	.35	.41	.48	.12
Car Theft	-.16	.27	.21	.29	.10
Burglary	-.19	.33	.39	.45	-.01
Vandalism	-.27	.25	.42	.56	.24
Arson	-.10	.28	.29	.35	.20
Robbery	-.34	.45	.36	.44	.12
Attempted Murder	.02	.02	.01	.15	.03
Assault	-.15	.40	.33	.36	.09
Smoking	-.25	.27	.34	.47	.15
Truancy	-.38	.36	.51	.58	.16
Defying Parents	-.26	.15	.28	.38	.26
Defying other Adults	-.21	.32	.30	.39	.05
Running Away from Home	-.30	.28	.46	.43	.01
Selling Drugs	-.15	.47	.40	.44	-.02
Taking Drugs	-.22	.48	.42	.44	.10
Buying Liquor	-.33	.40	.51	.55	.09
Taking Liquor	-.30	.42	.45	.52	.12
Possession of Dangerous Weapons	-.15	.38	.36	.47	.02
Driving without License	-.03	.17	.27	.27	.12
Other Traffic Offences	-.14	.17	.25	.24	.14
Gambling	-.29	.41	.46	.50	.07
Sexual Offences	-.22	.43	.41	.41	.15

The item *Number of Delinquent Peers* had low correlations with offences Theft of Articles valued less than RM10, Car Theft, Vandalism, Arson, Attempted Murder, Smoking, Defying Parents, Running Away from Home, Driving without License and Other Traffic Offences. Their correlations range from 0.02 to 0.28.

Item *Number of Delinquent Peers* however has moderate correlations with the offences Theft of Articles valued between RM10 to RM50, Theft of Articles valued More Than RM50, Bicycle Theft, Motorcycle Theft, Burglary, Robbery, Assault, Truancy, Defying other Adults, Selling Drugs, Taking Drugs, Buying Liquor, Taking Liquor, Gambling, Sexual Offences and Possession of Dangerous Weapons. The correlations range 0.32 to 0.48. The highest correlation (0.48) is with Taking Drugs.

The item *Time Spent with Friends after School Hours* has low correlations with the offences, Car Theft, Arson, Attempted Murder, Defying Parents, Driving without License and Other Traffic Offences. The correlations range from 0.01 for Attempted Murder to 0.29 for Arson. The correlations with the offences, Theft of Articles valued Less Than RM10, Theft of Articles valued Between RM10 to RM50, Theft of Articles valued More Than RM50, Bicycle Theft, Motorcycle Theft, Burglary, Vandalism, Robbery, Assault, Smoking, Truancy, Defying other Adults, Running Away from Home, Selling Drugs, Taking Drugs, Buying Liquor, Taking Liquor, Possession of Dangerous Weapons, Gambling and Sexual Offences, are moderate. Correlations range from 0.30 to 0.51. The highest correlations (0.51) are with Truancy and Buying Liquor.

The item, *Follow Friends With Plans For Deviant Activities* has low correlations with the offences, Car Theft, Attempted Murder, Driving Without License and Other Traffic Offences. They range 0.15 to 0.29. The correlations are moderate for the offences, Theft of Articles Valued Less Than RM10, Theft of Articles Valued Between RM10 to RM50, Theft of Articles Valued More Than RM50, Bicycle Theft, Motorcycle Theft, Burglary, Vandalism, Arson, Robbery, Assault, Smoking, Truancy, Defying Parents, Defying Other Adults, Running Away from Home, Selling and Taking Drugs, Buying and Taking Liquor, Possession of Dangerous Weapons, Gambling and Sexual Offences. The magnitude of the correlation ranges from 0.35 to 0.58. The correlation is highest with Truancy, the magnitude of 0.58 indicates an overlap or common variance of 33.6 per cent.

The item, *Delinquency Is Normal Among Adolescents* has low correlations with all the offences under study. The correlations are from 0.01 to 0.26. Based on their frequency of responses, as shown in Appendix E, 53.9 per cent of the subjects disagreed that delinquency is normal among adolescents in spite of committing numerous offences.

The five aspects of peer-group support were rank ordered according to the number of moderate correlation each has with the offences under study. The results of this ranking are displayed in Table 4.20.

Table 4.20
Rank Order of Peer-group Variables
According to Number of Moderate Correlations

Peer-group Variables	Type of Correlation	N Moderate Relationships
Follow Friends with Plans for Deviant Activities	Positive	22
Time Spent with Friends After School Hours	Positive	20
Number of Delinquent Peers	Positive	16
Importance of Getting Good Grades in School	Negative	7
Delinquency is Normal Among Adolescents	Positive	0

The item *Follow Friends with Plans for Deviant Activities* has the most number of moderate relationships with the offences hence it occupies the top rank. The next item, *Time Spent with Friends after School Hours* has 20 moderate correlations while *Number of Delinquent Peers* has 16 moderate correlations. The item *Importance of Getting Good Grades in School* has seven moderate correlations while the item *Delinquency is Normal Among Adolescents* has only low correlations with the offences.

4.5.3 School Experiences

The aspects of school experiences measured and used in the correlation analyses are *Academic Achievement*, *Sports Involvement*, *Responsible Posts Held*, *Co-curricular Activities*, *Enjoyed Schooling*, *Gave Teachers Problems* and *Played Truant*. Data in Table 4.21 show that the correlations between School Experiences and the offences range from low to moderate. They are

negative for *Academic Achievement, Responsible Posts Held, Co-curricular Activities* and *Enjoyed Schooling* and positive for *Sports Involvement, Gave Teachers Problems* and *Played Truant*.

