Research on the Social Causes of Juvenile Crime

FINAL REPORT

May 1995

Commissioned by : Fight Crime Committee

Prepared by : The University of Hong Kong

RESEARCH ON THE

SOCIAL CAUSES OF JUVENILE CRIME

FINAL REPORT

Commissioned by : Fight Crime Committee

Prepared by : The University of Hong Kong

May 1995

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

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.

THE SOCIAL CAUSES OF JUVENILE CRIME
CONTENTS

THE SOCIAL CAUSES OF JUVENILE CRIME
LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

4. Delinquency and socio-economic factors: the school sample

5. Explaining delinquency: the school sample

6. Becoming a recidivist

7. Young people's experiences in the criminal justice system

8. Media influences

9. Working with 'at risk' and marginal youth

1. INTRODUCTION

Police statistics indicate that over the last 15 or so years Hong Kong has seen a large increase in the level of juvenile and youth delinquency. Although the trend has been uneven, with substantial drops in some years, Table 1.1 indicates that in the period 1976-91, arrest rates for juveniles increased roughly four-fold, and doubled for young offenders.

This increase has generated a great deal of public and government concern.[1] However, there remains substantial dispute as to which, if any, social factors can explain the rise. Part of that debate also has to do with the argument that factors influencing the behaviour of youths are less important than an increasing tendency to report juvenile and youth misconduct to the police, instead of dealing with it informally within communities.[2]

It is against this background that the study reported here was conducted. Its aims were:

- 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.

---

[1]. Concerns about some facets of juvenile crime in fact pre-date the increase in juvenile crime rates from the late 1970s: see for example Hong Kong Government (1965).

[2]. It has been suggested that the rise in reported rates of juvenile shop theft is due to the rise in the number of chain stores, which may have a policy of automatically reporting shop theft to the police (see for example Royal Hong Kong Police 1986, 1987). More generally, it has been argued that increasingly high proportions of juvenile offending have been reported to the police as urbanization rendered society more anonymous, and residents did not know the identities of delinquents in their neighbourhood. For a more detailed discussion of these and other similar points, see Gray (1991).

1.1 Previous studies and their conclusions

There have been many reports on juvenile and youth crime in Hong Kong over the past two decades, and they will be discussed at appropriate points in the following chapters. However, it is worth beginning our own discussion by reviewing the conclusions of the major recent studies in this area.

The work of Agnes Ng (Ng et al. 1975; Ng 1980; Cheung and Ng 1988) is of crucial importance for two reasons. First, she conducted a series of large empirical surveys of self-reported juvenile delinquency in Hong Kong; and second, one of her studies was adopted by the Working Group on Juvenile Crime (Hong Kong Government 1981) and forms the basis for many of its conclusions.

Ng's two earlier studies (Ng et al. 1975; Ng 1980) present a range of findings concerning self-reported delinquency. In essence, she asserts, offenders are more likely than non-offenders to:

- come from broken or disharmonious homes and/or live away from their parents; live in poor conditions (shared housing, squatter areas, resettlement estates, etc.); have a negative attitude to parental control; and have less-well-educated parents;

- do poorly in school, believe they cannot do well in school, find teachers authoritarian and cold, and drop out or leave school early; begin working early (for a variety of reasons including poverty and low parental expectations) but work in low-status jobs and change jobs frequently. Some 40% of the offenders were unemployed when they committed their offences.

- have friends who are similar to them and who they see as adventurous; have friends who are triad members and/or are triad members themselves; and be much more likely than non-offenders to use gambling halls, dance halls, billiards rooms, cafes, and playgrounds and beaches as places of recreation and to join martial arts clubs. In short, juvenile offenders tended to prefer what they saw as 'adult' pastimes; and, if they were triad members, engage relatively frequently in gang fights and visits to opium divans, gambling places, and billiards rooms.

- have unfavourable attitudes towards the law and the police, and

- be more likely to orient to the present rather than the future.

The Working Group on Juvenile Crime (Hong Kong Government 1981) based its conclusions in part on these findings and in part on information provided by the police and other organizations. It asserted a variety of causes for the rise in juvenile

delinquency. These included: a breakdown in family authority and parental control occasioned by the shift from extended to nuclear families; an increase in the proportion of mothers who worked outside the home; a rising rate of divorce and separations; underachievement and frustration created by the raising of the school leaving age, coupled with a variety of problems in schools; poor use of leisure time (e.g. watching television); 'bad influences' from films and pornography; a growing materialism among young people and the influences of 'crazes' such as discos. Rather than attempt to identify which of these factors had the most explanatory significance, the Working Party offered a range of proposals addressed to each of the perceived problems in turn.

A more recent study of recidivism and young offenders was conducted by the Correctional Services Department and the Social Welfare Department (Correctional Services Department 1992; Social Welfare Department 1992). These two, co-ordinated, studies looked at 2,777 young offenders, of whom 524 were considered recidivists.[3]

The CSD report identified 29 factors associated with recidivism, of which 10 were considered statistically significant on the basis of chi-square tests ($P<0.05$). These 10 factors were: negative family background (defined in terms of a combination of parents being uneducated, unemployed, or family financial difficulties), no family activities together, poor academic performance in primary school, poor academic performance in high school,[4] a history of absconding from home, truancy in primary school, prior conviction history, prior admission to correctional institution, admitted drug use, and a preference for thrill-seeking activities.[5]

The SWD report was more circumspect, but identified recidivists as having more behaviourial problems and a poorer academic record than non-recidivists; to be likely to start

---

[3]. These were not matched samples, but rather intended to sample the population of detected offenders from two points in the criminal justice system in a comparable manner. Of the 2,777 offenders aged 9-25, 851 had been admitted to CSD custody and 1,926 had been the subject of an order implemented by SWD. There were 92 recidivists in the CSD group and 432 in the SWD group. However, recidivism was defined by CSD as being convicted within one year of discharge, and by SWD as conviction while on probation or during a follow-up period from an order; the time-frame varied but was typically 12-18 months.

