

# **Research on the Social Causes of Juvenile Crime**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**May 1995**

HK  
364.36  
V12

**Commissioned by : Fight Crime Committee  
Prepared by : The University of Hong Kong**

**RESEARCH ON THE  
SOCIAL CAUSES OF JUVENILE CRIME**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Commissioned by : Fight Crime Committee**

**Prepared by : The University of Hong Kong**

May 1995

CTRL NO.	ACV-7858
DATE REC'D	07 JUL 1995
CLASS NO.	HK 364.36
AUTOR NO.	V12
REBOUND	

## THE SOCIAL CAUSES OF JUVENILE CRIME

Prepared by:

Jon Vagg  
John Bacon-Shone  
Patricia Gray  
Debbie Lam

This report was the result of research conducted by the following academics at The University of Hong Kong :

John Bacon-Shone	Social Sciences Research Centre
Patricia Gray	Department of Social Work & Social Administration
Debbie O.B. Lam	Department of Social Work & Social Administration
Julian Y.M. Leung	Department of Curriculum Studies
Harold Traver	Department of Sociology
Jon Vagg	Department of Sociology
Sam Winter	Department of Education

with the help of:

Ben C. Choi	Research Assistants
Amy A.M. Chow	for the main study
S.W. Tang	
Kenneth K.M. Chan	
Lilian S.K. Law	Research Assistants
C.M. Chang	for the study of
Eric W.H. Chui	outreaching work
Sarina S.F. Lam	
C.S. Leung	
Tammy Y.C. Leung	
Ann O.Y. Lo	
Pitmus Y.Y. Siok	
Gary K.L. Yung	

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research team would like to thank the two agencies which funded this project, namely:

The Royal Hong Kong Jockey Club, through the Standing Committee on Young Offenders of the Fight Crime Committee

and

The University of Hong Kong, Committee on Research and Conference Grants (CRCG)

We would also like to acknowledge the assistance provided by the following agencies during the course of the research:

Standing Committee on Young Offenders (SCOYO)  
Security Branch, Hong Kong Government  
Royal Hong Kong Police  
Social Welfare Department  
Education Department  
Correctional Services Department  
Hong Kong Council of Social Services  
Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups

and in addition, all the schools, technical institutes, youth centres, and outreaching teams who facilitated our data collection.

Debbie Lam would like to thank the following persons who were members of the Working Group for the outreaching study: Agnes Chow, Bronze Cheung, C.Y. Cheung, and Winnie Kung (all from the Social Welfare Department); K.M. Ho (Department of Social Work and Social Administration, The University of Hong Kong); Eva Y.W. Hui (Y.W.C.A.); L.H. Li (Boys and Girls Clubs Association), Susan S.Y. So (Yang Methodist Memorial Social Centre), and W.H. Tang (Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups).

Finally, we would like to thank Prof. N.W.S. Chow, Department of Social Work and Social Administration, The University of Hong Kong, for permission to adapt parts of the research questionnaires from his earlier studies of delinquency for use in the present study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<b>THE RESEARCH TEAM</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. MAJOR FINDINGS</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1 <i>Self-reported delinquency is widespread but the majority of delinquent acts are committed by only a small proportion of young people</i>	4
3.2 <i>'Problem behaviour' does not necessarily lead to delinquency; often the reverse is the case</i>	5
3.3 <i>Subcultural factors provided the best explanation for delinquency among the school sample</i>	6
3.4 <i>Mass Media consumption has no direct causal relationship to delinquency</i>	10
3.5 <i>Family members often monitor delinquents and detect delinquency</i>	10
3.6 <i>Data from the offender sample confirms and extends the findings from the school sample; delinquency is largely the result of subcultural factors and negative labelling, especially from schools</i>	11
3.7 <i>Recidivism also results from subcultural factors such as gang membership, and negative labelling especially by schools</i>	12
3.8 <i>While many young offenders do progress from committing property offences to more violent forms of crime, the violence involved is usually minor</i>	13
3.9 <i>Many young offenders are placed under supervision, in residential institutions or custody after only a short 'criminal career' involving only minor offences</i>	14

3.10	<i>Outreaching social work assists clients in ways which may indirectly reduce or prevent delinquency</i>	16
<b>4.</b>	<b>THE MODEL OF DELINQUENCY</b>	<b>19</b>
4.1	<i>Committing one or two offences is a common aspect of growing up</i>	19
4.2	<i>Further occurrences of delinquency are more closely associated with subcultural factors and negative labelling, especially by schools</i>	19
<b>5.</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>22</b>
5.1	<i>Schools should do more to retain their marginal students</i>	22
5.2	<i>Family support should be extended</i>	22
5.3	<i>Work with marginal youth should be developed and expanded</i>	23
5.4	<i>The use of cautioning should be expanded and the guidelines revised</i>	23
5.5	<i>Further alternatives to residential training and custody should be introduced</i>	25
5.6	<i>Future research should take greater account of interactionist theories</i>	27
	<b>APPENDIX 1 - TABLES AND FIGURES (EXTRACTS)</b>	<b>29</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

		<b>Page</b>
TABLE 3.1	Crosstabulation of problem behaviour and delinquency scores	29
TABLE 3.2	Crosstabulation of problem behaviour and delinquency scores (females)	29
TABLE 3.3	Crosstabulation of problem behaviour and delinquency scores (males)	29
FIGURE 4.5	Summary of relationships between parental contact and selected measures of delinquency (males and females)	30
TABLE 4.6	Association between variable #468 delinquency score and seeing father (males)	30
TABLE 4.7	Association between variable #468 delinquency score and seeing mother (males)	30
TABLE 4.8	Association between variable #468 delinquency score and seeing father (females)	31
FIGURE 4.13	Canonical correlations, school factors and selected measures of delinquency and problem behaviour	31
FIGURE 4.17	Correlations between leisure activity factors and various measures of delinquency	31
TABLE 4.19	Where young people socialize with friends, and levels of delinquency	32
TABLE 4.20	Amount of time with friends, and delinquency scores (T-tests of equal mean and variance)	32
FIGURE 4.25	Selected correlations between committing delinquency and being caught	33
FIGURE 5.9	Summary of significant factors from regression analyses and delinquency measures	33
TABLE 6.1	Mean age at time of first offence, 'newcomers' and 'repeaters'	35
TABLE 6.2	'Delinquency ever count', 'newcomers' and 'repeaters'	35
TABLE 6.3	Delinquency score, 'newcomers' and 'repeaters'	35



TABLE 6.7	Do the types of crimes committed by young people change as they progress through their criminal careers?	35
TABLE 6.8	Level of violence involved in young offenders' most recent 'crime against the person'	35
TABLE 6.9	Level of injury to victim in young offenders' most recent 'crime against the person'	35
TABLE 6.10	Frequency of contact with parents, 'newcomers' and 'repeaters'	36
TABLE 6.21	Problems at school and work at time of interview compared to before first offence, 'newcomers' and 'repeaters'	36
TABLE 6.28	Preference to spend leisure with the gang, 'newcomers' and 'repeaters'	36
TABLE 6.30	Number of triad friends, 'newcomers' and 'repeaters'	36
TABLE 6.34	Minor delinquent activities (Factor MOB1#4)	36
TABLE 6.35	Bullying and fighting (Factor MOB1#2)	37
TABLE 7.1	Caught by the police, first vs. most recent arrest	37
TABLE 7.3	The sentence of the court, first conviction vs. most recent conviction	37
TABLE 7.6	Sentence on most recent conviction by total number of offences for which caught	37
TABLE 7.7	Type of offence for which most recently convicted, and sentence	37
TABLE 7.8	Level of violence by sentence on most recent conviction	38
TABLE 7.9	Injury to victim, by type of sentence (most recent conviction)	38

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The study reported here had the following aims:

- to identify the social and especially the social-environmental causes of crimes committed by different age groups from 7 to 20,
- to test different hypotheses relating to juvenile and youth delinquency,
- to study recidivism among offenders aged 7-20,
- to study the effect of the mass media on young offenders,
- to look at the effectiveness of outreach work, and
- to make policy recommendations.

This document summarizes the main findings of our research, and the model of delinquency and the policy recommendations which flowed from them. Fuller details and discussion of all the points below may be found in the full research report.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>. A book-length report was submitted to the Standing Committee on Young Offenders at the same time as this summary report. The full report may be published separately in the future.

## 2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In practical terms, the study comprised the following elements:<sup>2</sup>

1. a total of 1,945 questionnaires were collected from students in forms F1 to F6 in 30 secondary schools around the territory. These asked for information about their attitudes to school; delinquent activities; attitudes and beliefs about others' attitudes towards delinquency; recreational activities and mass media consumption; and a range of family and social factors.

These data were supplemented from two other sources (using the same questionnaire), namely:

2. 178 responses from 5 technical institutes. These enabled us to tap the activities and views of persons who had, for the most part, left school early but returned to full-time or part-time education to obtain vocational qualifications.
3. 204 responses from young persons in 7 youth centres. Although the majority were still in full-time education, this enabled us to collect the views of some 93 persons aged 18 or over.

These three samples, when combined, provided us with self-report data about the prevalence of delinquency among young people and its social correlates.

Some 373 young persons known to be offenders were interviewed. Our sample of offenders comprised:

4. 203 young persons in various CSD custodial facilities,
5. 86 in SWD residential facilities, and
6. 84 who were undergoing 'open' (that is, noncustodial) probation supervision or Community Service Orders.

All these respondents were given the same questionnaire as the school and technical institute students and the youth centre respondents, and in addition, they were interviewed using an

---

<sup>2</sup>. In addition to the groups described here, a truncated version of the questionnaire/interview schedule was sent to 1,200 young persons who had been cautioned under the Superintendents' Discretionary Scheme as an alternative to prosecution. A total of 226 replies were mailed back. In addition, 29 young persons who were in contact with outreaching teams around the territory were interviewed (this number does not include those interviewed as part of our evaluation of outreaching social work). For various reasons these data were not fully analyzed in the main report and hence are not discussed in this summary.

interview schedule which asked for information about the home, health, schooling, work, gang associations, offending, and attitudes towards the ways they had been treated in the criminal justice system.<sup>3</sup>

Finally, bearing in mind the importance attached to outreaching teams in Hong Kong as a way of diverting young persons from possible delinquency and offending, we conducted a qualitative study of how outreaching work operated. Specific questions addressed included: what kinds of interventions outreaching team members made, what they thought were the most effective strategies, and how their clients responded.

---

<sup>3</sup>. The combined questionnaire/interview schedule was divided into subject-based sections as follows: section A, school; section B, self-reported delinquency, attitudes towards delinquency, assessments of friends' and parents' responses to delinquency, and whether caught while committing delinquent acts; section C, attitudes towards parents, school, law, the courts, the police, and ratings of the seriousness of selected offences; section D, self-esteem; section E, mass media consumption; section F, personal and family socio-economic data; section G, leisure activities and friends; section H, life events concerning home, health, school, work, gang association, and offending; section I, further details of first offence, first offence for which caught, most recent offence and experiences in the criminal justice system. Sections A-G were questionnaire items given to both school-TI-YC and offender samples. Sections H-I were used only for the offender sample.