Academic Achievement, Responsible Posts Held and *Co-curricular Activities* have low correlations with all the offences. *Sports Involvement* however correlated moderately with Assault, Selling and Taking Drugs and Sexual Offences. The correlations are from 0.32 to 0.35.

Moderate correlations are also found between *Enjoyed Schooling* and several of the offences, they range from -0.30 to -0.34. The offences are Theft of Articles Valued More Than RM50, Bicycle Theft, Motorcycle Theft, Truancy, Taking Drugs, Buying and Taking Liquor.

The item, *Gave Teachers Problems* has low correlations with Theft of Articles Valued Less Than RM10, Car Theft, Attempted Murder, Defying Parents, Driving Without Licence and Other Traffic Offences and moderate correlations are with the offences, Theft of Articles Valued Between RM10 to RM50, Theft of Articles Valued More Than RM50, Bicycle Theft, Motorcycle Theft, Burglary, Vandalism, Arson, Robbery, Assault, Smoking, Truancy, Defying Other Adults, Running Away from Home, Selling Drugs, Taking Drugs, Buying Liquor, Taking Liquor, Possession of Dangerous Weapons, Gambling and Sexual Offences.

The item *Played Truant* has low correlations of 0.11 to 0.28 with the offences, Theft of Articles Valued Less Than RM10, Car Theft, Arson, Attempted Murder, Defying Parents, Defying Other Adults, Driving without a License and Other Traffic Offences. The correlation coefficients however are

moderate between *Played Truant* and the offences, Theft of Articles Valued Between RM10 to RM50, Theft of Articles Valued More Than RM50, Bicycle Theft, Motorcycle Theft, Vandalism, Burglary, Robbery, Assault, Smoking, Truancy, Running Away from Home, Selling Drugs, Taking Drugs, Buying Liquor, Taking Liquor, Possession of Dangerous Weapons, Gambling and Sexual Offences. Their correlations are from 0.30 to 0.58.

The various aspects of school experiences were rank ordered according to the number of moderate relationships obtained with the offences. Table 4.22 shows that, among the School Experiences items, *Gave Teachers Problems*, *Played Truant* and *Enjoyed Schooling* have higher correlations with the offences than items measuring the other aspects of school experiences.

The item, *Gave Teachers Problems* has 20 moderate correlations while the item *Played Truant* has 18 moderate correlations with the offences. Hence the former item occupies the top rank and the latter is second. Both of the items are positively correlated to the offences. The item *Enjoyed Schooling* correlations are negative, correlated moderately with seven of the offences under study (-0.30 to -0.33). On the other hand, *Sports Involvement* has only four moderate correlations and all are positive.

Table 4.21
Correlation Matrix: Deviant Behaviour with School Experiences

Offences	Academic Achievement	Sports Involvement	Responsible Posts Held	Co-curricular Activities	Enjoyed Schooling	Gave Teachers Problems	Played Truant
Theft of Articles Valued Less Than RM10	-.07	.19	-.04	-.04	-.16	.09	.25
Theft of Articles Between RM10-RM50	-.04	.27	.02	-.13	-.25	.35	.44
Theft of Articles Valued More Than RM50	.03	.29	.02	-.19	-.33	.40	.43
Bicycle Theft	-.10	.15	.00	-.09	-.31	.34	.34
Motorcycle Theft	-.01	.24	.07	-.05	-.34	.32	.40
Car Theft	.14	.22	.06	.07	-.21	.24	.20
Burglary	-.11	.25	.00	-.08	-.28	.38	.44
Vandalism	-.10	.13	-.03	-.20	-.20	.31	.33
Arson	.00	.06	-.04	-.16	-.21	.33	.28
Robbery	.11	.22	.03	-.14	-.23	.34	.30
Attempted Murder	-.01	-.05	.03	.09	-.04	-.01	.11
Assault	.08	.33	.16	-.03	-.05	.31	.32
Smoking	-.10	.21	.05	-.11	-.23	.32	.37
Truancy	-.09	.23	.01	-.21	-.33	.42	.58
Defying Parents	-.13	.05	-.09	-.14	-.23	.12	.21
Defying Other Adults	-.02	.24	.03	-.01	-.20	.31	.23
Running Away from Home	.04	.16	.04	-.22	-.22	.34	.45
Selling Drugs	.08	.35	.14	-.03	-.28	.39	.36
Taking Drugs	.14	.40	.10	-.05	-.30	.43	.33
Buying Liquor	.04	.25	.00	-.25	-.33	.49	.41
Taking Liquor	.01	.29	.01	-.21	-.33	.52	.38
Possession of Dangerous Weapons	.04	.26	.15	-.14	-.21	.35	.38
Driving Without License	.07	.17	.11	.01	-.12	.16	.26
Other Traffic Offences	.04	.19	.14	-.13	-.09	.22	.26
Gambling	.05	.19	-.06	-.16	-.23	.38	.37
Sexual Offences	.07	.32	.08	-.16	-.13	.42	.32

Table 4.22
Rank Order of School Experiences
According to Number of Moderate Correlations

School Experiences	Type of Correlation	Number of Moderate Correlations
Gave Teachers Problems	Positive	20
Played Truant	Positive	18
Enjoyed Schooling	Negative	7
Sports Involvement	Positive	4
Co-curricular Activities	Negative	0
Responsible Posts Held	Negative	0
Academic Achievement	Negative	0

Participation in Co-curricular Activities, Responsible Posts Held and Academic Achievement have only low correlations with the offences.