[4]. Presumably secondary school.

[5]. However, our view is that with such a large sample, a cutoff point of $P<0.05$ is probably not conservative enough. The multivariate regressions and significance tests reported in the following chapters use a more stringest criterion of $P<0.01$ unless otherwise clearly indicated.

working earlier and to be less stable in their jobs; to have family members or close friends involved in triad activities, offending, or drug use; and to be more likely themselves to have triad affiliations or to have used drugs.

1.2 Theoretical explanations for delinquency

While the studies discussed above help us build up a picture of recidivist offenders, and provide some insights as to which factors are associated with persistent offending, the key issue is that of deciding which factors are causes and which are effects. For example it is not clear whether those who had used drugs committed offences because of their drug-taking; nor is it clear whether drug-use preceded offending or vice versa.[6]

To date, the major attempt to provide a clear explanation for juvenile delinquency in Hong Kong is Cheung and Ng (1988). They used a self-report study to investigate the relative importance of eight main factors, in the context of four theories commonly applied to juvenile delinquency.[7] They suggest that 'the variable which has the greatest total causal effects on deviant behaviour is association with deviant friends' (1988: 40), and interpret this to mean that the key explanation for juvenile delinquency is 'differential association', with two other possible explanations - control theory and labelling theory - receiving a little support, and a fourth, strain theory, none at all.[8]

What is the significance of this finding? In essence, the theory which was supported, *differential association* theory, suggests that offending, or any kind of deviant behaviour, is the

---

[6]. There are some other unresolved questions. For example, although the CSD and SWD studies point to poor school performance as a factor in recidivism, they also assert that some 80% of recidivists were of average or above-average intelligence. This raises the question of why at least some young people of average or better intelligence perform poorly in school.

[7]. This study surveyed 1,139 school students aged 12-18 in 10 Hong Kong schools. The questionnaire covered eight areas: self-reported deviant behaviour, deviant values, association with deviant friends, negative labelling (that is, whether significant others such as parents, teachers, and friends were thought to have a generally good or poor opinion of the respondent), attachment to school, attachment to parents, educational strain (the difference between educational aspirations and realistic expectations), and family socio-economic status.

[8]. There are of course many more than four theories which can be applied to juvenile offending; these theories have a number of variants; and they can be used in different combinations. Later chapters discuss a variety of theories of crime causation as they become relevant to our own concerns.

result of frequent and/or intense social contacts with others who hold deviant values. The more often a person comes into contact with delinquents, and the closer that contact is, the more likely they are to commit delinquent acts themselves.[9] As Cheung and Ng point out (1988: 42), individuals who have such contacts not only learn techniques for committing the kinds of offences their contacts commit, but also learn how to justify such acts and perceive them as worthwhile. Increasingly close and frequent contacts with 'bad elements' in school, which may become more likely if juveniles do poorly and become disaffected with school, would be the main 'vector' for the transmission of delinquency.

Control theory, which also received some support, simply asserts that people commit crime because there is a temptation to do so, and too few countervailing controls to restrain them.[10] The factors which restrain most of us from committing offences are: attachment to others and sensitivity towards their feelings, opinions and expectations; commitment to maintaining stable relationships and remaining within a moral consensus; involvement in legitimate activities which both take up time and energy, and provide financial and psychological rewards; and belief in the prevailing moral and legal codes as a means of ordering one's life. Individuals who commit offences are, therefore, insufficiently attached to others, committed to stable relationships, or involved in rewarding activities; or do not believe the prevailing moral and legal codes are valid.

Labelling theory, which also received some support, asserts that individuals come gradually to define themselves as delinquent because others do so.[11] While at any point in the process it is possible for the delinquent to reform, there is usually a point at which individuals, told repeatedly that they

---

[9]. For further details on differential association theory, see Sutherland (1924, 1949). The theory has been subjected to a variety of criticisms, the most notable of which is that it appears to downplay the extent to which individuals are capable of resisting the influence of others and acting according to their own beliefs.

[10]. Control theory was first proposed by Hirshi (1969). A more recent reformulation of control theory suggests firstly, that it may be more useful to conceptualize social relationships and bonds in terms of 'social investment' and 'social capital' (Laub and Samson 1993). This is discussed in more detail in later chapters.

[11]. Labelling theory was first proposed by Lemert (1951), and Becker (1963), with the latter focusing specifically on delinquency. It has been used to argue that excessive policing creates an oppositional youth culture by labelling marginal youth, who may be only on the fringes of delinquency, as delinquent (Young 1971). Since the theory is intended to explain *how* people become involved in delinquency it does not address *why* they become involved.

are delinquent and punished for (usually minor) delinquency, internalize the 'label' and more or less self-consciously begin to live up to it, thus becoming confirmed in their delinquency.[12]

The final model, then, combines three theories to suggest that young people whose attachments to parents and school are weak may associate with delinquents, while weak attachments are made more likely if a family has a low socio-economic status (control theory); their association with delinquents makes it more likely that they will absorb delinquent values (differential association theory), while the lack of attachment to parents and school leads young people to evaluate themselves negatively, which also makes association with others who hold a negative self-image more likely (labelling theory). The three factors of association with other delinquents, negative self-image, and deviant values, all combine to make the commission of delinquent acts more likely.[13]