### 3. MAJOR FINDINGS

#### **3.1 Self-reported delinquency is widespread but the majority of delinquent acts are committed by only a small proportion of young people**

One part of our research was a 'self-report' study of delinquency conducted (on a 'normal' population of juveniles) We asked our respondents to indicate whether they had ever been involved in 34 specified activities, and whether they had been involved in them within the last year. Sixteen of these activities can be broadly described as 'problem behaviours', that is, acts which are not in themselves delinquent but are often held to be undesirable (particularly when committed by juveniles) and to indicate a propensity towards later delinquency.<sup>4</sup> The remaining 18 items dealt with activities that can clearly be seen as offences.<sup>5</sup>

Our conclusion is that the current situation in Hong Kong is roughly the same as it was in most developed countries twenty or more years ago. In general terms, (about 30% of our sample had never committed any delinquent act while 70% had done so at some time.) Specifically,

- for females, about 43-48% in each age group had never committed any offence or serious delinquency, and 68-78% in each age group had not committed any such act in the last year (there was no clear pattern by age). Thus slightly more than half had committed a delinquent act at some time and slightly more than a quarter had done so in the last year.

---

<sup>4</sup>. The 16 'problem behaviour' items were: (1) threatening others in school; (2) running away from home; (3) smoking; (4) using alcohol; (5) flirting; (6) sex; (7) truancy from school; (8) getting tattoos; (9) seeing violent movies or, (10) pornographic movies; (11) reading pornographic magazines; (12) staying out past midnight; (13) gambling; (14) cheating in school exams; (15) lying; and (16) swearing.

<sup>5</sup>. The 18 offence items were: (1) threats and menaces (threatening others at school was not counted in this grouping of delinquent acts because it is too often of a minor nature); (2) the extortion of money by threats; (3) blackmail; (4) robbery; (5) taking money from home without permission; (6) using money entrusted to one for an unauthorized purpose; (7) avoiding paying bus fares; (8) shop theft; (9) destroying or (10) damaging public or others' property; (11) assaults (fistfights); (12) fights using weapons; (13) drug use (for own purposes, including the abuse of substances such as cough mixture); (14) drug sale; (15) drug trafficking; (16) throwing items from high buildings; (17) involvement in triad activities; and (18) driving without a license.

- for males, the proportion who had never been involved in delinquency or offending was lower - 16-31% for teenagers, depending on the age band - and the proportion who had not been involved in such acts in the last year was 41-59%, depending on age.<sup>6</sup> By implication, over three quarters of all males had been involved in delinquency at some time and between four and five in every ten had committed such an act in the last year.

Despite the prevalence of delinquency, the majority of delinquent acts are committed by only a small proportion of young people. A rough and probably conservative estimation would be that (half (51%) of all delinquent acts were committed by only 11% of the sample.)

### **3.2 'Problem behaviour' does not necessarily lead to delinquency; often the reverse is the case**

It is very often suggested that young people who engage in problem behaviour are 'at risk' of going on to commit more serious, that is delinquent, acts.

In fact only 3% of our sample reported never having been involved in any problem behaviour, though half of all problem behaviour acts were committed by only 21% of the sample.

Our study suggests that the relationship between problem behaviour and delinquency is rather complex and that the former does not necessarily lead to the latter.

While some youths clearly do engage in substantial amounts of problem behaviour without becoming involved in any significant level of delinquency, higher levels of problem behaviour are broadly associated with higher delinquency scores (see Tables 3.1-3.3).<sup>7</sup> However, our data do not support the contention that problem behaviour typically precedes and leads into delinquency.

If becoming involved in problem behaviour leads to delinquency, we would expect our data to show some relationship between problem behaviour reported in the past (for example at some point prior to the year before the study) and recent delinquency (for example in the year prior to the study). Yet our data suggested the reverse pattern. There were very poor correlations between desisting from problem behaviour and having committed delinquency within the last year (0.053 for females,

---

<sup>6</sup>. Disregarding the figures for those aged 12 or under as being less reliable on the grounds of their definition of delinquency, and those aged 21 or over because of the small number in the sample.

<sup>7</sup>. Tables and Figures in this document are extracted from the main report and, for easy reference, retain the same scheme of numbering.

0.07 for males); and there were much stronger correlations between desisting from delinquency and having been involved in problem behaviour in the last year (0.334 for females, 0.305 for males).<sup>8</sup>

In brief, most young people go through a phase of problem behaviour during which they may commit one or two delinquent acts; a few become more deeply involved in a lifestyle which includes both kinds of activities, and the earlier the young person is involved in this lifestyle the more deeply they are likely to go into it. In so far as we can determine 'which comes first', it seems on the whole more likely that higher levels of problem behaviour follow rather than precede delinquency and may persist even if the delinquency ceases.

### **3.3 Subcultural factors provided the best explanation for delinquency among the school sample**

In total, over 550 variables were used in our analysis of the social correlates of delinquency. Multiple regression analyses using different measures of delinquency, and conducted separately for males and females, produced core lists of 13 items for males, and 11 for females (with 6 items appearing on both lists), which were repeatedly shown to be strongly associated with variations in levels and patterns of delinquency. These lists are reproduced as Figure 5.9.<sup>9</sup>

It will be seen from this figure that some issues were masked by others. For example the analysis shows gang membership to be highly correlated with delinquency for females but not for males. Gang membership, as such, explained less of the variation in male delinquency than many of the leisure/lifestyle variables which do in fact appear in Figure 5.9; those variables, however, are in turn related to gang membership. Thus the primary issue is whether young males spend their time engaging in what might be described as typically 'gang-like' activities; actual membership of a gang is only of secondary importance.

---

<sup>8</sup>. The measures we used related to the *number of different kinds* of acts rather than the actual number of acts committed, and reports of acts being committed within the last year does not preclude their having also been committed in previous years. 'Desisting' from an activity meant for the purposes of this calculation that the respondent had committed it at some time in the past but has not done so within the last year.

<sup>9</sup>. Many of the variables entered into the multiple regressions were factors generated using principal component analysis, a form of analysis which identifies underlying scales and patterns across multiple items.

In plain terms, our analysis found that the following factors were correlated with delinquency:<sup>10</sup>

- a variety of factors concerning leisure activities and friends had a complex relationship with delinquency. Some clusters of activities, which can be described as lifestyles, or as centring around certain core interests, were related (either positively or negatively) to delinquency. For both males and females, the factors labelled G1#1 (which refers to mass media consumption, and includes going to electronic games centres), G1#2 (socializing which revolves around gambling and drug use), and G1#5 (socializing in public places) were all moderately positively correlated with some if not most measures of delinquency (Figures 4.17 and 5.9). Factor G1#3 (a studious lifestyle) was moderately negatively correlated with delinquency.

That said, our findings do suggest that we should distinguish different linkages between leisure time activities and delinquency for males and females. And in addition, they distinguish between qualitatively different kinds of socializing. Factor G1#5 appears on the face of it to involve little more than 'hanging out' or whiling away the time, albeit in a public setting. Factor G1#2, on the other hand, suggests a form of 'hanging around' which is more deeply involved in deviant subculture.

In addition, we collected information on the number of hours per week spent with friends, the relationships between individual pastimes and the amount of time spent with friends, where they met their friends, and their attitudes towards them. Two points are noteworthy. First, those who have a high delinquency score tend to socialize more often in places such as illegal gambling stalls, karaoke parlours, dance halls and billiards halls, and electronic games centres (Table 4.19). Second, while some young people clearly spend a great deal of time with their friends

---

<sup>10</sup>. Factor analysis generates composite variables from clusters of the specific questionnaire items asked; these composite variables are intended to explain as much as possible of the variation within the sample in the responses to those items. The factors were initially given labels based on the part of the questionnaire from which they were derived; for example G1#2 is the second factor analysis-generated variable based on the G1 (use of leisure time) sequence of items in the questionnaire. These variables were then given names which reflected their content. Thus for example Factor A2#1 groups together items which can be described as 'anti-school' attitudes; A2#2 and A2#4 both identified clusters of responses to items which can be described as feelings that the school sees the respondent negatively; and factor A3#2 can be identified as negative feelings towards others and perceptions of others' negative feelings towards the respondent.



engaging in ordinary pursuits,<sup>2</sup> it does appear that those who spend the most time with friends appear to be more likely than others to engage in delinquency (Table 4.20). The relationship between time spent with friends and delinquency for females is rather smooth. However, for males, there is a 'jump' at around 20 hours per week socializing with friends; those who spend more than this amount of time with friends have committed almost twice as many delinquent acts as those who spend less than 20 hours a week with friends:

- *frequency of contact with parents* had a strong relationship to delinquency (see Figure 4.5, Tables 4.6-8), though in the multiple regressions the effects were masked by the lifestyle factors, i.e., the kinds of activities young people engaged in out of the home. (For males, almost all measures of delinquency and problem behaviour are significantly related to the 'see father often' and 'see mother often' variables) with higher rates of self-reported delinquency and problem behaviour occurring where young people see their parents less often. (For females, the relationships are stronger between seeing one's mother less often and higher rates of problem behaviour, and seeing one's father less often and some measures of both problem behaviour and delinquency) (In essence, young people who see at least one parent every day are likely to commit delinquency at only about half the rate of those who do not.)

- *perceptions of schooling and attitudes towards school and classmates* showed some significant links with delinquency. A factor analysis of a variety of measures (including attitudes towards school and classmates, perceptions of the school's and classmates' attitudes towards the respondent, and a rating of the school), and inspection of correlations between the resulting factors and various measures of delinquency (Figure 4.13), suggested that (delinquency was associated with a perception that the school sees the student negatively.) In addition, for girls, anti-school attitudes were associated with problem behaviour and delinquency, while for boys, negative relationships with classmates were linked to delinquency. All these relations were confirmed in the solutions to multiple regressions (Figure 5.9). However, there were (no significant associations between academic self-rating and problem behaviour or delinquency.<sup>11</sup>)

---

<sup>11</sup>. Our data provided a variety of other findings concerning delinquents' perceptions of their friends, detailed information about where they socialized with friends, attitudes towards the courts, the law, and the police, and so forth. Such findings, on the whole, constitute descriptions of the delinquents' lifestyles and attitudes but are not of immediate relevance to any explanation of delinquency.

Finally, several social and environmental factors often cited as potential causes of delinquency turned out not to be of any significance. In particular:

- an apparent link between *social class* and delinquency was in fact a derivative of the relationship between contact with parents and delinquency, which followed a socially-structured pattern. (Young people from households where the father is a professional or non-manual worker, where one or both parents have some tertiary education, and where the family income is higher than average, are just as likely to be delinquent as those who come from poor households where parents are not well-educated and do not have good jobs.) Delinquency rates were lower for young people from more average backgrounds. However, these findings can be explained by the fact that the amount of time spent with parents is patterned in the same way - lower at both ends of the socio-economic spectrum and higher in the middle.
- ✓ *home ownership* (whether categorized by private, public, HOS, temporary, dormitory, or simply by rented versus owned) and *amount of rent or mortgage* show no significant relationship to self-reported delinquency for either sex.
- our data shows no relationship between low self-esteem and delinquency. Most previous studies which found this link were conducted on young detected offenders in custody or under supervision and it is most likely that (the low self-esteem was a product of the custody or supervision, rather than a causal factor related to delinquency.<sup>12</sup>)

In general, then, delinquents tend to spend less time at home with parents, more time with friends, more time socializing with friends in public places (and particularly in billiards halls, karaoke parlours, and electronic games centres, all of which have previously been seen as gathering-places for delinquents), are more likely to describe their friends as a 'street gang', and see those friends perhaps in a slightly cynical light. Both male and female delinquents are likely to hold anti-school attitudes; male delinquents in particular are more likely to perceive both their school and their classmates as rejecting them).