Frequency of responses in Appendix E shows that 22.2 per cent of the delinquent subjects were not involved in any form of sports, 65.1 per cent did not participate in any form of co-curricular activities, while 49.2 per cent did not hold any responsible posts in their former schools.

4.5.4 Concepts of Self

The three aspects of self concepts investigated are *Perceived Intelligence, Satisfaction with Physical Appearance and Perceived Social (Peer) Acceptance*. Correlation analyses were carried out using the three items and all the offences under study. Table 4.23 shows that all the correlations between concepts of self and the various offences are low and the

majority of them are negative. Negative correlation indicates that as concept of self increases, frequency of offending decreases. Among the three aspects of Concepts of self in this study, *Perceived Intelligence* has the highest correlations and seems to be most important in moderating behaviour.

4.5.5 Coping Behaviours

Three modes of coping, consisting of 12 coping behaviours were identified. Correlation analyses were computed between the 12 coping behaviours and all the 26 offences. Three correlation matrices were obtained for the three modes of coping: Problem-focused Coping, Emotion-focused Coping and Avoidance-focused Coping. They are shown in Tables 4.24, 4.25 and 4.26.

a. Problem-focused Coping

All the four Problem-focused coping behaviours, in Table 4.24, have low correlations with the offences. Correlation coefficients range from -0.28 to 0.18 . Items *Talk to Parents About It* and *Pray to God* have the highest correlations. *Pray to God* has correlations of -0.27 and -0.28 with Liquor offences. Such coping behaviours however can be viewed as adaptive because increasing their usage decreases deviant behaviour as indicated by their negative correlation coefficients.

Table 4.23
Correlation Matrix: Deviant Behaviour with Concepts of Self

Offences	Perceived Intelligence	Satisfaction with Physical	Perceived Social (Peer) Acceptance
Theft of Articles valued Less Than RM10	-.12	-.12	-.02
Theft of Articles between RM10-RM50	-.22	-.12	-.07
Theft of Articles valued More Than RM50	-.19	-.13	-.07
Bicycle Theft	-.17	-.05	-.20
Motorcycle Theft	-.21	-.01	-.17
Car Theft	.00	-.05	-.09
Burglary	-.22	-.16	-.08
Vandalism	-.21	.00	-.14
Arson	-.19	-.14	.03
Robbery	-.18	-.05	-.07
Attempted Murder	-.15	-.06	-.07
Assault	-.09	-.01	.02
Smoking	-.06	.00	.05
Truancy	-.11	-.16	-.12
Defying Parents	-.06	-.08	-.08
Defying other Adults-Teachers, Neighbours	-.04	.00	.05
Running Away from Home	-.16	-.10	-.03
Selling Drugs	-.18	-.06	-.09
Taking Drugs	-.11	-.09	-.06
Buying Liquor	-.23	-.14	-.10
Taking Liquor	-.19	-.17	-.07
Possession of Dangerous Weapons	-.19	.03	.00
Driving without License	-.09	.04	-.05
Other Traffic Offences	.03	.07	.02
Gambling	-.11	-.01	-.13
Sexual Offences	-.21	-.03	.00

Table 4.24
Correlation Matrix: Deviant Behaviour with Problem-focused Coping Behaviours

Offences	Organize My Life and What I Have to Do	Pray to God	Try to Make My Own Decision	Talk to Parents About It
Theft of Articles valued Less Than RM10	-.10	-.09	.05	-.15
Theft of Articles between RM10-RM50	.03	-.17	.10	-.26
Theft of Articles valued More Than RM50	-.02	-.21	.15	-.21
Bicycle Theft	.01	-.28	.09	-.19
Motorcycle Theft	-.03	-.17	.05	-.12
Car Theft	.09	-.05	.08	.02
Burglary	.00	-.17	.07	-.17
Vandalism	-.07	-.22	.05	-.20
Arson	-.11	-.16	.13	-.11
Robbery	.05	-.17	.12	-.22
Attempted Murder	.03	-.02	-.01	-.01
Assault	.14	.00	.11	-.25
Smoking	.10	-.17	.00	-.15
Truancy	.08	-.24	.11	-.27
Defying Parents	-.05	-.14	.04	-.07
Defying other Adults-Teachers & Neighbours	.04	-.08	.06	-.18
Running Away from Home	.00	-.25	.12	-.17
Selling Drugs	.15	-.05	.05	-.11
Taking Drugs	.05	-.09	.01	-.14
Buying Liquor	-.07	-.27	.02	-.26
Taking Liquor	-.03	-.28	.05	-.18
Possession of Dangerous Weapons	.18	-.07	.09	-.22
Driving without License	.16	.00	.13	-.07
Other Traffic Offences	.15	-.14	.09	-.08
Gambling	.09	-.14	.02	-.17
Sexual Offences	.11	-.13	.05	-.25

Table 4.25
Correlation Matrix: Deviant Behaviour with Emotion-focused Coping Behaviours