1.3 The problem of mutually reinforcing factors

The major problem with most theoretical models of delinquency, including Cheung and Ng's, is that they tend to assume that flows of cause and effect operate only one way. However we know from a wide range of studies that many are in fact two-way, mutually reinforcing, links.[14] For example the more a young person associates with delinquent friends, the more likely it is that he or she will engage in delinquency; but the more the youth engages in delinquency, the more likely it is that he or she will associate with others who accept or value delinquency, that is,

---

[12]. While Cheung and Ng include 'negative labelling' as a variable in their analysis, it measured the self-labelling of the individual respondent. For reasons explained later in the text this does not, unfortunately, amount to a full test of labelling theory.

[13]. Strain theory, which was not supported by Cheung and Ng, claims that for many people there is a gap between what they can legitimately obtain (e.g. buy) and what they want (e.g. things promoted, advertised, etc. in the media). This gap creates a social strain, and for some groups of people a way to remove the strain is to obtain the things they want by illegal means. The original proponent of strain theory was Merton (1938). The theory was originally intended to explain a wide variety of kinds of deviance, from religious fundamentalism to alcoholism and drug abuse as well as offending. Although Merton's original formulation of the theory has been extensively criticized, it inspired a large number of more sophisticated theories which can be described collectively as 'subcultural' theories and which are dealt with later in this report.

[14]. For a detailed review and discussion of this point see Thornberry 1987). Laub and Sampson (1993) also make use of it in their reformulation of control theory.

associate with delinquent friends. A full model must therefore allow for and assess the strength of such 'feedback loops'.

Not allowing for such feedback loops has serious theoretical implications. It creates the implicit assumption that factors earlier in the sequence cannot be the effects of factors later in the sequence. It thus implicitly over-values theories such as differential association and control theory, which explain crime in terms of the effects of social variables on individuals, and under-values theories such as labelling theory, which explain crime precisely in terms of feedback loops in which the actions of individuals affect other's acts towards them, which in turn affect the way the individual acts. Thus while Cheung and Ng are right to suggest that negative self-labelling may have implications for 'downstream' events such as (further or stronger) associations with delinquent friends and delinquent acts, their model fails to allow for the possibility that such negative self-images are reinforced by having delinquent associates, or change the nature of the young people's relationships with parents (as we might well expect they would, for example by leading young people to spend less time with their parents). It is hardly surprising, therefore, that Cheung and Ng conclude by suggesting that there is only very weak support for labelling theory.

Our own self-report study was not designed specifically to test any particular model of delinquency.[15] We expected, with the full range of criminological theories in mind and a data-set which included a wide variety of social, psychological, and attitudinal data, to be able to formulate and test a range of possible models. This may be a simple point but its implication is profound. We had no a priori expectations about the directions of causality and as a result allowed implicitly for the possibility that variables could have a mutually reinforcing effect. In consequence interactionist theories such as labelling, and unidirectional theories such as differential association and control theory, started on an equal footing as candidates for consideration. It is hardly surprising under such circumstances that our own conclusions give greater weight to interactionist theories than any of the previous Hong Kong studies.

---

[15]. However, as will become clear, we did assume that delinquency would follow a 'career path' in which different phases - onset, changes in the type and frequency of delinquency, and desisting from delinquency - might be associated with life experiences and events, though within this assumption it was in principle possible that delinquency could affect life events and experiences as well as vice versa, while future anticipated events could influence current behaviour. So far as recidivism is concerned, we considered that Braithwaite's (1989) model of 'reintegrative shaming', which links together labelling theory, control theory, and subcultural theory was worth testing. Consequently we included a number of questions in the offender interview schedule that dealt with offenders' reactions to detection and subsequent events such as sentencing.

1.4 The thinking behind this study

The general approach which informs this study differs from previous studies in a second way; it takes a broadly developmental approach. It explicitly assumes:

- there are pathways into delinquency; and given the massive difference between levels of male and female delinquency there may be at least two different kinds of pathways, leading to different levels and patterns of delinquency.[16]

- there are different types, patterns, or lifestyles of delinquent activity; however they may differ from other (law-abiding) youth lifestyles in only minor ways.

- individuals have a variety of motivations which may lead them into, and sustain them in, delinquent behaviour and these motivations appear reasonable to them.

- the type, frequency, and seriousness of delinquency and the motives for it may change over time as others (parents, friends, teachers etc.) notice and react to changes in a young person's behaviour; thus there may be 'feedback loops' in which, for example, poor attachment to parents may lead to stronger associations with (other) delinquents which in turn may lead to even worse relations with parents. The same may also be true of detection and punishment; it is conceivable that events such as arrest and prosecution lead to poorer relationships with family and non-deviant friends and thus to further delinquency. In short, the response of others to delinquency may change the frequency and nature of the delinquency.

- this should not, however, be taken to imply that all responses of family, friends, social work and law enforcement agencies are likely to lead in the direction of confirming the offending pattern or moving into more frequent offending or more serious types of crime. A variety of interventions and reactions may result in decreases in the frequency or seriousness of delinquency, even if they do not lead to a complete withdrawal from it.

- at virtually any stage in this criminal career it is possible for the delinquent or offender to cease the delinquent or offending behaviour; and in practice, most offenders cease their offending career by about their mid-

---

[16]. Most previous studies, where they collected information on both males and females, analyzed them together rather than separately. In consequence many of the analyses reflect the differences between males and females rather than the (potentially different) pathways into delinquency for each sex.