This amounts to a picture of young delinquents who often participate in a peer-dominated, street and public-place oriented, and somewhat manipulative or exploitative lifestyle or subculture. It should be noted, however, that many if not most young people 'dip into' such a lifestyle or subculture at some stage, and a large proportion commit one or two offences (but

---

<sup>12</sup>. Offenders had slightly lower self-esteem scores compared to the total male school sample, which was possibly linked to their negative experiences within the criminal justice system; but we found little significant difference between newcomers (one or two arrests) and repeaters (recidivist offenders, i.e. three or more arrests) in terms of their level of self-esteem.

usually are not caught). Those who are involved more frequently and persistently in delinquency, however, are typically more fully immersed in this subculture.

### **3.4 Mass Media consumption has no direct causal relationship to delinquency**

Arguments concerning the effects of mass media consumption are complex, partly because such consumption is (affected by other matters such as income and educational level, and partly because the very term 'mass media consumption' includes print, film, and electronic media) and arguments range across diverse issues such as sex, violence, and (in Hong Kong) depictions of triads. Our own data offer some *associations* between mass media consumption of various kinds and overall levels of delinquency. In particular:

- our male *offender* sample reported a level of readership of comics more than double that of the school males (61% of the former and 35% of the latter read such material).
- there were also some significant differences between the offender and school samples in their evaluations of various specific characters from well-known comic titles. For example, the character 'Lame Ho' (a well-known drug tycoon from the 1950s and 1960s who has now been turned into a fictional character) was evaluated positively by twice as many of those in the offender sample as those in the school sample (17% of the school sample, and 38% of male offenders, described this character as 'brave').

However, our data indicated that consumption of films and television generally, and reading comic books, was simply part of a wider subcultural array of behaviours, with no direct causal relationship to delinquency.

### **3.5 Family members often monitor delinquents and detect delinquency**

There are strong correlations between committing delinquency and being caught for it - not always by the police, but by family, teachers, and others. Figure 4.25 indicates that for both sexes, there are strong correlations between being involved in problem behaviour and being caught both by one's family and by others for at least some of it. There is however a minor difference between males and females, with the former being slightly less likely than the latter to be caught by family and slightly more likely to be caught by others.

When we look at delinquency, a different picture emerges. There is, it appears, little if any relationship for females between committing delinquency and being caught by persons outside the family - though there is a likelihood of being caught by other family members. For males, on the other hand, while at

least some delinquent acts are caught by the family they are even more likely to be caught by others - police, teachers, social workers, and other adults (for example shop staff in the case of shop theft).

These correlations give no support whatever to the contention that young people with high rates of delinquency come from families that take little interest in them. It may be true that they spend less time with their families; and it is certainly true for problem behaviour, at least, that behaviour such as coming home late at night must almost inevitably result in being 'caught'. But what is interesting is the point, given that much delinquency typically takes place outside the family home, that a great deal of it was detected by family members.

Our data throw no light on the question of what was said or done by parents or other family members when the young person was caught. But the simple fact that they were caught by their family rather than by outsiders such as police or teachers, and for delinquent acts as well as problem behaviour, suggests that many families do monitor their younger members and do not simply allow them to go their own way.

### ***3.6 Data from the offender sample confirms and extends the findings from the school sample; delinquency is largely the result of subcultural factors and negative labelling, especially from schools***

Those who ended up in the care or custody of CSD or SWD typically started their offending career at about age 12 or 13. By the time of their first offence more than a third had already played truant, experienced academic problems, had a change of school (for what reasons is not clear), or dropped out of school altogether. Just over 40% had become a member of a street gang and slightly more than 30% had become, by their own estimation, triads. All these factors are suggestive of young people becoming disinvolved in schooling, involved in a juvenile street culture, and ultimately involved in delinquency at an early age.

However, by the age of about 17 the proportions of young detected offenders who reported various problems has increased dramatically. The rise in reported rates of truancy, academic problems, and behavioural problems in school suggest that the school situation prior to the first offence became even more difficult afterwards. One-third of the sample also reported by the age of about 17 that they had experienced periods of unemployment and most had changed their job at least once. And even more tellingly, participation rates in juvenile gangs increased by about 50% and involvement in triad activities doubled.

We can therefore say that for some individuals, school and other problems occur prior to the first offence - perhaps as young as age 12 or 13. As indicated earlier, our data do not suggest that such problems are likely to cause delinquency.

However what is clear is that participation in problem behaviour often becomes deeper, and the problems faced by young persons at school and elsewhere become more common, around the time of or following the first offence.

*a repeated relapse into delin. habit*

### **3.7 Recidivism also results from subcultural factors such as gang membership, and negative labelling especially by schools**

Unlike the 1992 CSD and SWD recidivism studies, this research found no significant differences in the socio-economic backgrounds of those with longer records of delinquency (the 'repeaters', who we defined as those who had been arrested on three or more occasions) and those who had been arrested only once or twice (the 'newcomers'). However,

- the *repeaters* had begun their offending career at a significantly earlier age than the *newcomers* (Table 6.1). They also reported significantly higher frequencies of offending, and had usually tried a wider variety of crimes (Tables 6.1-3).
- *repeaters* tend to have significantly less contact with their parents, particularly their fathers (Table 6.10). Despite this finding, and unlike previous studies, our data do not support the view that delinquency is the result of inappropriate parental child-rearing attitudes. We found no evidence that the *repeaters* believed that their parents would adopt a more liberal or tolerant approach to misbehaviour.
- *repeaters* expressed a much stronger preference than *newcomers* to spend their leisure with a gang (Table 6.28) and reported a significantly higher number of triad friends (Table 6.30). The importance of the gang for *repeaters* is further evidenced by the life history data, which shows that *repeaters* (47.8%) are slightly more inclined than *newcomers* (40.7%) to have joined a gang before the commission of their first offence. However, by the time of interview, the number of *repeaters* (61.5%) and *newcomers* (59.7%) who had joined a gang had more or less levelled off.
- for *repeaters*, the commission of their first offence appears to have been a significant turning point for the emergence of problems at school and/or work. Following the first offence, *repeaters* who remained at school report a higher incidence of behavioural problems than *newcomers*, generally in the form of conflicts with teachers over conduct and academic performance (Table 6.21). In addition, around two-thirds of both *newcomers* and *repeaters* reported having changed jobs at least once (perhaps not uncommon for young people), one-third had experienced a period of unemployment (probably more unusual), and about one in six had been dismissed from a job.

**3.8 While many young offenders do progress from committing property offences to more violent forms of crime, the violence involved is usually minor<sup>13</sup>**

The majority (63.9%) of young people commit property crimes for their first offence and a further 29.2% engage in crimes against the person (see Table 6.7). By the time of their most recent offence (usually the one for which they were in custody or under supervision when interviewed), a higher percentage of young offenders reported that they had engaged in crimes against the person, or offences such as possession of dangerous drugs, or having sex with an underage girl.

About half of young offenders' crimes against persons involve no more than verbal threats and fist fighting (see Table 6.8). While the other half (47%) had threatened their victim with a weapon or used one, in only about one out of every four cases in which a weapon was produced was it actually used (14% of cases in which the most recent conviction was for a crime against the person). In general, the level of victim injury in crimes against persons was usually minor (see Table 6.9).

Contrary to what might be expected, young offenders may have to endure significant disapproval from their peers if they engage in some forms of problem behaviour or delinquency. For example, and despite its prevalence, 'throwing objects from a height' is likely to be frowned upon, as it is obviously a dangerous and serious pastime in the high-rise life of Hong Kong (Table 6.34).<sup>14</sup> Some other kinds of offending, such as robbery and blackmail items, may also lead to criticism even from within the peer group (Table 6.35), though repeaters are much more likely to obtain the approval of their friends for delinquent behaviour.

In summary, the most revealing differences between repeaters (i.e. recidivists) and newcomers appear to be similar to those that discriminate between low and high levels of self-reported delinquency in the school-TI-YC sample; problems with school and/or work, the amount of time spent out of the home and the nature of their friendship networks, leisure pursuits, and lifestyle. Repeaters express a stronger preference to spend their leisure with the gang and are more heavily involved in 'marginal youth subculture' and triad connections.

In this regard it should also be pointed out that the offenders had a mean 'delinquency score' comparable to that of the 10% in the school sample with the highest delinquency scores, but significantly lower than that of the most delinquent 5% still

---

<sup>13</sup>. Due to the small number of females in the offender sample, the comments in this section refer only to males.

<sup>14</sup>. Despite this observation, our self-report data suggest that this offence is relatively common; see Chapter 2.

in school.<sup>15</sup> Their problem behaviour score, however, was the highest among all four groups. The difference in scores was so marked (despite the difference in average age between the offender and school samples) that we can conclude that the reason they have become members of the offender sample in the first place - that is, placed in custody or under supervision - must have a great deal to do with their problem behaviour rather than their delinquency. It is a very clear indication that the criminal justice system, largely intended to deal with delinquency, is in fact responding to offenders on the basis of their lifestyle and non-delinquent behaviour.

### **3.9 Many young offenders are placed under supervision, in residential institutions or custody after only a short 'criminal career' involving only minor offences**

The following points are based on information from a sub-sample of the total male offender sample where information was known about both the first and most recent arrests:

- the majority of young offenders were caught by the police either at the scene of the crime or in stop and search operations. Young people who have already entered the criminal justice system once, have a significantly greater chance of getting picked up by the police for a subsequent offence. While 58.8% of males were caught by the police at the scene or in stop and search operations for their first arrest, 72.2% were so caught in their most recent arrest (Table 7.1).
- by definition, all those we interviewed and for whom we had data on the first and the most recent arrest had been sent to court following the latter. However, it is interesting to consider what had happened to them following their *first* arrest. Despite the flexibility of the Superintendent's Discretionary Scheme, the majority of young offenders for whom we have data on both first and most recent arrests had been sent to court following their first arrest (64.7%); only 35.3% had received a caution. (In the whole male offender sample 70% were sent to court following their first arrest and only 30% cautioned. Recent Social Welfare Department research similarly found that the majority of young people on probation (79.6%), in probation homes (59.4%), and in reformatory schools (57.5%) had never received a caution prior to their first appearance in court.<sup>16</sup>) Those who now constitute the 'correctional and supervised population' of offenders had thus experienced

---

<sup>15</sup>. Some of whom, admittedly, may also have experienced arrest and a few of whom may in fact be under some form of supervision.

<sup>16</sup>. Social Welfare Department (1992) *Recidivism Study on Young Offenders*. Unpublished Departmental Report.

only a limited use of cautioning at the beginning of their offending career, despite many being less than 16 years old at that time. This may have occurred for a variety of reasons, but the two main factors which appear to explain the non-use of cautions are first, the issue of whether the offence is against property or against the person, and second, police perceptions of problem behaviour influencing decisions about whether or not cautioning would be desirable.

The majority of the young offenders for whom we have data on both the *first and the most recent conviction* had received a non-residential or non-custodial sentence following their first conviction, with 55.4% placed on probation or community service order, and 22% receiving a fine or bind-over. However a fairly large percentage (22%) had been immediately placed in residential care or custody following their first conviction, without being given the opportunity to reform in the community (Table 7.3). Following their most recent conviction, the majority of young offenders ended up in residential care (40.9%) or custody (47.8%).