Offences	Get Angry and Yell at People	Complain to Friends and Family	Talk to Friends About How I Feel	Cry Alone
Theft of Articles valued Less Than RM10	.16	.00	-.02	.14
Theft of Articles between RM10-RM50	.26	.13	.07	.21
Theft of Articles valued More Than RM50	.33	.13	-.01	.18
Bicycle Theft	.36	.13	-.03	.22
Motorcycle Theft	.31	.18	.03	.12
Car Theft	.22	.18	.00	.07
Burglary	.33	.09	.08	.23
Vandalism	.23	.17	-.04	.03
Arson	.22	.05	.02	.16
Robbery	.34	.15	-.05	.10
Attempted Murder	.05	.21	-.03	.12
Assault	.18	.21	.09	.11
Smoking	.16	.18	.06	.15
Truancy	.23	.18	-.04	.14
Defying Parents	.17	.10	.07	.09
Defying other Adults-Teachers, Neighbours	.30	.26	.05	.16
Running Away from Home	.41	.10	-.01	.18
Selling Drugs	.33	.19	.06	.13
Taking Drugs	.33	.28	.10	.13
Buying Liquor	.34	.22	-.03	.11
Taking Liquor	.36	.22	-.01	.13
Possession of Dangerous Weapons	.23	.16	.01	.09
Driving without License	.12	.08	.09	.05
Other Traffic Offences	.23	.12	-.01	.03
Gambling	.27	.15	-.02	.04
Sexual Offences	.24	.30	.06	.19

Table 4.26
Correlation Matrix: Deviant Behaviour with Avoidance-focused Coping Behaviours

Offences	Joke and Try to be Funny	Sleep a Lot	Tell Myself that the Problem is Not Important	Do Strenuous Physical Activity
Theft of Articles valued Less Than RM10	.33	.12	.12	.13
Theft of Articles between RM10-RM50	.36	.10	.15	.21
Theft of Articles valued More Than RM50	.33	.07	.19	.26
Bicycle Theft	.26	.10	.10	.23
Motorcycle Theft	.25	.10	.18	.21
Car Theft	.13	-.03	.11	.06
Burglary	.31	.18	.13	.22
Vandalism	.31	.16	.25	.21
Arson	.21	.12	.06	.20
Robbery	.26	-.07	.10	.22
Attempted Murder	.10	.08	.01	.02
Assault	.26	-.02	-.02	.29
Smoking	.31	.12	.18	.17
Truancy	.33	.04	.21	.26
Defying Parents	.19	.11	.28	.14
Defying other Adults-Teachers & Neighbours	.22	.05	.15	.16
Running Away from Home	.43	.08	.17	.20
Selling Drugs	.26	-.02	.19	.26
Taking Drugs	.21	-.09	.20	.15
Buying Liquor	.29	.12	.18	.17
Taking Liquor	.28	.17	.14	.19
Possession of Dangerous Weapons	.29	-.04	.09	.18
Driving without License	.23	.05	.11	.21
Other Traffic Offences	.19	.03	.12	.12
Gambling	.25	.05	.19	.15
Sexual Offences	.21	.03	.16	.18

b. Emotion-focused Coping

Most of the correlations in Table 4.25 are low except for the items, *Get Angry and Yell at People* and *Complain to Friends and Family*. *Get Angry and Yell at People* has higher correlation coefficients compared to other coping behaviours in this category. The item *Get Angry and Yell at People* correlated moderately with the offences Theft of Articles valued More Than RM50, Bicycle Theft, Motorcycle Theft, Burglary, Robbery, Defying other Adults, Running Away from Home, Selling Drugs, Taking Drugs, Buying Liquor and Taking Liquor. The correlations are from 0.30 to 0.41. The item *Complain to Friends and Family* has a moderate correlation value of 0.30 with Sexual Offences.

c. Avoidance-focused Coping

Most of the correlations in Table 4.26 are low except for item, *Joke and try to Be Funny*. The item, *Joke and try to Be Funny* has moderate correlations with the offences, Theft of Articles valued Less Than RM10, Theft of Articles valued between RM10-RM50, Theft of Articles valued More Than RM50, Burglary, Vandalism, Smoking, Truancy and Running Away from Home. The correlations range from 0.31 to 0.43.

Comparing all the coping behaviours identified in this study, correlation coefficients of coping behaviours, *Get Angry and Yell at People*, *Complain to Friends and Family*, *Joke and Try to be Funny* and *Do Strenuous Physical Activity* are higher than those of other coping behaviours. The items *Get Angry and Yell at People* and *Complain to Friends and Family* are

emotion-focused coping behaviours while *Joke and Try to be Funny* and *Do Strenuous Physical Activity* are avoidance-focused coping behaviours.

4.5.6 Moral Development

The moral development of the delinquent subjects was ascertained using three items. First, they were asked to evaluate with reason, a hypothetical moral dilemma, which is the Heinz's Dilemma from Kohlberg. Next, they had to explain why the act of stealing is often considered wrong. Lastly, they had to choose a situation whereby the act of stealing is acceptable. The subjects' stage of moral reasoning was identified by their responses. Correlation analyses were carried out to determine the relationship between stages of moral development and their offences. Data in Table 4.27 shows that most of the offences correlated negatively with all the three items measuring moral development (-0.30 to 0). However, the correlation coefficients are low and only Smoking is moderately correlated with the item that required them to evaluate with reasons, Heinz's Dilemma. The correlation coefficient between Smoking and moral reasoning is -0.3.