30s.[17] However, this process of 'disinvolvement' may pose practical problems, probably of different kinds, depending on the offenders' age and the length and seriousness of his or her criminal career. If these problems are not successfully overcome, younger offenders in particular may revert to crime.

This approach thus conceives of the 'social causes of juvenile crime' not only in terms of the factors which may lead into offending, but also in terms of the factors which affect delinquent and offending 'careers'. That is, it considers the factors which can lead from minor delinquency to repeated offending to be as important as the origins of delinquency. And it also considers the pathways out of delinquency as important. If, for example, delinquents can be encouraged to terminate their offending careers earlier - or even to commit crimes less often - there is likely to be a significant crime-reduction effect.

As a result, this approach generates a number of questions. For example, how easy is it for a potential offender to become an actual offender? What else is necessary besides opportunity and motivation, and why do most young people not take those opportunities? How do potential offenders define what is an opportunity and what is not? What are the critical factors in determining whether those opportunities are taken? Is becoming an offender an easy process, or is it, like learning to smoke cigarettes, something that requires persistence? At what point, if at all, does offending become a characteristic that an offender recognizes as a major part of his or her social identity? Is it necessary to have the support of a subculture of like-minded people in order to continue an offending lifestyle? Are there any kinds of events that might cause a qualitative shift in the frequency or seriousness of offending? Are there any factors which can distinguish between those who cease offending if they are caught and those who become more committed to crime? And are there any factors closely associated with giving up a lifestyle which includes offending?

1.5 Where did our data come from?

We shall draw on a number of different data sources in this report, as follows:

1. We collected a total of 1,945 questionnaires (of which 1,898 were ultimately used) from students in forms F1 to F6 in 30 secondary schools around the territory. These questionnaires asked for information about their attitudes to school; delinquent activities; attitudes towards delinquent activities; beliefs about others' attitudes towards delinquency; recreational activities and mass media consumption; and a range of family and social factors.

---

[17]. Farrington (1994) provides a detailed discussion of the findings from criminal career research.

2. Using the same questionnaire, we collected 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 either full-time or part-time education to obtain vocational qualifications.

3. Again using the same questionnaire, we collected 204 responses from young persons in 7 youth centres. Although the majority of respondants 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.[18] They also enabled us to create sub-samples of young people with no track record of delinquency, and of young people who had been involved in delinquency but had never been detected by the police or other formal agencies: comparisons could then be made between these sub-samples, and between them and various groups of known young offenders.

Some 373 young persons known to be offenders were interviewed and/or sent questionnaires with the co-operation of three agencies; the Correctional Services Department, the Social Welfare Department, and the police. Our sample of offenders thus comprises:

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 respondants were given the same questionnaire as the school and technical institute students and the youth centre respondants, and in addition, they were interviewed using an 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. Much of this information was obtained in the form of sequences of life events, thus providing the opportunity to investigate whether events commonly held to be precursors of delinquency did in fact appear to precede it.[19]

---

[18]. The numbers in some of the tables in this report are based on smaller numbers than those quoted because of missing data or decisions to exclude certain individuals from the analysis. This is discussed further in the appendix on methods.

[19]. 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

We were also able to contact two other groups:

7. a truncated version of this questionnaire/interview schedule was sent to some 1,200 young persons who had been detected by the police for offences but who had been cautioned under the Superintendents' Discretionary Scheme, as an alternative to prosecution. A total of 226 replies were mailed back, enabling us to draw some tentative conclusions about detected offenders who had committed relatively minor crimes.

8. A further group of respondents comprised young persons who were in contact with outreaching teams around the territory. Only some of these persons were offenders, though most were considered 'at risk' of committing offences in the future. They thus constituted a sample of persons who were typically at the very beginning of a 'criminal career' or thought likely to embark on one in the near future. A total of 29 such individuals were contacted and interviewed with the help of 6 outreaching centres.

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

Some basic information about these samples is presented in Tables 1.2 to 1.4. More detailed information about the samples and sampling methods is provided as and where relevant in the following chapters, and is summarized in the appendix on methods.

It is important in what follows to understand certain features of these samples. The school sample is broadly representative of all secondary school students, provided that analyses of it control, where relevant, for age (because it under-represents the secondary school population aged 13 or under). Strenuous efforts were made to stratify the sampling of schools, that is, to ensure adequate representation from

---

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, and most recent offence. Sections A-G were questionnaire items given to both school-TI-YC and offender samples. Sections H-I were interview schedules given only to offenders.

different bands of school, geographical areas, etc. However a representative sample of persons aged 15-18 clearly cannot be gathered from schools alone because many young people leave school at age 15. Similarly, a sample of young offenders in custody or under supervision cannot be seen as representative of all young offenders, given that many young offenders are never detected.

The Technical Institute and Youth Centre samples were intended to complement the school sample by tapping the experiences and views of young persons who had left school. However, since there is little adequate documentation or discussion of what characteristics should be taken into account in sampling from a population of young people, we cannot say unequivocally that our school-TI-YC sample is in fact representative of all young people.

Those points made, we should also state that the statistical representativeness of our samples is, for most purposes, not a major issue. We have been more concerned to cover a wide range of youths than to ensure that they are sampled with equal probability. In contrast to most previous studies, which have sought to make explicit comparisons between school and offender samples and therefore required the construction of directly comparable samples, the majority of the analyses in this report are intended to explain the variation within sample groups or across the whole set of respondents. While it is clearly useful to be able to state that each sub-sample is representative of a particular sub-population, our mode of analysis avoided the need for the creation of such tightly-structured samples.