Undoubtedly many of these young people have already been given a community-based disposal and subsequently reoffended. Therefore one might expect to see a high incidence of institutional and custodial disposals following their most recent conviction. Nevertheless it would appear that many young offenders have been placed in residential institutions or custody after very brief offending careers and for crimes which could hardly be described as posing a serious threat to the public. The following points are based on information from the whole male offender sample concerning their *most recent conviction*:

- there is a small, but statistically significant, correlation between the number of previous offences for which offenders were caught and the level of severity of sentence for their most recent conviction (Table 7.6). However, there remains a great deal of variability in sentencing that is not explained in terms of the number of offences for which they have previously been caught.
- 41% of young offenders placed in residential care and 52% of custody cases were convicted of crimes against the person. Nevertheless, just over one third of those sentenced to residential training (37%), and about one in five of those sentenced to custody (17%), had been involved in property crimes which posed little immediate danger to the public (Table 7.7). Of those who had committed a crime against the person, the majority of those sent to residential care (62%), and still a large minority of those sent to custody (32%), had done little more than engage in verbal threats or fist-fighting (Table 7.8).
- 63% of those in residential institutions or custody for a crime against the person had committed offences which



resulted in no physical injury to a victim. Since the actual use of violence, and victim injuries, was comparatively rare, any discussion of injuries must proceed on the basis of very small numbers. However, in most of these cases the actual level of injury to the victim required no more than outpatient treatment, even if medical attention was required (Table 7.9).

These observations, when taken together, suggest that in Hong Kong the majority of young offenders who are placed in residential institutions or custody have rather short track records of offending (and about one in five receive some form of custody for a first offence); and the kinds of offences which lead to residential training or custody are in the majority of cases comparatively minor. (These findings can be substantiated by Gray's (1994a) research on sentencing in the juvenile courts, and by Social Welfare and Correctional Services Department statistical data.<sup>17</sup>) Our data shows that many young offenders who have not committed serious crimes are nonetheless placed in residential training or custody. In addition the data suggests that the problem behaviour that they display may have influenced the sentencing decision.

### **3.10 Outreaching social work assists clients in ways which may indirectly reduce or prevent delinquency**

This part of our study comprised interviews with 24 persons receiving service from outreaching teams, selected to provide a

---

<sup>17</sup>. (a) A recent Social Welfare Department Research shows the almost 69% of juveniles in probation homes are first offenders, with a further 23% having only one previous conviction. Similarly 35% of juveniles in reformatory schools had no previous convictions and a further 45% had only one. In addition, the majority of young people in probation homes and reformatory schools have committed property crimes. Social Welfare Department (1992) *Recidivism Study on Young Offenders*.

(b) Recent Correctional Services Department data shows that 27% of males under 20 committed to a training centre had no previous convictions and 36% had only one. Similarly 78% of detection centre inmates under 24 had only one or no previous convictions. The majority of juveniles in detention centres (64.4%) and training centres (66.7%) had been involved in property crimes. The figures for 'crimes against the person' were 8.9% and 7.7% respectively. Commissioner of Correctional Services: *Annual Statistical Tables 1993*. Government Printer: Hong Kong.

(c) Gray's (1994a) research focuses on the sentencing practices inside the juvenile courts. Based on court data, which provides a detailed description of the nature of the offence, she found that only a small percentage of juveniles had committed crimes which involved the theft of substantial amounts of money or were of a life-threatening nature.

cross-section of the outreaching clientele, and their outreaching social workers (in total therefore 48 interviews were conducted). This was a qualitative and exploratory study, intended to provide a picture of the outreaching work process and the perceptions and experiences of both clients and workers, and to review the range of services provided.

Outreaching social work is a service offered to youth by workers who initiate contacts in places where young people tend to congregate - for example fast food shops, video games centres, and shopping arcades. It is a flexible service provided to a population which either would not receive social services, or for various reasons would not accept service in a more structured way.

The key point is that outreaching social workers can be effective, ironically, because *they are not 'officials' and have no authority over the clients*. Their advice and help is thus sought and taken more readily than it would be from someone perceived as an authority figure.

The primary forms of service offered included (the list is compiled from interviews with clients):

- *giving information or advice* (the most common category), on issues ranging from dating and courtship to triad connections, a court hearing, drinking, and going to consult a doctor. In some cases the worker-client relationship was very close and described by clients as having some qualities of a *parental role*; in others it was perceived as a form of *teaching or lecturing*. In addition to simply providing information or advice, workers could *mobilize resources*, both internal agency resources and arranging access to other facilities on behalf of their clients.
- helping clients *analyze* different aspects of their lives.
- *expressing concern*; this took several different forms, from simply being a listening-post to explicit verbal support and encouragement, and accompanying clients in situations which they found difficult to cope with (e.g. to court, to visit the probation officer, or back home after the client had run away). This shaded into
- *talking to others on the client's behalf* in order to sort out problems. This included, for example, talking to gang members in the case of some inter-gang problems, etc.
- although *offering activities* tended to be most used at the point of contact with a client, for some clients it was also a relevant means of service, for example offering an alternative to those who would otherwise go to places or engage in activities which could get them into trouble.

The most common problems, as analyzed by the workers, were: study problems, peers, family, and the behavioural problems of drug-taking and stealing. Others also mentioned were: problems of work, fighting and assault, staying out late, possession of a weapon for robbery, gambling, sex and abortion, self-destructive behaviour, and poor self-image. Client needs were extremely varied and almost always more extensive than the agency categorizations of clients, which were normally based on the type of need or problem which formed the basis for the first contact. In practice, clients' different problems were often inter-related, but help with one problem could help solve others.

Outreaching work has a number of limitations. It takes time to build relationships with clients, and the clients often live in relatively unstable situations where regular contact with an outreach worker presents difficulties. The Hong Kong Council of Social Service (1992) notes that only about half of all outreaching cases are terminated with the objective reached, and in one third of cases contact with clients was lost for various reasons. It must be accepted that there will be a substantial 'dropout rate' when dealing with clients who lead unstable lives and who are contacted on the street. Moreover, many of the problems which are associated with delinquency are also associated with the family, school, the availability of drugs, and triad influence, all of which are matters that outreaching workers can address in only limited ways.

Nonetheless, the forms of assistance offered by outreaching social work may have an *indirect* effect on delinquency, for example encouraging young people to reflect on their experiences, offering alternatives to delinquent activities, and helping young people solve the kinds of problems which tend to be associated with delinquency.

#### 4. THE MODEL OF DELINQUENCY

Previous studies of delinquency in Hong Kong have tended to assume that various kinds of social conditions, and problems experienced by young people, can propel them towards delinquency. Our own stance is slightly more complex. Many of these factors are interlinked and can reinforce each other as well as leading to delinquency. And significantly, it appears from our data that being involved in delinquency can lead to a 'labelling effect' - those who are known to be delinquents find that alternative relationships or activities are closed to them, and they become locked into a 'vicious circle' which leads to more and more delinquent activity. Those who are the most persistent delinquents typically started their delinquent 'career' at an earlier age than others, and this labelling effect took place correspondingly earlier for them.

##### ***4.1 Committing one or two offences is a common aspect of growing up***

The majority of young people (though more males than females) commit one or two offences, for which they are usually not caught by the police. Because offending at this level is so widespread, the causes are likely to be highly varied and largely circumstantial. At this level, we can say that a limited and temporary involvement in delinquency is simply a testing of the limits of acceptable behaviour and is no more than part of growing up. What has to be explained is why some young people become much more delinquent than others: what are the factors that lead roughly 11% of young people to commit more than half of all delinquency?)

##### ***4.2 Further occurrences of delinquency are more closely associated with subcultural factors and negative labelling, especially by schools***

Those who have committed more delinquent acts stand out from the 'average' in three significant ways. They feel they are treated negatively by the school; they have less contact with their parents; and they are more immersed in the marginal youth subculture.

These facts do not rule out the 'differential association' explanation; that is, that young people who are unhappy with school and family gravitate towards persons who are already delinquent, absorb their values, and are 'led into' a life of delinquency. However, our data give grounds for emphasizing other processes which are likely to result in young people becoming more delinquent:

- those who have higher levels of delinquency appear to feel rejected by their school. The implication is that they have been 'labelled' by their school and (for males) also by classmates as a 'bad element'. The net result is that those

on the verge of delinquency may have few options except to socialize with other delinquents, which in turn may mean spending more time in the marginal youth subculture.

- spending more time within the marginal youth subculture is likely to lead to further offending. The subculture is not centred around offending as a core activity, but it does accept most (though not all) offending as an incidental accompaniment to subcultural membership. It should be noted, however, that the experience of that subculture and the kinds of activities involved are different for males and females, and also differ between those who are simply members of it as opposed to those who can be described as 'culture-carriers'. In particular, females do tend to form closer relationships with their friends and act more co-operatively together than do the males.
- young delinquents, finding that the marginal youth subculture will tolerate their behaviour, thus have a less strong 'stake' in conventional society. We do not want to deny that young people have free choice, nor imply that they are somehow forced into crime. Nonetheless, the situation they find themselves in is one where (a) they can 'drift', postponing making moral judgements about others' activities, and (b) where compelling reasons not to commit crime are absent. Offending may thus come about, we might say, as an incidental, occasional, and perhaps even accidental consequence of living in that situation.
- becoming a member of a 'street gang' appears to lead to more purposive offending, in particular violent offences. Most 'violent' crimes do not in fact involve serious injury to victims. Nonetheless, gang membership and its link to violent crime represents a particular modification of the general pattern.
- those who are more deeply immersed in the marginal youth subculture are more likely to be prosecuted for a first offence than those who are not (assuming that they are within the age-limit for cautioning).
- those who have become 'repeaters', that is, who have committed and been sentenced for three or more offences, appear to be the most deeply involved in the marginal youth subculture. They may in fact be the 'culture-carriers', that is, the individuals who most fully adopt and act out the attitudes and values associated with the subculture.

(In summary, we can say that there is no single 'cause' of juvenile delinquency, though several factors related to school, family, and use of leisure time can make delinquency more likely, and such factors can reinforce each other. In general, the earlier the onset of delinquency the longer and more serious the delinquent 'career' will be, but those who come to be labelled as delinquent experience further problems as a result; this may drive them further into the marginal youth subculture and

reinforce their patterns of offending. Finally, those who have the most serious records of delinquency tend to be the 'culture carriers' who form the role models for other, younger, delinquents.

## 5. RECOMMENDATIONS

### **5.1 Schools should do more to retain their marginal students**

One of our key findings is the importance of negative labelling from schools in increasing the likelihood of (first or further) delinquency. There must, accordingly, be efforts made to retain students. Accordingly, schools should:

- a. operate a more diverse, and perhaps vocational rather than academic, curriculum for some students;
- b. provide more educational support for students, such as running remedial classes for students who are falling behind, strengthening parent-teacher communication, and relaxing the quota on repeaters; and
- c. develop a district-level school resource file or network information system so that school social workers and outreaching social workers can more readily tap available resources for their clients.<sup>18</sup>
- d. provide more social work support to help students with problems or special needs. This might facilitate them to take better advantage of their time at school, with hopefully a greater sense of self-fulfilment.

In relation to this last point, we understand that moves are under way to recruit more school social workers, and to create integrated teams working from Children and Youth Centres but including work in schools within their remit. These are welcome steps.

In addition to these points:

- e. it should be made rather hard for students to be expelled, transferred, or placed in a position in which they are forced to drop out. Such measures should only be considered after the school has made several serious attempts to reintegrate the delinquent back into school life, and failed repeatedly.

### **5.2 Family support should be extended**

Our study found a strong association between contact with parents and delinquency. This is consistent with previous research findings (Ng, 1975; Chow *et al.*, 1987). Bearing in mind that the

---

<sup>18</sup>. The Education Department has already introduced some such services and specialized teaching facilities. While welcoming these we consider it important that they be kept under review so that appropriate services can continue to be developed.

type of care and control that families can provide may be limited by socio-economic circumstances, and also that the arrest of a young family member is likely to be a stressful time for both parents and the delinquent, we recommend that:

- f. family life education programmes should further reiterate the need for parents to spend time with their children.
- g. further research be conducted to identify in greater depth the qualitative aspects of the link between delinquency and family contact.
- h. better liaison between the police and social workers at the time of the young persons' arrest and the availability of social work assistance and mediation.