Table 4.27
Correlation Matrix: Deviant Behaviour with Moral Development

Offences	Evaluate Heinz's Decision to Steal	Explain Why Stealing is Wrong	Give Situation When Stealing is Acceptable
01.Theft of Articles valued Less Than RM10	-.11	.09	.00
02.Theft of Articles between RM10-RM50	-.14	-.04	-.03
03.Theft of Articles valued More Than RM50	-.09	-.05	-.07
04.Bicycle Theft	-.09	-.01	.06
05.Motorcycle Theft	-.08	-.01	.03
06.Car Theft	-.08	-.08	-.03
07.Burglary	-.09	-.11	-.07
08.Vandalism	.00	-.01	-.06
09.Arson	-.06	-.08	-.08
10.Robbery	-.02	-.01	.09
11.Attempted Murder	-.07	.01	.00
12.Assault	-.16	.01	.05
13.Smoking	-.30	-.06	-.07
14.Truancy	-.16	.00	-.09
15.Defying Parents	.02	.10	.05
16.Defying other Adults-teachers, neighbours	-.14	.09	.00
17.Running Away from Home	-.12	.01	-.01
18.Selling Drugs	-.17	.01	-.08
19.Taking Drugs	-.10	.12	.00
20.Buying Liquor	-.09	-.01	-.11
21.Taking Liquor	-.03	-.07	-.14
22.Possession of Dangerous Weapons	-.13	.03	.05
23.Driving without License	-.07	.03	.08
24.Other Traffic Offences	-.02	.04	.08
25.Gambling	-.11	.16	.02
26.Sexual Offences	-.06	-.08	-.09

4.6 PREDICTORS OF DEVIANT BEHAVIOUR

If one seeks to control delinquency and deviant behaviour, then one needs to be able to explain them first by identifying their predictors. Regression analysis (stepwise) was used to determine the predictors of deviant behaviour. Multiple Regression was used to determine the relative importance of each variable in predicting deviant behaviour among the delinquent subjects. The additional variance explained by each variable was also determined. Deviant behaviour that is the sum total of all the offences, acted as the criterion variable while correlates of the offences were used as the independent variables.

For the results to be valid, there must be a reasonable balance between the size of the sample and number of variables used. The general rule of thumb is to increase sample size by at least 15 subjects for each variable that will be included in the multiple-regression. In this study, 63 delinquent subjects were used so only four variables with the highest correlation values were entered. They were *Time Spent with Friends after School Hours*, *Number of Delinquent Peers*, *Follow Friends with Plans for Deviant Activities* and *I did not have Enough Money*. Unless specified otherwise, the computer programme will start the multiple regression analysis with the most powerful predictor of the criterion variable. The predictors were entered step by step, one at a time until no other variables make a significant contribution to the prediction equation. For the inclusion of the variables in this stepwise mode, the minimal F value was 0.01 and the tolerance value was 0.001. This was to

ascertain the relative contributions of these variables towards the total variance in deviant behaviour. The R^2 value in the equation indicated the percentage of deviant behaviour that was explained by the equation.

Table 4.28
Relative Importance of Predictor Variables with
Deviant Behaviour as Criterion Variable

Correlates	Beta Coefficients			
Time Spent with Friends after School Hours	0.43	0.40	0.33	0.30
Number of Delinquent Peers		0.38	0.38	0.36
Follow Friends with Plans for Deviant Activities			0.28	0.27
I had no Money				0.21
R^2	0.18	0.33	0.40	0.44
Change in R^2		0.15	0.07	0.04

Data in Table 4.28 show that the item *Time Spent with Friends after School Hours* accounted for 18 per cent of the variation in deviant behaviour. This item together with *Number of Delinquent Peers* accounted for 33 per cent of the variation in deviant behaviour with an increase of 15 per cent. The three peer-group variables *Time Spent with Friends after School*, *Number of Delinquent Peers* and *Follow Friends with Plans for Deviant Activities* together accounted for 40 per cent of the variance in deviant behaviour. Motivation for deviant behaviour *I had no Money* when entered increased the variance by four per cent and together with the peer-group variables, accounted for 44 per cent of the total variance.

4.7 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DELINQUENT SUBJECTS AND CONTROLS

Differences between delinquent subjects and controls with regard to the correlates of deviant behaviour were determined using t-tests. The F value obtained by the Levene's Test was observed first. F value is the ratio of the variances of the two independent samples. If its value is almost one, t for equal variances is used because the two variances are considered equal. If they differed significantly then t for unequal variances is quoted.

4.7.1 Deviant Behaviour

Delinquent subjects were compared to controls with regard to their offences in the checklist of deviant behaviour using t-tests. Table 4.29 shows that the means obtained by the delinquent subjects are higher than the means of the controls for all the offences studied and the differences are significant at the 0.05 level. The delinquent subjects selected are significantly higher from their controls in their deviant behaviour which is the criterion variable in this study.

4.7.2 Perceived Parental Support

Table 4.30 shows that certain aspects of Perceived Parental Support are different for the delinquent subjects and their controls. Controls scored higher on all the items measuring perceived parental support except for the items *Mother Can Help with Schoolwork* and *Father Can Help with Schoolwork*.