1.6 The structure of this report

The remainder of this report falls into several distinct parts. Chapters 2-5 deal primarily with the rates, patterns, and social correlates of delinquency among the youth population at large, that is, the sample of respondents from schools, Technical Institutes, and Youth Centres (usually referred to as the 'school-TI-YC sample or simply as the 'school sample'). Chapters 6-7 look in more detail at the 'known offenders', that is, those persons interviewed while in custody or under supervision. Chapter 8 is our study of marginal youth and outreaching work. Chapter 9 addresses a number of 'loose ends'.

Since our model was created in a cumulative and inductive way, each of these chapters ends with a summary of the findings from the data it draws upon and a brief discussion of how it can be integrated into a 'final' model. Our concluding chapter, Chapter 10 summarizes our findings, presents the model of delinquency we shall argue that our data supports, and discusses the policy recommendations that flow from it.

Table 1.1 Offender and arrest rates, by age group, 1976-91

Year	Juveniles (under 16)		Young persons (16-20)		Adults (21 plus)
	Offender rate	Arrest rate	Offender rate	Arrest rate	Arrest rate
1976	212.3	na	972.7	na	na
1977	250.0	na	823.2	na	na
1978	275.7	na	762.7	na	na
1979	391.8	na	836.8	na	na
1980	560.6	na	1,045.7	na	na
1981	606.6	na	1,126.0	na	na
1982	525.2	524.0	1,307.3	1,303.2	658.0
1983	598.7	597.1	1,343.6	1,338.2	717.2
1984	633.4	631.8	1,435.9	1,430.9	720.6
1985	896.4	894.1	1,528.0	1,524.3	783.3
1986	788.1	787.8	1,394.0	1,394.0	780.4
1987	995.1	997.0	1,513.2	1,531.1	733.4
1988	925.2	925.5	1,613.0	1,629.0	709.9
1989	946.2	962.0	1,868.3	1,914.7	712.5
1990	849.6	849.5	1,921.3	1,920.9	735.6
1991	931.8	919.0	1,937.5	1,889.2	715.2

Notes
Figures are per 100,000 population in the corresponding age group.
na: figure not calculated prior to 1982.
The 'offender rate' is the number of persons per 100,000 in the relevant age group prosecuted or placed on the Superintendents Discretionary Scheme. Source: RHKP Statistician.
The 'arrest rate' is the number of persons per 100,000 in the relevant age group arrested. Source: *Hong Kong Annual Digest of Statistics 1992*, Table 18.3.
The two rates differ because some of those arrested may be released without charge, while in some circumstances prosecution or placement on the SDS scheme is possible without prior arrest. In addition, the rate of convictions may exceed these rates because many offenders are summonsed for minor offences without being arrested.

Table 1.2 Summary of survey and interview samples, by sample and age

		AGE									
Sample	Total	12-*	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21+
Unweighted base	2899	130	386	567	601	405	239	269	162	98	42
Total %	100%	4%	13%	20%	21%	14%	8%	9%	6%	3%	1%
School	1898	109	312	441	484	284	115	118	25	9	1
	100%	6%	16%	23%	26%	15%	6%	6%	1%	0%	0%
Technical Insti	178	0	1	0	0	2	23	44	55	33	20
tute	100%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	13%	25%	31%	19%	11%
Youth Centre	204	0	9	8	17	28	49	42	25	13	13
	100%	0%	4%	4%	8%	14%	24%	21%	12%	6%	6%
Sub Total	2280	109	322	449	501	314	187	204	105	55	34
	100%	5%	14%	20%	22%	14%	8%	9%	5%	2%	1%
CSD Institution	203	1	2	4	7	18	28	52	49	38	4
	100%	0%	1%	2%	3%	9%	14%	26%	24%	19%	2%
SWD Home	86	2	14	31	18	16	5	0	0	0	0
	100%	2%	16%	36%	21%	19%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Probation/Commu	84	2	4	8	17	15	11	10	8	5	4
nity Serv Offic	100%	2%	5%	10%	20%	18%	13%	12%	10%	6%	5%
Sub Total	373	5	20	43	42	49	44	62	57	43	8
	100%	1%	5%	12%	11%	13%	12%	17%	15%	12%	2%
Outreach Centre	29	0	3	7	5	7	5	2	0	0	0
	100%	0%	10%	24%	17%	24%	17%	7%	0%	0%	0%
Superintendant	217	16	41	68	53	35	3	1	0	0	0
Discretion Scheme	100%	7%	19%	31%	24%	16%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Note:
*. In this and all subsequent tables, the notation '12-' is used to mean age 12 or under.

Table 1.3 Summary of survey and interview samples, by sample and age: females

Sample	Total	AGE 12-	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21+
Unweighted base	1266	72	183	272	278	164	106	105	47	24	15
Total %	100%	6%	14%	21%	22%	13%	8%	8%	4%	2%	1%
School	998	65	166	248	255	140	56	54	12	2	0
	100%	7%	17%	25%	26%	14%	6%	5%	1%	0%	0%
Technical Insti	81	0	0	0	0	2	11	24	21	13	10
tute	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	14%	30%	26%	16%	12%
Youth Centre	101	0	7	5	8	13	29	20	8	6	5
	100%	0%	7%	5%	8%	13%	29%	20%	8%	6%	5%
Sub Total	1180	65	173	253	263	155	96	98	41	21	15
	100%	6%	15%	21%	22%	13%	8%	8%	3%	2%	1%
CSD Institution	18	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	6	2	0
	100%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	28%	22%	33%	11%	0%
SWD Home	8	1	0	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
	100%	13%	0%	50%	25%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Probation/Commu	12	1	0	2	1	1	4	2	0	1	0
nity Serv Offic	100%	8%	0%	17%	8%	8%	33%	17%	0%	8%	0%
Sub Total	38	2	0	6	4	2	9	6	6	3	0
	100%	5%	0%	16%	11%	5%	24%	16%	16%	8%	0%
Outreach Centre	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
	100%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Superintendant	46	5	9	13	11	6	1	1	0	0	0
Discretion Scheme	100%	11%	20%	28%	24%	13%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%