### **5.3 Work with marginal youth should be developed and expanded**

We would like to stress the following points in relation to the services delivered to marginal youth:

- i. in so far as factors relating to the family, school, and marginal youth subculture may affect the continuation of delinquent behaviour, outreaching social workers (as they now are) and integrated team youth workers (as they will be) can help structure the circumstances of clients in ways that make it easier for them to desist from a delinquent career. However it is important that workers look beyond the immediate behaviour problems identified.
- j. since those who persist in delinquent careers typically appear to start them at an earlier age, there are benefits to providing service and attention to persons even as young as 12. At this age it is impossible to predict which young people will become persistent offenders, or indeed even first offenders (none of our statistical models for delinquency were able to predict more than half of the delinquency in our school-TI-YC sample). In consequence, dealing with any problems that members of this age group have, whether or not those problems are proven to be predictive of delinquency, must be regarded as a form of social defence.

### **5.4 The use of cautioning should be expanded and the guidelines revised**

It is important to remember that on the first occasion that young delinquents are detected by the police, they have often done no more than the majority of their contemporaries (who have not been caught) have done. It is thus also important not to treat them as though they are especially wicked, and not to respond to them on the basis of perceptions of their personal problems or friendship networks. We thus recommend that:



- k. all young offenders, unless their offences are extremely serious,<sup>19</sup> should be explicitly considered as candidates for cautioning in response to a first detected offence if there is an admission of guilt and a parent or guardian can be found to accompany the young person to the formal caution.<sup>20</sup>

The above recommendation does little more than reiterate existing cautioning guidelines. However, in view of the large number of first offenders found (in both this research and SWD data) to have been prosecuted without the benefit of a previous caution, we also recommend that:

- l. a consultative body comprising relevant juvenile justice professionals be established to monitor cautioning practices and so ensure greater consistency in the selection of targets.<sup>21</sup>
- m. in addition, it is clearly worth considering whether cautioning for a second offence should become normal rather than exceptional.<sup>22</sup>

At this stage it may actually be counter-productive to seek to supervise the young person or even to seek the involvement of

---

<sup>19</sup>. In this context the 'extremely serious' offences which we would consider as automatically excluded from cautioning comprise only murder, rape, assaults and woundings resulting in in-patient hospital treatment, and offences in which the offender carried a knife, chopper, gun, or other implement which if used could have led to the victim sustaining injuries requiring hospital in-patient treatment.

<sup>20</sup>. The 1990 Home Office guidelines for the police in the UK state: 'Cautioning is recognised as an increasingly important way of keeping offenders out of the courts and in many circumstances, reducing the risk that they will re-offend ... the courts should only be used as a last resort, particularly for juveniles and young adults.' (Home Office Circular 59/1990, cited in the NACRO Briefing Report *The Home Office Circular on the Cautioning of Offenders*, 1990, pp. 2-3). These guidelines apply to all young people below the age of 18 years.

<sup>21</sup>. In the UK, this role is performed by district juvenile bureaux. These consultative panels, comprised of representatives from the police, social work, probation and education departments, act as 'gatekeepers' monitoring local cautioning practices to prevent juveniles inappropriately entering the criminal justice system (NACRO, *Diverting Juvenile Offenders From Prosecution*, 1989).

<sup>22</sup>. In Hong Kong, there has as yet been no recidivism study on the use of cautioning. However, in the UK, the use of cautioning has proved to be highly successful in preventing young people from becoming further involved in crime (NACRO, *Diverting Juvenile Offenders From Prosecution*, 1989).

social welfare agencies. So far as the young offenders are concerned such supervision or help, whatever the motivation for offering it, may in fact have a negative labelling effect. That said, in the UK many cautioning schemes are backed up by the provision of supplementary welfare services (often referred to as 'cautioning plus'). Generally, such assistance is targeted at persistent offenders and particular emphasis is placed on ensuring that it is offered on a voluntary basis after the caution has been issued.<sup>23</sup> A number of youthwork agencies in Hong Kong have recently established or are about to establish such 'cautioning plus' schemes.<sup>24</sup> We therefore recommend that:

- n. 'cautioning plus' schemes be further developed and expanded. However, care must be taken to ensure that such services are provided on a voluntary basis as experience from other countries shows that they have the potential to be misused if they become a condition of the caution.

We understand that the use of cautioning is presently under review, and there may be an opportunity to make some of the above changes in the near future.

#### **5.5 Further alternatives to institutional and custodial penalties should be introduced**

After each arrest and conviction young offenders are moved briskly on to increasingly severe sanctions, so that those in SWD and CSD custody have frequently never experienced a caution, and have been given one or perhaps two noncustodial sentences prior to custody or residential training. However, in most cases their offences appear to be fairly minor; only a small percentage are involved in violent crime; and even in such cases, the actual level of violence offered was usually low.

There will of course always be a place for residential training and custody as a last resort for those who do commit serious violence, and those whose offending is persistent. Nor can we expect that such people will be easy to rehabilitate. However, the picture we have drawn above suggests that alternative and more effective courses of action can be taken for many of those who currently end up in residential training or custody.

Over the past ten years, criminal justice legislation in the UK has sought to tighten up on the punishment of persistent, serious young offenders. However this has not resulted in an

---

<sup>23</sup>. Home Office Circular 59/1990. HMSO: London.

<sup>24</sup>. See for example Cheng C.H., *Evaluation Report on the Phoenix Project* (Mimeograph, 1993). See also Lo, K.W., Lam Y.W., Hung, P.M. 'The Phoenix Counselling Project', in Hong Kong Council of Social Services, *Casebook of Innovative Attempts* (Hong Kong, Cosmos Books Ltd., 1994; in Chinese).

increased reliance on residential care or custody. Instead a number of innovative sentencing measures have been introduced to ensure an appropriate balance is maintained between the need for punishment and the need for rehabilitation. Several research studies in the 1980s and 1990s have shown that pure punishment is not an effective means to deter young offenders from crime (Gelsthorpe and Morris, 1994).

The 1991 Criminal Justice Act in the UK replaced Juvenile Courts with new Youth Courts which have jurisdiction over all offenders below the age of 18 years. This recognises the fact that much young adult crime is not that different from juvenile crime, and thus requires a similar response. While the Act gave magistrates increased power to place serious young offenders in custody (the equivalent of detention and training centres in Hong Kong), it also introduced strict criteria which must be met before such sentences can be imposed. Similar restrictions have been placed on the use of residential care (the equivalent of probation homes and reformatory schools in Hong Kong). The 1989 Children Act abolished the use of residential training for juvenile offenders in criminal proceedings. Place of residence requirements (usually in small group homes or hostels) may still be added to supervision orders (similar to probation homes in Hong Kong) for a specified period up to a maximum of six months, and juveniles may also be placed in 'secure' accommodation for persistent absconding. However, once again strict criteria must be satisfied before either of these two sanctions can be imposed. The end result of the above legislation is that the number of young people in residential care or custody in the UK has dropped dramatically (NACRO, 1993). Many of the recent changes made in the UK reflect an attempt to implement the basic principles embodied in the 1989 United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

To replace residential training and alleviate the need for custody, resources have been re-directed into the development and expansion of a wide range of community-based sentencing disposals, which cater for various categories of young offenders at different stages in their criminal careers. These community-based sentencing options have proved to be more effective than residential care or custody in preventing young people from returning to crime (NACRO, 1993).

We earlier proposed that cautioning should be much more widely used than it now is, and perhaps used for a second as well as a first arrest in which the offender admits guilt. But in addition it seems sensible to take account of the UK experience and make stronger efforts to rehabilitate young offenders in the situation where, it now appears, there is a better chance of doing so - in the community, where the family, school, employer, and perhaps friends can be mobilized to assist. In short, therefore, we recommend:

- o. the creation of community-based programmes as an explicit alternative to residential training and custody. These

differ from open probation<sup>25</sup> in that they are more structured, with requirements to attend the programme perhaps one to three times a week for up to six months, depending on the seriousness of the young person's criminal career. Participants should be under no illusions about the compulsory nature of attendance, with a significant level of non-attendance being punishable. But at the same time, and bearing in mind that young people often react more readily to inducement than punishment, the programme should offer clear benefits to participants. These may include facilities for developing hobbies and life interests, vocational courses, remedial education, recreational facilities and group activities, community service or reparation placements, individual counselling, social skills training, and the possibility of referral to more specialized help (e.g. psychological, psychiatric, drug addiction treatment). In addition, these programmes should provide the opportunity to confront young people with the consequences of their behaviour, challenge their attitudes, and induce a sense of personal responsibility and self-respect.

The arguments about the net-widening effects of such programmes (i.e. that the programmes come to be used not for those who would otherwise receive residential training or custody, but those who would otherwise be cautioned or placed on probation) in other countries are well-known and must be taken seriously. The only way to counter net-widening tendencies is to implement systematic and detailed monitoring of the courts' use of such programmes and to provide regular feedback to judges and magistrates.

#### **5.6 Future research should take greater account of interactionist theories**

Our data, while mainly quantitative, has shown the importance of labelling and subcultural effects in the Hong Kong context. It has thus also shown the importance of realizing that young people's propensity to commit delinquency is the result not only of social influences such as peer group interaction, but also of the way in which officials and other adults, and institutions, respond to delinquency. Those who continue their delinquent career are often those who feel that more 'respectable' lifestyles and opportunities have been or are being denied them. Marginal youth subculture clearly provides a refuge from the negative and often authoritarian way in which many social institutions treat delinquents; that is why it survives.

---

<sup>25</sup>. They also differ from Community Service Orders, although a community service placement may be included as part of the programme. In addition, they are different from the new Community Support Schemes recently established by the Social Welfare Department for probationers, and juvenile offenders discharged on after-care supervision from probation homes and reformatory schools.

In addition our study has shown the importance of making a clear separation between males and females, since their patterns and levels of offending differ in some important respects, including the particular influences of school, family, and youth subculture.

Any further research on delinquency would be well advised to concentrate on the qualitative issues thrown up by this research. In particular,

- p. we would welcome further studies of marginal youth subculture, which would be able to provide a more detailed account of young delinquents' entry into the subculture, the nature of associations within the subculture, and its ability to maintain and recreate itself over time.
- q. it also seems important to study female delinquents. There are fewer of them than males, and often they commit less serious offences. However we now have good reason to believe that their 'pathways into delinquency' differ in some important respects from that of males.
- r. finally, it is important that the impacts of all policy changes are properly monitored and evaluated.

APPENDIX 1

TABLES AND FIGURES (EXTRACTS)

NB: The following tables and figures are extracted from the main report and retain their original numbering scheme. Where necessary, additional explanatory notes have been added.