Table 4.29
Differences in Frequency of Offending between
Delinquent Subjects and Controls

Offences	Delinquent Subjects N=63		Controls N=69		F	t	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
1. Theft of Articles valued less than RM 10	3.11	1.09	2.06	0.92	0.33	6.00	0.00*
2. Theft of Articles valued between RM 10-RM 50	3.08	1.02	1.23	0.57	18.80	12.66	0.00*
3. Theft of Articles valued more than RM 50	3.02	1.24	1.10	0.39	103.03	11.76	0.00*
4. Bicycle Theft	2.16	1.13	1.12	0.40	120.11	6.96	0.00*
5. Motorcycle Theft	2.10	1.10	1.01	0.12	180.86	7.74	0.00*
6. Car Theft	1.48	0.86	1.04	0.36	67.40	3.71	0.00*
7. Burglary	2.75	1.16	1.07	0.31	150.37	11.06	0.00*
8. Vandalism	2.79	1.18	1.54	0.76	13.02	7.21	0.00*
9. Arson	1.79	1.00	1.12	0.44	82.01	4.95	0.00*
10. Robbery	2.03	1.24	1.03	0.17	259.18	6.35	0.00*
11. Attempted Murder	1.19	0.59	1.03	0.17	21.05	2.09	0.04*
12. Assault	2.57	1.12	1.62	0.93	5.25	5.28	0.00*
13. Smoking	3.62	0.87	2.38	1.29	37.33	6.56	0.00*
14. Truancy	3.35	0.95	1.55	0.90	0.02	11.15	0.00*
15. Defying Parents	2.48	1.09	1.68	0.93	3.56	4.52	0.00*
16. Defying other Adults	2.76	1.04	1.70	0.88	0.38	6.37	0.00*
17. Running Away from Home	2.44	1.15	1.12	0.37	134.81	8.80	0.00*
18. Selling Drugs	2.52	1.39	1.01	0.12	707.27	8.59	0.00*
19. Taking Drugs	2.49	1.42	1.12	0.50	275.25	7.27	0.00*
20. Buying Liquor	2.79	1.19	1.07	0.31	146.57	11.10	0.00*
21. Taking Liquor	2.75	1.26	1.06	0.38	152.12	10.24	0.00*
22. Possession of Dangerous Weapons	2.75	1.16	1.43	0.81	14.26	7.44	0.00*
23. Driving without License	3.51	0.97	2.83	1.19	7.48	3.63	0.00*
24. Other Traffic Offences	3.19	1.19	2.42	1.22	1.36	3.67	0.00*
25. Gambling	2.59	1.24	1.43	0.85	27.14	6.18	0.00*
26. Sexual Offences	2.54	1.31	1.17	0.57	120.51	7.67	0.00*

* Significant at $p < 0.05$

these two items, the delinquent subjects scored higher but the differences based on the t value are not significant at the 0.05 level.

Several differences between the delinquent subjects and their controls however are significant at the 0.05. They are *Feel Wanted by Mother, Talk to Mother About What Bothers Me, Talk to Father About What Bothers Me, Do Things Together with Father, Father Enquires About Daily Activities* and *Educational levels* of both parents. The biggest difference between delinquent and non-delinquent is found in the educational levels of both parents.

Differences fail to reach 0.05 level of significance for *Mother is Understanding, Father is Understanding, Feel Unwanted by Father, Mother Can Help with School Work, Father Can Help with School Work, Do Things Together with Mother*, and *Mother Enquires About Daily Activities*.

For paternal support, *Talk to Father About What Bothers Me, Do Things Together with Father, Father Enquires About Daily Activities* and *Educational Level* are significantly different between delinquents and non-delinquents, but for maternal support, the differences are significant for *Feel Wanted By Mother, Talk to Mother About What Bothers Me* and *Educational Level*. Although *Do Things Together with Mother* and *Mother Enquires About Daily Activities* are not significantly different between delinquents and non-delinquents, *Do Things Together with Father* and *Father Enquires About Daily Activities* are significantly different between delinquents and non-delinquents.

Table 4.30
Differences in Perceived Parental Support
Between Delinquent Subjects and Controls

Items Measuring Perceived Parental Support	Delinquent Subjects N=63		Controls N=69		F	t	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Mother is Understanding	3.59	1.49	3.80	0.98	26.18	-0.95	0.35
Father is Understanding	3.18	1.45	3.47	1.15	4.47	-1.22	0.23
Feel Unwanted by Mother (decoded)	3.70	1.51	4.24	0.95	16.36	-2.36	0.02*
Feel Unwanted by Father (decoded)	4.11	1.03	4.38	0.89	1.92	-1.54	0.13
Talk to Mother About What Bothers Me	2.00	1.28	2.73	1.38	0.82	-3.12	0.00*
Talk to Father About What Bothers Me	1.76	1.07	2.32	1.36	6.04	-2.52	0.01*
Mother Can Help with School Work	2.76	1.59	2.46	1.27	6.85	1.16	0.25
Father Can Help with School Work	2.51	1.45	2.34	1.32	0.89	0.65	0.52
Do Things Together with Mother	3.56	1.38	3.88	1.39	0.67	-1.35	0.18
Do Things Together with Father	3.03	1.45	3.65	1.42	0.12	-2.38	0.02*
Mother Enquires About Daily Activities	3.62	1.53	3.99	1.16	13.26	-1.54	0.13
Father Enquires About Daily Activities	2.83	1.61	3.63	1.34	6.01	-2.96	0.00*
Mother's Educational Level	2.25	0.99	3.10	1.40	16.60	-3.85	0.00*
Fathers' Educational Level	2.58	1.12	3.58	1.69	11.04	-3.70	0.00*