Table 1.4 Summary of survey and interview samples, by sample and age: males

Sample	Total	AGE 12-	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21+
Unweighted base	1633	58	203	295	323	241	133	164	115	74	27
Total %	100%	4%	12%	18%	20%	15%	8%	10%	7%	5%	2%
School	900	44	146	193	229	144	59	64	13	7	1
	100%	5%	16%	21%	25%	16%	7%	7%	1%	1%	0%
Technical Insti	97	0	1	0	0	0	12	20	34	20	10
tute	100%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	12%	21%	35%	21%	10%
Youth Centre	103	0	2	3	9	15	20	22	17	7	8
	100%	0%	2%	3%	9%	15%	19%	21%	17%	7%	8%
Sub Total	1100	44	149	196	238	159	91	106	64	34	19
	100%	4%	14%	18%	22%	14%	8%	10%	6%	3%	2%
CSD Institution	185	1	2	4	6	18	23	48	43	36	4
	100%	1%	1%	2%	3%	10%	12%	26%	23%	19%	2%
SWD Home	78	1	14	27	16	15	5	0	0	0	0
	100%	1%	18%	35%	21%	19%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Probation/Commu	72	1	4	6	16	14	7	8	8	4	4
nity Serv Offic	100%	1%	6%	8%	22%	19%	10%	11%	11%	6%	6%
Sub Total	335	3	20	37	38	47	35	56	51	40	8
	100%	1%	6%	11%	11%	14%	10%	17%	15%	12%	2%
Outreach Centre	27	0	2	7	5	6	5	2	0	0	0
	100%	0%	7%	26%	19%	22%	19%	7%	0%	0%	0%
Superintendant	171	11	32	55	42	29	2	0	0	0	0
Discretion Scheme	100%	6%	19%	32%	25%	17%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%

2. THE DISTRIBUTION OF SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENCY

2.1 Some delinquency is 'normal'

It is important to appreciate, in what follows, that some level of delinquency among young people is both normal and natural. It is part of growing up, testing the limits of one's autonomy, and discovering the strength of social norms. Research in various countries since the 1960s has repeatedly shown that the majority of young people engage at some time in delinquency, some of it fairly serious. In what remains one of the most influential studies of juvenile delinquency, West (1967: 39-42) cites a number of European and American studies which collectively suggest that 90% or more of all males commit at least one offence in their teenage years, while around half admit at least one serious offence (such as robbery, burglary, or vehicle theft or damage).[1] Yet almost all young people grow out of delinquency and lead respectable and law-abiding adult lives. This is not to say that we should ignore those offenders who are caught. It does, however, mean we should retain a sense of proportion when we discuss juvenile delinquency. West (1967: 47-8) points out that

> There are obvious practical reasons for authorities expressing disapproval whenever an offender is caught red-handed. However, since the behaviour of most first offenders is no different from that of their friends who don't happen to have been caught, it is important to discipline them without treating them as if they were specially wicked or peculiar. Society's greatest efforts should be directed towards identifying and changing the ways of that small but disruptive minority of recidivists. Their offences tend to be more persistent and serious than ordinary youthful misconduct, and their attitudes and characters are often blatantly deviant.

This is a theme to which we shall return.

2.2 Interpreting self-report data

One of the ground-clearing tasks necessary for a discussion of juvenile delinquency is to identify how prevalent delinquency actually is among a 'normal' population of juveniles. One way of doing this is to conduct a 'self-report' survey which invites respondants to indicate what delinquent acts they have ever committed, and what they have committed within a given time-frame (usually the year prior to the survey).

One component of our research was thus a 'self-report' study

---

[1]. The studies cited by West come from England, the US, and two countries reckoned internationally to have low crime rates: Sweden and Norway.

of delinquency based on our school, Technical Institute, and youth centre samples. We asked these young people to indicate whether they had ever been involved in any of 34 specified activities, and whether they had been involved in them within the last year.

In interpreting the data which follow, some cautions must be borne in mind.

First, the collection of data from a large sample carries the cost of not knowing precisely the substance of the acts reported. Thus 'using drugs' could cover everything from cough medicine to heroin; 'gambling' could run from informal games for small stakes to participation in organized illegal gambling likely to lead to serious indebtedness; damaging property could mean anything from overturning rubbish bins and spraying graffiti to smashing cars or large shop windows; and so on. It is important to bear in mind that the literature on self-report studies repeatedly points out that many of the acts reported, were they to have come to the attention of the police, would be seen as relatively minor.