**Table 3.1 Crosstabulation of problem behaviour and delinquency scores**  
 Sample base: all cases/females and males  
 (Count/Row %/Column %)

		Delinquency score					Row Total
		0-16	16-32	32-48	48-64	64-80	
Problem behaviour score	0-18:	1334	6	1			1341
		99.5	0.4	0.1			
		59.6	2.2	0.9			49.9
18-36:		610	57	1	1		669
		91.2	8.5	0.1	0.1		
		27.3	21.0	0.9	1.8		24.9
36-54:		249	110	24	5	2	390
		63.8	28.2	6.2	1.3	0.5	
		11.1	40.4	22.6	9.1	12.5	14.5
54-72:		42	89	64	32	3	230
		18.3	38.7	27.8	13.9	1.3	
		1.9	32.7	60.4	58.2	18.8	8.6
72-90:		2	10	16	17	11	56
		3.6	17.9	28.6	30.4	19.6	
		0.1	3.7	15.1	30.9	68.8	2.1
Column	:						
Total	:	2237	272	106	55	16	2686

NB: table includes 4 cases elsewhere removed, suspected unreliable

**Table 3.2 Crosstabulation of problem behaviour and delinquency scores (females)**  
 Sample Base: School Female  
 (Count/Row %/Column %)

		Delinquency score					Row Total
		0-15.75	15.75-31.5	31.5-47.25	47.25-63		
Problem behaviour score	0-18.25:	852	1	1			854
		99.8	0.1	0.1			
		74.9	2.8	16.7			72.3
18.25-36.5:		231	11	1			243
		95.1	4.5	0.4			
		20.3	30.6	16.7			20.6
36.5-54.75:		46	14	2			62
		74.2	22.6	3.2			
		4.0	38.9	33.3			5.2
54.75-73:		9	10	2	1		22
		40.9	45.5	9.1	4.5		
		0.8	27.8	33.3	100.0		1.9
Column	:						
Total	:	1138	36	6	1		1181

NB: table contains 1 case elsewhere removed, suspected unreliable

**Table 3.3 Crosstabulation of problem behaviour and delinquency scores (males)**  
 Sample Base: School Male  
 (Count/Row %/Column %)

		Delinquency score				Row Total
		0-20	20-40	40-60	60-80	
Problem behaviour score	0-22.5:	613	6			619
		99.0	1.0			
		60.0	9.7			56.1
22.5-45:		340	27	2		369
		92.1	7.3	0.5		
		33.3	43.5	14.3		33.4
45-67.5:		68	27	8		103
		66.0	26.2	7.8		
		6.7	43.5	57.1		9.3
67.5-90:		1	2	4	6	13
		7.7	15.4	30.8	46.2	
		0.1	3.2	28.6	100.0	1.2
Column	:					
Total	:	1022	62	14	6	1104

NB: table contains 4 cases excluded elsewhere, considered unreliable

**Figure 4.5 Summary of relationships between parental contact and selected measures of delinquency (males and females)**  
 T-test of equal mean & variance: one-way analysis of variance

Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Male

Criterion variable #297 F6B:1 See father often			
Variable	P value	Variable	P value
#384 Problem behaviour ever count	0.0003**	#385 Problem behaviour last year count	0.0030**
#390 Delinquency ever count	0.0000**	#391 Delinquency last year count	0.0000**
#467 Problem behaviour score	0.0003**	#468 Delinquency score	0.0000**
#480 SM B4 Factor #1	0.0555	#481 SM B4 Factor #2	0.0001**
#482 SM B4 Factor #3	0.0004**		

Criterion variable #298 F6B:2 See mother often			
Variable	P value	Variable	P value
#384 Problem behaviour ever count	0.0085**	#385 Problem behaviour last year count	0.0238*
#390 Delinquency ever count	0.0000**	#391 Delinquency last year count	0.0000**
#467 Problem behaviour score	0.0030**	#468 Delinquency score	0.0000**
#480 SM B4 Factor #1	0.2780	#481 SM B4 Factor #2	0.0000**
#482 SM B4 Factor #3	0.0032**		

Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Female

Criterion variable #297 F6B:1 See father often			
Variable	P value	Variable	P value
#384 Problem behaviour ever count	0.0134*	#385 Problem behaviour last year count	0.2150
#390 Delinquency ever count	0.0000**	#391 Delinquency last year count	0.0197*
#467 Problem behaviour score	0.0036**	#468 Delinquency score	0.0013**
#477 SF B4 Factor #1	0.4406	#478 SF B4 Factor #2	0.0000**
#479 SF B4 Factor #3	0.2304		

Criterion variable #298 F6B:2 See mother often			
Variable	P value	Variable	P value
#384 Problem behaviour ever count	0.0152*	#385 Problem behaviour last year count	0.0105*
#390 Delinquency ever count	0.0621	#391 Delinquency last year count	0.0122*
#467 Problem behaviour score	0.0111*	#468 Delinquency score	0.0639
#477 SF B4 Factor #1	0.1447	#478 SF B4 Factor #2	0.2521
#479 SF B4 Factor #3	0.0595		

\* = significant at 5% level  
 \*\* = significant at 1% level

**Table 4.6 Association between variable #468 delinquency score and seeing father (males)**

Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Male  
 T-test of equal mean & variance: one-way analysis of variance

F6B:1 Father/often	Level	Count	#468 Delinquency score		
			Mean	Std Dev	Variance
Once a day or more	1	809	5.997	7.193	51.68
Once a week or more	2	92	10.73	13.63	183.9
Once a month or more	3	59	8.214	9.111	81.6
Total		960	6.587	8.268	68.28

One-Way Analysis of Variance

Variation	SS	DF	MS	F=15.18	P val=0.0000
Explained	2015	2	1008		
Residual	6.354e+004	957	66.39		
Total	6.555e+004	959			

**Table 4.7 Association between variable #468 delinquency score and seeing mother (males)**

Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Male  
 T-test of equal mean & variance: one-way analysis of variance

F6B:1 Mother/often	Level	Count	#468 Delinquency score		
			Mean	Std Dev	Variance
Once a day or more	1	894	6.192	7.429	55.13
Once a week or more	2	30	16.77	16.69	269.2
Once a month or more	3	45	8.095	8.526	71.07
Total		969	6.607	8.125	65.95

One-Way Analysis of Variance

Variation	SS	DF	MS	F=26.72	P val=0.0000
Explained	3350	2	1675		
Residual	6.056e+004	966	62.69		
Total	6.391e+004	968			

**Table 4.8 Association between variable #468 delinquency score and seeing father (females)**  
 Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Female  
 T-test of equal mean & variance: one-way analysis of variance

F6B:1 Father/often	#468 Delinquency score				
	Level	Count	Mean	Std Dev	Variance
Once a day or more	1	849	2.627	4.369	19.07
Once a week or more	2	91	3.246	7.079	49.57
Once a month or more	3	68	4.814	7.009	48.4
Total		1008	2.83	4.913	24.12

One-Way Analysis of Variance

Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	P val
Explained	318.5	2	159.3	F=6.67	P val=0.0013
Residual	2.399e+004	1005	23.87		
Total	2.431e+004	1007			

**Figure 4.13 Canonical correlations, school factors and selected measures of delinquency and problem behaviour**

Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Female  
 Analysis uses 545 cases

	Problem behavior ever	Problem behavior last yr	Delinq ever	Delinq last yr	Problem behavior score	Delinq score	SFB4#1	SFB4#2	SFB4#3
Academic	-0.172	-0.153	-0.125	-0.128	-0.165	-0.125	-0.165	0.051	-0.034
S-esteem	-0.156	-0.135	-0.146	-0.120	-0.183	-0.175	-0.184	0.055	0.048
Fac A2 #1	0.262	0.282	0.185	0.203	0.298	0.218	0.303	-0.041	-0.033
Fac A2 #2	-0.064	-0.070	-0.140	-0.114	-0.103	-0.161	-0.104	0.094	0.031
Fac A2 #3	0.136	0.081	0.141	0.090	0.139	0.176	0.138	-0.149	-0.035
Fac A2 #4	-0.126	-0.162	-0.095	-0.083	-0.166	-0.120	-0.169	-0.017	0.001
Fac A3 #1	-0.044	-0.025	-0.065	-0.046	-0.057	-0.075	-0.060	0.068	-0.004
Fac A3 #2	0.123	0.119	0.090	0.115	0.136	0.114	0.127	-0.089	-0.086

Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Male  
 Analysis uses 505 cases

	Problem behavior ever	Problem behavior last yr	Delinq ever	Delinq last yr	Problem behavior score	Delinq score	SMB4#1	SMB4#2	SMB4#3
Academic	-0.189	-0.196	-0.127	-0.151	-0.180	-0.124	-0.155	-0.061	0.079
S-esteem	-0.014	-0.018	-0.059	-0.092	-0.026	-0.062	-0.006	-0.095	-0.065
Fac A2 #1	0.216	0.256	0.231	0.211	0.255	0.231	0.196	0.128	-0.176
Fac A2 #2	-0.098	-0.091	-0.218	-0.207	-0.101	-0.245	0.004	-0.231	0.169
Fac A2 #3	0.113	0.105	0.115	0.131	0.118	0.139	0.076	0.158	0.036
Fac A2 #4	-0.079	-0.080	-0.050	-0.053	-0.091	-0.069	-0.064	-0.067	0.012
Fac A3 #1	-0.019	-0.028	-0.075	-0.110	0.000	-0.097	0.038	-0.098	0.062
Fac A3 #2	0.126	0.114	0.330	0.343	0.133	0.360	-0.044	0.425	-0.164

Notes:

- all correlations of 0.200 or greater underlined for clarity.
- for definitions of 'Academic' and factors A2#1-4, A3#1-2 see text of Chapter 4.
- for definition of 'S-esteem' (self-esteem) see Chapter 4, footnote 4.
- for definitions of the factors SF B4 #1-3 and SM #1-3 see Chapter 3.
- sample sizes are smaller than normal due to missing data on some variables.

**Figure 4.17 Correlations between leisure activity factors and various measures of delinquency**

Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Female  
 Analysis uses 993 cases

	Problem behavior ever	Problem behavior last yr	Delinq ever	Delinq last yr	Problem behavior score	Delinq score	SF B4 #1	SF B4 #2	SF B4 #3
G1 Factor #1	0.118	0.104	0.165	0.105	0.132	0.130	0.134	-0.126	-0.068
G1 Factor #2	0.165	0.160	0.171	0.165	0.190	0.182	0.166	-0.179	0.147
G1 Factor #3	-0.273	-0.304	-0.246	-0.231	-0.306	-0.248	-0.287	0.175	-0.029
G1 Factor #4	0.122	0.171	0.055	0.103	0.137	0.093	0.135	-0.025	0.013
G1 Factor #5	0.324	0.282	0.269	0.220	0.314	0.254	0.315	-0.133	0.005

Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Male  
 Analysis uses 899 cases

	Problem behavior ever	Problem behavior last yr	Delinq ever	Delinq last yr	Problem behavior score	Delinq score	SM B4 #1	SM B4 #2	SM B4 #3
G1 Factor #1	0.077	0.090	0.120	0.143	0.100	0.146	0.054	0.085	-0.151
G1 Factor #2	0.224	0.212	0.345	0.355	0.265	0.362	0.130	0.326	-0.229
G1 Factor #3	-0.183	-0.230	-0.172	-0.157	-0.216	-0.177	-0.186	-0.091	0.070
G1 Factor #4	0.082	0.123	-0.011	-0.012	0.097	0.008	0.126	-0.053	0.024
G1 Factor #5	0.202	0.167	0.190	0.123	0.231	0.187	0.195	0.113	-0.064