*Significant at $p < 0.05$

4.7.3 Peer-group Support

Table 4.31 shows differences in peer-group support between the delinquent subjects and their controls. The controls have a higher mean for the item *Importance of Getting Good Grades in School* while the delinquent subjects have higher means for the items *Number of Delinquent Peers*, *Time Spent with Friends After School Hours*, *Follow Friends with Plans for Deviant Activities* and *Delinquency is Normal Among Adolescents*. The differences between the delinquent subjects and their controls are all significant at the 0.05 level, except for the item *Delinquency is Normal Among Adolescents*.

The biggest difference between delinquents and non-delinquents is *Follow Friends with Plans for Deviant Activities*. This followed closely by *Time Spent with Friends After School Hours*.

4.7.4 School Experiences

Table 4.32 shows that among the items measuring school experiences, the delinquent subjects scored higher on items measuring *Sports Involvement*, *Gave Teachers Problems* and *Played Truant*. Controls on the other hand scored higher on *Academic Achievement*, *Responsible Posts Held*, *Co-curricular Activities Participated* and the item *Enjoyed Schooling*.

The differences are significant at the 0.05 level for *Sports Involvement*, *Gave Teachers Problems* and *Played Truant* for which the delinquent subjects scored higher, and *Enjoyed Schooling* for which the controls scored higher. The biggest difference between delinquents and non-delinquents is *Played Truant*. This is followed very closely by *Gave Teachers Problems*.

The differences are not significant for *Academic Achievement*, *Responsible Posts Held* and *Co-curricular Activities*.

4.7.5 Concepts of Self

Table 4.33 shows differences in concepts of self between delinquent subjects and their controls. The controls have higher means for all the items measuring concepts of self. The differences are significant at the 0.05 level for *Perceived Self-Intelligence* and *Satisfaction with Physical Appearance* but not for *Perceived Social (Peer) Acceptance*. The biggest difference between delinquents and non-delinquents is for *Satisfaction with Physical Appearance*.

4.7.6 Coping Behaviour

Table 4.34 shows differences between the delinquent subjects and their controls with regard to the frequency they employ the coping behaviours, when faced with life stresses. Among the coping behaviours classified as problem-focused, the controls scored higher for *Organize My Life And What I Have to Do*, *Talk to Parents About It* and *Pray to God*. Delinquent subjects scored higher for the coping behaviour *Try to Make My Own Decision*. The differences however are significant at the 0.05 level only for the coping behaviours *Talk to Parents about it* and *Pray to God* for which the controls scored higher.

Delinquent subjects scored higher than controls for all coping behaviours classified as emotion-focused. They are *Get Angry and Yell at People*, *Talk to Friends About How I Feel*, *Complain to Friends and Family*, and *Cry Alone*. Except for *Talk to Friends About How I Feel*, all the differences are significant at the 0.05 level.

Delinquent subjects also scored higher than controls on all coping behaviours classified as avoidance-focused. These coping behaviours are *Joke and Try to be Funny, Sleep a lot, Tell Myself that the Problem is Not Important, and Do Strenuous Physical Activity*. The differences between delinquents and non-delinquents are all at the 0.05 level of significance.

Table 4.31
Differences in Peer-group Support between
Delinquent Subjects and Controls

Items in Peer-group Support	Delinquent Subjects N=63		Controls N=69		F	t	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Importance of Getting Good Grades in School	3.62	1.25	4.44	0.87	15.81	-4.34	0.00*
Number of Delinquent Peers	3.14	1.67	1.61	1.11	33.17	6.14	0.00*
Time Spent with Friends After School Hours	3.83	1.49	1.75	0.97	19.47	9.39	0.00*
Follow Friends with Plans for Deviant Activities	3.97	1.31	1.78	0.95	10.71	10.84	0.00*
Delinquency is Normal Among Adolescents	2.57	1.27	2.41	1.01	5.97	0.83	0.41

*Significant at $p < 0.05$

Table 4.32
Differences in School Experiences between
Delinquent Subjects and Controls

Items in School Experiences	Delinquent Subjects N=63		Controls N=69		F	t	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Academic Achievement	3.06	1.05	3.26	0.80	2.73	-1.23	0.22
Sports Involvement	5.41	5.67	2.13	3.73	8.38	3.89	0.00*
Responsible Posts Held	7.46	8.98	8.70	10.13	0.22	-0.74	0.46
Co-Curricular Activities	0.78	1.43	1.13	1.04	1.50	-1.63	0.11
Enjoyed Schooling	3.43	1.27	4.39	0.73	24.39	-5.28	0.00*
Gave Teachers Problems	3.21	1.42	1.74	0.82	30.00	7.18	0.00*
Played Truant	3.32	1.29	1.51	1.00	10.53	8.87	0.00*

• Significant at $p < 0.05$

Table 4.33
Differences in Concepts of Self
Between Delinquent Subjects and Controls