Second, and bearing in mind that the survey asked for information on 'problem behaviour' as well as delinquency, some of the items reported are not offences, while in other cases it would be impossible to determine whether the act reported disclosed an offence. For example, where males admitted to sexual activity, the legal status of the act would depend on factors such as the age of the partner and the partner's consent - issues that the questionnaire did not cover. Moreover, the status of some acts are 'age-sensitive'. For example, females under the age of 16 who admitted prior experience of sexual intercourse were admitting to an act of dubious moral status which, while it could conceivably lead to social work intervention, would not in and of itself be an offence.[2] For females aged 16 and above, the act would be lawful, although the parents, if they knew, might still define it as delinquent.[3] At some point, however, as young people become increasingly autonomous, sexual experience has to be regarded as normal. Equally, smoking, drinking, staying out after midnight, and getting tattoos are all acts that are regarded as acceptable, even if not necessarily common or desirable, from the mid to late teens onwards.

---

[2]. Though their (male) partner would, in most normal circumstances, be committing an offence.

[3]. However there are complicating factors. We did not ask whether the respondants consented to sexual activity and some may have been coerced. We did not ask what kind of sexual activity respondants had been involved in and some (e.g. homosexual activity) could have constituted an offence. And in a few cases the admission of sexual activity could conceivably have related to experiences of prostitution.

2.3 Activities covered in the self-report survey

The 34 items on the questionnaire covered a wide range of activities. In view of widespread concern about 'predelinquency' or 'problem behaviour', that is, acts which are not in themselves delinquent but are often held to be precursors to delinquency, 16 of the 34 items dealt with acts which, while perhaps undesirable, did not necessarily involve the young people in the commission of acts likely to be defined as offences.[4] Swearing and lying may be seen as simply undesirable, while looking at pornographic or violent movies or pornographic magazines, and staying out after midnight, can be considered as having a varying level of seriousness depending on the age and maturity of the young person. There was, however, one item - threatening others at school - which would perhaps be more likely than the other acts to be defined as an offence, especially if the threats were made with the intention of extorting sums of money from fellow students.[5]

Specifically, these 16 items were:

- threatening others in school, running away from home, smoking, using alcohol, flirting, sex, truancy from school, getting tattoos, seeing violent movies, pornographic movies, or pornographic magazines, staying out past midnight, gambling, and cheating in school exams.

- and in addition, we asked about two relatively common acts which should and did show a very high prevalence: lying and swearing.[6]

The remaining 18 items dealt with activities that can clearly be seen as offences. Most would normally be minor: for instance, damaging property, fighting (with fists), and not paying bus fares. However, a few were relatively serious offences

---

[4]. Though others, for example persons selling cigarettes or alcohol to minors, or admitting them to Category III films, would have been committing an offence.

[5]. Though one can also imagine situations in which the threat was made by a young person towards a school bully, with the intention of intimidating him and heading off further bullying.

[6]. The case of lying is interesting. Few adults have a need to lie routinely to others and most lies are 'white lies' intended to assuage feelings rather than mislead. Young people, however, may have a greater need to lie to protect themselves, though not all the connotations of this are negative. They may for example lie about various matters to protect themselves from bullying or other forms of victimization.

such as selling or trafficking in drugs.[7]

These items, covering virtually all of the forms of delinquency and offending known or believed to be common in Hong Kong, were:

- threats and menaces of various kinds, (threatening others at school was not counted in this grouping of delinquent acts because it is too often of a minor nature); the extortion of money by threats, and blackmail; and robbery, (4 items)

- thefts of various kinds, including taking money from home without permission, using money entrusted to one for an unauthorized purpose (arguably a minor form of fraud), avoiding paying bus fares, and shop theft, (4 items)

- criminal damage, including destroying or damaging public or others' property, (2 items)

- assaults (fistfights and fights using weapons), (2 items)

- drug offences, including drug use (for our purposes, including the abuse of substances such as cough mixture), sale, or trafficking, (3 items), and

- several offences which have particular significance in the Hong Kong situation; throwing items from high buildings, involvement in triad activities, and driving without a license (3 items).

It is worth reiterating that while all these items involve clear breaches of criminal law, it is by no means certain that they would systematically be reported to the police. For example, threatening others, taking money from home without permission, and using money entrusted to one for an unauthorized purpose, may be more often dealt with through school or parental discipline.

2.4 Measures of delinquency

Our data enabled us to calculate several different measures of delinquency and problem behaviour. Since they are measurements of different aspects of delinquency and problem behaviour it is worth pausing briefly to explain them, and they are summarized in Figure 2.1.

For the list of 34 self-report items, divided (as indicated above) into 16 problem behaviour and 18 delinquency items, we

---

[7]. In this context, 'trafficking' may be taken to mean moving drugs from one place to another within Hong Kong. This was included in the questionnaire because of reports of young people being used in this capacity by drug dealers, allegedly because young people would attract less police attention.

asked respondents to indicate *how long ago they had last* engaged in each activity and *how many times* they had done so. On the basis of this information we created some 14 indices of delinquency or problem behaviour. The simplest measures were four variables based on counts of the number of *different kinds* of problem behaviour or delinquency young people had committed:

- number of different kinds of problem behaviour ever engaged in;
- number of different kinds of problem behaviour engaged in, in the last year;
- number of different kinds of delinquency ever engaged in; and
- number of different kinds of delinquency engaged in, in the last year.

We also created two 'scores', based on the *total number of acts* reported:

- a 'problem behaviour score' based on the number of problem behaviour acts reported as ever having been committed; and
- a 'delinquency score' based on the number of delinquent acts reported as ever having been committed.