**Table 4.19 Where young people socialize with friends, and levels of delinquency**

Sample base: whole sample, males and females

Table Inds | Rows Resp once

#468 Delinquency Total Score	Type of place (see location codes at foot of page)															
	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15	
Unweigd base	2656	240	771	742	525	759	74	516	242	424	648	256	572	826	1449	113
Total %	100%	9%	29%	28%	20%	29%	3%	19%	9%	16%	24%	10%	22%	31%	55%	4%
Score 20+	348	32	152	148	63	122	41	157	129	99	218	18	109	112	59	15
	13%	13%	20%	20%	12%	16%	55%	30%	53%	23%	34%	7%	19%	14%	4%	13%
Score 15-19	125	12	53	54	30	46	8	35	17	33	56	14	33	49	56	4
	5%	5%	7%	7%	6%	6%	11%	7%	7%	8%	9%	5%	6%	6%	4%	4%
Score 10-14	226	17	84	74	48	70	4	60	28	45	86	22	53	70	105	17
	9%	7%	11%	10%	9%	9%	5%	12%	12%	11%	13%	9%	9%	8%	7%	15%
Score 5-9	447	35	137	158	103	149	10	90	32	78	129	47	103	148	243	19
	17%	15%	18%	21%	20%	20%	14%	17%	13%	18%	20%	18%	18%	18%	17%	17%
Score 1-4	703	72	180	181	139	191	7	101	21	91	109	74	132	215	436	28
	26%	30%	23%	24%	26%	25%	9%	20%	9%	21%	17%	29%	21%	26%	30%	25%
Score 0	807	72	165	127	142	181	4	73	15	78	50	81	142	232	550	30
	30%	30%	21%	17%	27%	24%	5%	14%	6%	18%	8%	32%	25%	28%	38%	27%
Average	8.25	8.13	11.58	11.72	8.29	10.12	28.31	16.02	24.66	13.07	17.45	6.32	10.87	8.93	4.62	8.73
Standar Dev	12.75	12.83	15.13	14.73	12.31	14.04	22.77	17.82	19.30	16.07	17.01	10.24	15.01	13.47	7.76	12.40
Standar Err	0.25	0.83	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.51	2.65	0.78	1.24	0.78	0.67	0.64	0.63	0.47	0.20	1.17

Key to location codes

01 Youth centres	06 Gambling stalls	11 School clubs
02 Cinemas	07 Karaoke/roller skating	12 Fast food shops
03 Playground/park/street	08 Dance/billiard hall	13 Shopping malls
04 Your home	09 Cafe	14 School
05 Someone else's home	10 Electronic game centre	15 Other

Row percentages sum to more than 100 due to multiple responses.

**Table 4.20 Amount of time with friends, and delinquency scores (T-tests of equal mean and variance)**

Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Female

G10a Hrs friends (group)	#468 Delinquency score				
	Level	Count	Mean	Std Dev	Variance
0-2	1	315	1.82	3.608	12.97
3-5	2	320	2.327	3.867	14.91
6-9	3	155	3.562	5.065	25.49
10-19	4	169	3.847	6.108	37.09
20-34	5	118	3.862	5.79	33.24
35+	6	62	4.624	6.907	46.94
Total		1139	2.864	4.861	23.61
P val=0.0000					

Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Male

G10a Hrs friends (group)	#468 Delinquency score				
	Level	Count	Mean	Std Dev	Variance
0-2	1	240	4.455	5.821	33.74
3-5	2	295	6.085	8.69	75.26
6-9	3	145	6.208	5.786	33.24
10-19	4	190	6.294	7.136	50.66
20-34	5	133	10.34	11.03	120.7
35+	6	57	11.84	13.61	182
Total		1060	6.613	8.461	71.52
P val=0.0000					

Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Female

Variable #401 G10a Hrs friends (group) and  
 #467 Problem behaviour score Spearman's correlation=0.3307 Degrees of freedom=1137 P value=0.0000  
 #468 Delinquency score Spearman's correlation=0.1901 Degrees of freedom=1137 P value=0.0000

Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Male

Variable #401 G10a Hrs friends (group) and  
 #467 Problem behaviour score Spearman's correlation=0.3225 Degrees of freedom=1057 P value=0.0000  
 #468 Delinquency score Spearman's correlation=0.2244 Degrees of freedom=1058 P value=0.0000

**Figure 4.25 Selected correlations between committing delinquency and being caught**

**Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Female: Analysis uses 774 cases**

	Problem behavior ever	Problem behaviour last yr	Delinq ever	Delinq last yr	Problem behavior score	Delinq score
Prob. beh. caught by family	0.577	0.463	0.372	0.140	0.533	0.303
Del caught by family	0.213	0.140	0.495	0.277	0.213	0.430
Prob. beh. caught by others*	0.288	0.240	0.153	0.105	0.268	0.185
Del caught by others*	0.200	0.124	0.196	0.115	0.180	0.175

\*. police, teacher, social worker, other adult

**Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Male: Analysis uses 721 cases**

	Problem behavior ever	Problem behaviour last yr	Delinq ever	Delinq last yr	Problem behavior score	Delinq score
Prob. beh. caught by family	0.441	0.395	0.300	0.237	0.411	0.283
Del caught by family	0.187	0.161	0.390	0.322	0.134	0.349
Prob. beh. caught by others*	0.328	0.302	0.300	0.316	0.325	0.257
Del caught by others*	0.271	0.258	0.534	0.489	0.257	0.460

\*. police, teacher, social worker, other adult

Dependent variable is 390 Delinquency ever count:

<b>FEMALES:</b>	552 Prob behaviour caught by family	T value= 5.58	P value= 0.0000
	553 Delinq caught by family	T value= 13.1	P value= 0.0000
	554 Prob behaviour caught by others	T value= -0.299	P value= 0.7653
	555 Delinq caught by others	T value= 3.16	P value= 0.0017
<b>MALES:</b>	552 Prob behaviour caught by family	T value= 1.16	P value= 0.2477
	553 Delinq caught by family	T value= 7.52	P value= 0.0000
	554 Prob behaviour caught by others	T value= 1.26	P value= 0.2098
	555 Delinq caught by others	T value= 11.2	P value= 0.0000

Dependent variable is 468 Delinquency score:

<b>FEMALES:</b>	552 Prob behaviour caught by family	T value= 3.27	P value= 0.0011
	553 Delinq caught by family	T value= 10.9	P value= 0.0000
	554 Prob behaviour caught by others	T value= 1.82	P value= 0.0695
	555 Delinq caught by others	T value= 2.34	P value= 0.0196
<b>MALES:</b>	552 Prob behaviour caught by family	T value= 1.62	P value= 0.1061
	553 Delinq caught by family	T value= 6.07	P value= 0.0000
	554 Prob behaviour caught by others	T value= 0.221	P value= 0.8250
	555 Delinq caught by others	T value= 8.5	P value= 0.0000

**Figure 5.9 Summary of significant factors from regression analyses and delinquency measures**

Key to delinquency variable numbers:

School-TI-YC/Males	Delinquency ever count = 390
	Delinquency score = 468
	SM B4 Factor #2 = 481
	SM B4 Factor #3 = 482
School-TI-YC/Females	Delinquency ever count = 390
	Delinquency score = 468
	SF B4 Factor #2 = 478

Key to factor labels:

SFB4#2:	threats/bullying at school, elsewhere, and for money; shoptheft, robbery, blackmail, and drug use (females only).
SMB4#2:	threats/bullying at school, elsewhere, and for money; destroying and damaging property, fistfights, fights with weapons, shoptheft, using others' money without permission, robbery, blackmail, running away, and triad activity (males only).
SMB4#3:	robbery, sex, driving without a license, drug use, selling drugs, and drug trafficking (males only).
A2#1:	anti-school attitudes.
A2#2:	feeling that school sees student negatively.
A2#3:	students' confidence in his/her English abilities.
A3#2:	negative feelings towards others and perceptions of others' negative feelings towards the student.
C1#1:	views about whether the Hong Kong criminal justice system (laws, magistrates and judges, police) is fair.
C1#3:	feelings of how immediately relevant or distant individuals felt the law was to their lives.
SFC2#1/SMC2#1:	rating of seriousness of 'ordinary' property crime.
SFC2#2/SMC2#2:	rating of seriousness of offenses involving violence (killing, rape, robbery), or defrauding or harming individuals. For females (SFC2#2), stealing cars for fun (rather than re-sale) and shoptheft both loaded onto this factor as well as on SFC2#1: for males, both these offenses loaded onto the first factor.
SFC2#3/SMC2#3:	rating of seriousness of three non-violent, fraudulent, offenses which do not directly harm identifiable victims: practising as a lawyer without a license, providing false tax returns, and selling stolen goods.
G1#1:	reading comics and magazines, watching TV, watching videos, listening to the radio or hi-fi, playing musical instruments, playing on personal computers, playing karaoke, playing cards, chess etc, watching movies, and going to electronic games centres.
G1#2:	loitering in public places, playing mahjong, other gambling, getting tattoos, drug abuse, and smoking; going to night school/part-time education (all positive loadings).
G1#3:	reading newspapers and schoolbooks, doing household chores, studying.
G1#4:	participation in group games and organised youth activities, ball games, other sports, camping and other outdoor activities, and other hobbies (all negative loadings).
G1#5:	going to public places, loitering, chatting and chatting on the phone, and eating and drinking away from home.
G4 =	with whom happiest during spare time (available responses: parents/siblings/school friends/ friends outside school/boy or girlfriend/street gang/alone/other)
G6 =	how/where first got to know friends (available responses: school/workplace/neighbourhood/ family/through other friends/recreation spots/street/other)
G7 =	descriptions of friends (available responses: adventurous/have guts (daring)/hardworking (studious)/strong allegiance to group/rich & welcoming/frank/like to play (playful)/like to make jokes (fun-loving))
G8 =	relationship with friends (available responses: they are kind to me/I get materialistic benefits/we help each other/we make use of each other/have same interests/I care about them/other)
G9 =	where socialize with friends (available responses: youth centre/cinema/playground, park, street/own home/someone else's home/gambling stall/karaoke, roller skating/dance, billiards hall/cafe/electronic games centre/school club/fast food shop/shopping malls/school/other)

Figure 5.9 (continued)

Variable # and label	Males				Females		
	390	468	481	482*	390	468	478*
298 F6B:2 Not see mother often			+				
409 G1 Factor #1	+	+		+	+		
410 G1 Factor #2	+	+			+	+	+
411 G1 Factor #3	-	-		-	-		-
412 G1 Factor #4		+					
413 G1 Factor #5	+	+			+	+	+
469 A2 Factor #1						+	
470 A2 Factor #2	-	-			-	-	
471 A2 Factor #3				-			
474 A3 Factor #2	+	+	+				
495 SF C2 Factor #1 (females only)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	-	
496 SF C2 Factor #2 (females only)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			+
497 SF C2 Factor #3 (females only)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	+	
499 SM C2 Factor #2 (males only)				+	n/a	n/a	n/a
500 SM C2 Factor #3 (males only)	+	+	+	+	n/a	n/a	n/a
503 C1 Factor #1	-						
505 C1 Factor #3	-	-					
506 G4 Parents							+
511 G4 Gang			+		+	+	+
513 G4 Other			+				
520 G6 Streets				+			+
527 G7 Frank			-				
528 G7 Like to play	+				+	+	
529 G7 Like to make jokes			-				
531 G8 I get material benefit					+	+	
534 G8 Have same interests					+		+
536 G8 Other						+	
539 G9 Playground/park/street	+	+					
546 G9 TV centre						+	
551 G9 Other	+	+	+				
552 Problem behaviour caught by family					+	+	
553 Delinquency caught by family	+	+	+		+	+	+
555 Delinquency caught by police/others	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
275 Age			-	+			-

\*. For factors 482 (SMB4#3) and 478 (SFB4#2) the scores were originally in the reverse direction, i.e. high delinquency counts corresponded to large negative values. In order to simplify the presentation the factors have been reversed here so that '+' indicates a positive relationship between the dependent and independent variable.