Items in Concepts of Self	Delinquent Subjects N=63		Controls N=69		F	t	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Perceived Self- Intelligence	2.73	0.60	3.21	0.74	0.68	-4.01	0.00*
Satisfaction With Physical Appearance	3.92	0.73	4.26	0.89	7.83	-2.42	0.02*
Perceived Social (Peer) Acceptance	3.33	1.03	3.45	0.90	1.33	-0.69	0.49

* Significant at $p < 0.05$

Table 4.34
Differences in Coping Behaviours between
Delinquent Subjects and Controls

Different Modes of Coping	Delinquent Subjects N=63		Controls N=69		F	t	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Problem-focused Coping							
Organize My Life and What I Have to Do	3.40	1.49	3.47	1.00	23.45	-0.33	0.72
Try to Make My Own Decision	3.26	1.59	3.00	1.21	18.23	1.04	0.30
Talk to Parents About It	2.06	1.13	2.88	1.27	0.61	-3.91	0.00*
Pray to God	3.27	1.16	3.86	1.18	0.05	-2.83	0.01*
Emotion-focused Coping:							
Get Angry and Yell at People	2.10	1.07	1.41	0.70	15.62	4.29	0.00*
Complain to Friends and Family	2.75	1.19	2.29	1.00	2.84	2.39	0.02*
Cry Alone	2.36	1.28	1.68	0.93	7.17	3.42	0.00*
Talk to Friends About How I Feel	3.33	1.44	3.07	1.18	5.13	1.13	0.26
Avoidance-focused Coping:							
Joke and Try to Be Funny	3.79	1.32	2.64	1.24	2.05	5.19	0.00*
Sleep a Lot	2.78	1.30	2.30	1.08	4.63	2.27	0.03*
Tell Myself that the Problem is Not Important	2.81	1.27	2.16	1.12	0.72	3.13	0.00*
Do Strenuous Physical Activity	3.69	1.37	3.06	1.33	0.23	2.69	0.01*

*Significant at $p < 0.05$

4.7.7 Moral Development

Data in Table 4.35 show that the controls scored higher than delinquent subjects on all the three items measuring moral development. The differences between delinquents and non-delinquents for all the three items are significant at the 0.05 level. The greatest difference between delinquents and non-delinquents is to give situation whereby stealing is acceptable.

Table 4.35
Differences in Stages of Moral Development between
Delinquent Subjects and Controls

Items in Moral Development	Delinquent Subjects N=63		Controls N=69		F	t	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
<i>Evaluate</i> Heinz's decision to Steal	2.84	1.19	3.39	1.40	10.32	-2.45	0.02*
<i>Explain</i> Why Stealing is Wrong	3.39	1.27	3.91	1.30	0.48	-2.33	0.02*
<i>Give Situation</i> When Stealing is Acceptable	3.82	1.27	4.40	0.98	12.42	-2.86	0.01*

* Significant at $p < 0.05$

4.8 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DELINQUENT SUBJECTS AND NON-DELINQUENT SIBLINGS

Only ten pairs of delinquent and non-delinquent siblings were available for comparison. Non-parametric procedure used with paired samples, the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks test was used to determine differences between the ten pairs of siblings. Table 4.36 shows that seven correlates of deviant behaviour are significantly different between delinquent subjects and their non-delinquent siblings at the 0.05 level. These seven correlates are peer-group variables, *Number of Delinquent Peers*, *Time Spent with Friends after School Hours* and *Follow Friends with Plans for Deviant Activities*; school experiences, *Gave Teachers Problems* and *Played Truant*; and moral development items, *Evaluate Heinz's decision to Steal* and *Give Situation when Stealing is Acceptable*.

Delinquent subjects scored higher on peer-group variables *Number of Delinquent Peers*, *Time Spent with Friends after School Hours* and *Follow Friends with Plans for Deviant Activities*. Delinquent subjects also scored higher for school experiences, *Gave Teachers Problems* and *Played Truant*. Delinquent subjects however, reasoned at lower stages of moral development for two of the three items measuring moral reasoning; *Evaluates Heinz's decision to Steal* and *Give Situation when Stealing is Acceptable*.

Table 4.36
Significant Differences in Social and Personal Resources
Between Delinquent Subjects and Non-delinquent Siblings

Correlates of Deviant Behaviour	Siblings Less than Delinquents (Mean Rank)	Siblings Greater than Delinquents (Mean Rank)	Siblings Equal to Delinquents	Missing	z	p
Peer-group Variables						
Number of Delinquent Peers	6 (3.50)	0 (0.00)	4	-	-2.02	0.03*
Time Spent With Friends after School Hours	6 (5.33)	2 (2.00)	2	-	-.196	0.05*
Follow Friends with Plans for Deviant Activities	7 (4.00)	0 (0.00)	2	1	-.236	0.02*
School Experiences						
Gave Teachers Problems	8 (5.81)	2 (4.25)	0	-	-1.94	0.05*
Played Truant	8 (6.13)	2 (3.00)	0	-	-2.19	0.03*
Moral Development						
Evaluate Heinz's decision to Steal	1 (2.50)	6 (4.25)	3	-	-1.94	0.05*
Give Situation When Stealing is Acceptable	0 (0.00)	6 (3.50)	4	-	2.20	0.03*

* Significant at $p < 0.05$