**Table 6.1 Mean age at time of first offence, 'newcomers' and 'repeaters'**  
 Sample base: male offenders

	<u>COUNT</u>	<u>MEAN AGE</u>	<u>STD DEV</u>
Newcomers	140	13.14	3.01
Repeaters	153	11.93	2.49
Total	293	12.51	2.81

(P=0.0002)

**Table 6.2 'Delinquency ever count', 'newcomers' and 'repeaters'**  
 Sample base: male offenders

	<u>COUNT</u>	<u>MEAN NO. DIFFERENT OFFENCES EVER TRIED</u>	<u>STD DEV</u>
Newcomers	159	6.30	3.55
Recidivists	174	9.38	3.44
Total	333	7.91	3.81

(P=0.0000)

**Table 6.3 Delinquency score, 'newcomers' and 'repeaters'**  
 Sample base: male offenders

	<u>COUNT</u>	<u>MEAN NUMBER OF OFFENCES</u>	<u>STD DEV</u>
Newcomers	159	21.18	5.72
Repeaters	174	33.6	17.48
Total	333	27.67	17.76

(P=0.0000)

**Table 6.7 Do the types of crimes committed by young people change as they progress through their criminal careers?**  
 Sample base: male offenders

<u>TYPE OF CRIME</u>	<u>1ST OFFENCE</u>	<u>MOST RECENT OFFENCE</u>
Against property	63.93% (195)	27.21% (83)
Against the person	29.18% (89)	48.85% (149)
Other	6.89% (21)	23.93% (73)
TOTAL	(305)	(305)

(Chi-sq.=17; Deg. of Free.=4; P=0.0020)

**Table 6.8 Level of violence involved in young offenders' most recent 'crime against the person'**  
 Sample base: male offenders

<u>LEVEL OF VIOLENCE</u>	<u>NEWCOMERS</u>	<u>REPEATERS</u>	<u>ROW TOTAL</u>
Threatened verbally	16% (9)	10% (8)	12% (17)
Threatened with fists	14% (8)	11% (9)	12% (17)
Use of fists	12% (7)	33% (26)	24% (33)
Use of fists and kicks	-	-	-
Threatened with weapons	38% (22)	30% (23)	33% (45)
Use of weapons	16% (9)	13% (10)	14% (19)
Sexual violence	3% (2)	3% (2)	3% (4)
Don't know	3% (2)	-	2% (2)
COLUMN TOTAL	(59)	(78)	(137)

(Chi-sq.=8.1; Deg. of Free.=5; P=0.15)

**Table 6.9 Level of injury to victim in young offenders' most recent 'crime against the person'**  
 Sample base: male offenders

<u>LEVEL OF INJURY</u>	<u>NEWCOMERS</u>	<u>REPEATERS</u>	<u>ROW TOTAL</u>
None	76% (45)	50% (39)	61% (84)
Minor (e.g. scratches and bruises)	12% (7)	22% (17)	18% (24)
Medium (e.g. sent to outpatients)	5% (3)	12% (9)	9% (12)
Major (e.g. admitted to hospital)	7% (4)	14% (11)	11% (15)
Don't know	-	3% (2)	1% (2)
COLUMN TOTAL	(59)	(78)	(137)

(Chi-sq.=8.9; Deg. of Free.=4; P=0.06)

**Table 6.10 Frequency of contact with parents, 'newcomers' and 'repeaters'**  
Sample base: male offenders

	<u>COUNT</u>	<u>MEAN'</u>	<u>STD DEV</u>
Newcomers	99	1.343	0.894
Repeaters	113	1.735	1.268
Total	212	1.552	1.124

(P=0.0111)

\* 1=Both parents once a day or more; 2=One parent once a day and one parent once a week; 5=Both parents once a month or less.

**Table 6.21 Problems at school and work at time of interview compared to before first offence, 'newcomers' and 'repeaters'**  
Sample base: male offenders

	<u>COUNT</u>	<u>NEWCOMERS</u>			<u>REPEATERS</u>			<u>RATIO PRIOR: SINCE</u>
		<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>DIFF.%</u>	<u>RATIO PRIOR: SINCE</u>	<u>COUNT</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>DIFF.%</u>	
Change of school	67	42.1%	+10.8%	1:1.35	71	40.8%	+8.1%	1:1.27
Left school	122	76.7%	+35.4%	1:1.86	142	81.6%	+49.5%	1:2.54
Truancy	98	61.6%	+19.6%	1:1.47	112	64.4%	+22.3%	1:1.53
Academic problems	92	57.9%	+17.2%	1:1.42	96	55.2%	+13.7%	1:1.33
Behavioural problems at school	64	40.3%	+9.6%	1:1.31	85	48.9%	+17.5%	1:1.56
Started work	119	74.8%	+36.1%	1:1.93	139	79.9%	+51%	1:2.76
Changed jobs	111	69.8%	+37.1%	1:2.13	107	61.5%	+41.4%	1:3.06
Unemployed	55	34.6%	+23.9%	1:3.23	61	35.1%	+26.3%	1:3.99
Dismissed	26	16.4%	+8.4%	1:2.05	32	18.4%	+12.7%	1:3.23
Problems at work	30	18.9%	+12.2%	1:2.82	24	13.8%	+10%	1:3.63
Total:	159				174			

**Table 6.28 Preference to spend leisure with the gang, 'newcomers' and 'repeaters'**  
Sample base: male offenders

	<u>NEWCOMERS</u>	<u>REPEATERS</u>	<u>ROW TOTAL</u>
Yes	18.2% (29)	31% (54)	24.9% (83)
No	81.8% (130)	69% (120)	75.1% (250)
COLUMN TOTAL	(159)	(174)	(333)

(Chi-sq=7.3; Deg. of Free.=1; P=0.0070)

**Table 6.30 Number of triad friends, 'newcomers' and 'repeaters'**  
Sample base: male offenders

	<u>COUNT</u>	<u>MEAN'</u>	<u>STD DEV</u>
Newcomers	156	3.41	1.58
Repeaters	169	4.10	1.25
TOTAL	325	3.77	1.46

(P=0.0000)

\* 1=None; 2=Fewer than half; 3=Half; 4=More than half; 5=Almost all.

**Table 6.34: Minor delinquent activities (Factor MOB1#4)**  
Sample base: male offenders

<u>ITEM NO.</u>	<u>ITEM CONTENT</u>	<u>ROTATED FACTOR LOADING</u>	<u>MEAN'</u>	<u>STD DEV</u>
15	Throwing objects from a hight	-0.69	3.55	1.66
8	Lying	-0.61	4.17	1.38
5	Damaging others property	-0.52	3.72	1.87
4	Destroying public property	-0.51	4.06	1.88
11	Embezzlement	-0.47	3.55	1.53
9	Shoptheft	-0.46	4.20	1.98
10	Stealing money from home	-0.46	3.47	1.21
28	Not paying on public transport	-0.43	3.97	1.77
21	Playing truant	-0.40	4.63	1.89
14	Running away from home	-0.40	3.99	1.82

Number of cases = 287

\* 1=Report me to authority; 2=Try to stop me; 3=Remind me of the consequences; 4=No comment; 5=Support me verbally; 6=Teach me how to do it; 7=Do it with me

**Table 6.35 Bullying and fighting (Factor MOB1#2)**  
 Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	ROTATED FACTOR		STD DEV
		LOADING	MEAN	
2	Bullying outside school	-0.81	4.17	1.95
3	Bullying and taking money	-0.74	4.08	2.01
7	Fighting with weapons	-0.69	4.24	2.18
1	Bullying at school	-0.68	3.94	1.87
6	Fist fighting	-0.60	4.74	2.22
13	Blackmail	-0.55	3.81	1.93
4	Destroying public property	-0.48	4.06	1.88
12	Robbery or mugging	-0.46	3.74	2.02
9	Shoptheft	-0.44	4.20	1.98
14	Running away from home	-0.42	3.99	1.82
16	Triad association	-0.42	4.38	1.86

Number of cases = 287

\* 1=Report me to authority; 2=Try to stop me; 3=Remind me of the bad effects; 4=No comment; 5=Support me verbally

**Table 7.1 Caught by the police, first vs. most recent arrest**  
 Sample base: male offenders caught at least twice

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	FIRST ARREST	RECENT ARREST
1+2	Police caught me at the scene of the offence/in stop and search operations	58.78% (144)	72.24% (177)
	Total	(245)	(245)

(P=0.002)

**Table 7.3 The sentence of the court, first conviction vs. most recent conviction**  
 Sample base: male offenders caught at least twice

	FIRST CONVICTION	RECENT CONVICTION
Discharge, fine, bind over, suspended sentence	22.01% (35)	2.52% (4)
Open probation, community service	55.35% (88)	8.81% (14)
Residential care: probation home, SWD detention home, reformatory school	15.09% (24)	40.88% (65)
Custody: detention centre, training centre, imprisonment, drug centre	6.92% (11)	47.80% (76)
Care and protection order	0.63% (1)	--
Total	(159)	(159)

**Table 7.6 Sentence on most recent conviction by total number of offences for which caught**  
 Sample base: male offenders

SENTENCE	COUNT	MEAN	STD DEV
Probation/CSO	43	2.81	2.34
Residential care	131	3.49	2.56
Custody	110	4.33	3.85
Total	290	3.70	3.10

(Spearman's rank correlation 0.18, P=0.0024)

**Table 7.7 Type of offence for which most recently convicted, and sentence**  
 Sample base: male offenders

Percentages are column percentages.

TYPE OF OFFENCE	PROBATION/CSO	RES. CARE	CUSTODY	ROW TOTAL
Property	33% (14)	37% (49)	17% (19)	29% (82)
Against the person	33% (14)	41% (54)	52% (57)	44% (125)
Other (e.g. drugs, sex with underage girl)	35% (15)	21% (28)	31% (34)	28% (77)
Column total	(43)	(131)	(110)	(284)

**Table 7.8 Level of violence by sentence on most recent conviction**  
 Sample base: male offenders

Percentages are column percentages.

<u>LEVEL OF VIOLENCE</u>	<u>PROBATION/CSO</u>	<u>RES. CARE</u>	<u>CUSTODY</u>	<u>ROW TOTAL</u>
Threatened verbally	14% (2)	19% (10)	9% (5)	14% (17)
Threatened with fists	21% (3)	19% (10)	7% (4)	14% (17)
Use of fists	36% (5)	24% (13)	16% (9)	22% (27)
Use of fists and kicks	-	-	-	-
Threatened with weapons	21% (3)	33% (18)	37% (21)	34% (42)
Use of weapons	-	4% (2)	25% (14)	13% (16)
Sexual violence	7% (1)	2% (1)	3% (2)	3% (4)
Don't know	-	-	3% (2)	2% (2)
Column total	(14)	(54)	(57)	(125)

**Table 7.9 Injury to victim, by type of sentence (most recent conviction)**  
 Sample base: male offenders

Percentages are column percentages.

<u>LEVEL OF INJURY</u>	<u>PROBATION/CSO</u>	<u>RES. CARE</u>	<u>CUSTODY</u>	<u>ROW TOTAL</u>
None	57% (8)	70% (38)	53% (30)	63% (79)
Minor (scratches and bruises)	36% (5)	19% (10)	12% (7)	15% (19)
Medium (e.g. outpatient treatment)	7% (1)	11% (6)	9% (5)	10% (12)
Major (e.g. admitted to hospital)	-	-	23% (13)	10% (13)
Don't know	-	-	4% (2)	2% (2)
Column total	(14)	(54)	(57)	(125)