In addition, we derived two further measures from the difference between the number of different kinds of acts reported as ever committed and the number of different kinds of acts reported as having been committed within the last year. These measured, for problem behaviour and delinquency respectively, the extent to which there had been some change in the types of acts the young people had committed.[8]

---

[8]. These were measures of the numbers of different kinds of acts previously engaged in which had not been engaged in within the last year. Though they could not measure the number of new kinds of acts committed within the last year but not previously, they can be treated (with caution) as a rough indicator of change in patterns of delinquency or problem behaviour. Someone who had committed a large number of different kinds of acts prior to the survey, but the last occasion on which most of them were committed was more than a year ago, would have a high score. Those who had consistently committed the same kinds of acts, or who had committed most of the kinds of acts ever committed within the last year, would score close to zero. The reason for caution in using this measure is of course that those who had never committed any acts would also score zero. Because of time constraints we were unable to ask respondents in the school sample to indicate exactly how many individual acts of any kind they had committed at and what time, though these data are available for the offender samples and are discussed in later

In some later chapters, we also report on a factor analysis which enabled us to differentiate between patterns or clusters of acts, based on reports of the number of times different acts had been committed. In essence, for the school sample, we found three important factors for males and three somewhat different patterns for females.[9] Since these factors were created from data about the number of acts, it was also possible to use the factor scores as dependent variables in some analyses.

Figure 2.2 shows the correlations between all these various measures. As might be expected, all are high although most of the very highest correlations are among the problem behaviour variables, and among the delinquency variables, with typically lower correlations between problem behaviour and delinquency variables.

2.5 The prevalence of problem behaviours and delinquency

Tables 2.3 to 2.6 outline, for males and females, and by age, the proportions who had *ever* engaged in selected types of delinquency or problem behaviour and the proportions who had done so *in the last year*.

Tables 2.3 and 2.4, dealing with whether respondents had ever done these acts ought, other things being equal, to show rising prevalence with age, and sudden increases in the proportions who had done certain things as they reach the age at which it becomes a legal activity. Some of these patterns can be seen quite clearly. For example, the proportion of males who had ever drunk alcohol rises from 36% at age 12 to 55% by age 15, and to 76% by age 19. The proportion who had ever smoked rises from 27% at age 12 to 44% at age 16, though it does not increase much thereafter. The activities that one would expect to be more common do indeed show a high prevalence; lying (92% of all males), swearing (77%), gambling (65%), and fist fights (52%). Except for lying, the prevalence for females is generally lower; for many of the less delinquent acts by a factor of only a few per cent, and for the more serious offences, by a margin of as much as 20% (which results in, for example, boys being at least twice as likely as girls to use threats, steal from shops, fight with weapons or drive without a license). The exception - the 'equal opportunity' area of delinquency - appears to be drug use, where similar proportions of boys and girls had some experience

---

chapters.

[9]. For females these were variables 477, 478 and 479, labelled as SF B4 Factors #1, #2 and #3; for males, they were variables 480, 481 and 482, respectively labelled as SM B4 Factors #1, #2 and #3. An explanation of what kinds of behaviours grouped into which factors appears in Chapter 3.

of using or selling drugs.[10]

It will be seen from all these tables that a variety of acts appear to be more common in the younger age groups than the older ones. However, we must be conservative in our discussion of this because it this is likely to be an artefact of our methodology and sampling strategy. First, some part of the variation in these tables is likely to be the result of younger individuals more readily defining minor acts as worth reporting (hence the high rate of reporting for 'tattoos' in the younger age group, which almost certainly reflects the current fashions for temporary tattoos) while older individuals may cease to regard acts committed some time ago as worth mentioning (which would explain the lower rates of reporting for 'threats in school' in the older age group, some of whom had already left school). Second and equally importantly, one of the schools in our sample was a special school for children with behaviour problems, from which we sampled a Form 2 class. These young people almost all reported much higher rates of problem behaviour and delinquency than others. In many of the later analyses the effects of this are reduced because most of the questionnaires had substantial amounts of missing data.

However, while these factors could explain patterns such as that seen in relation to various kinds of threats and fistfights (for males, and presumably mainly related to peer arguments), it is by no means clear that it can explain the case of shop theft, where the highest percentages of self-reported shoptheft occurred among males aged 14 or under (the pattern is less clear for females but appears to peak at age 13).[11] Similarly, and notwithstanding that the term 'triad' is often used very loosely, it is interesting to note that even disregarding the figures for males aged 12 and under, the higher rates of self-reported triad activity occur in the younger age group.[12]

---

[10]. Tables 2.1 and 2.2 also confirm that one activity which may not be common (or dangerous) in many other countries is common in Hong Kong; 46% of males and 35% of females in the sample admitted to having thrown items from high buildings at some point. See also Law (1986: 23); his self-report study of youths in Kwun Tong indicated that 17% had thrown something from a high building in the year prior to his survey.

[11]. The high rate of shop theft for females aged 20 is unreliable because of the small number of cases in the sample.

[12]. This raises the question of what 'triad-related activity' means. Lo (1986), in a detailed study of juvenile gangs in Tung Tau Estate, points out that gangs often had a 'core membership' of only three of four youths and a more fluid 'outer core' and 'fringe'. Most gangs comprised no more than about 15 youths, even including those on the fringe. While Lo describes the gangs as triad-related, he qualifies this by pointing out that usually none of the gang had undergone any formal triad membership ceremony nor even 'hung the blue lantern', nor state

The figures for involvement in delinquency and problem behaviour in the last year (Tables 2.5 and 2.6) are, as one would expect, lower than those which summarize lifetime incidence. Yet they largely confirm the patterns outlined above. Males are more likely than females to engage in most delinquent acts, by a factor of two or more. The acts identified above - shop theft, various kinds of threats (often, presumably, made in or around school), fistfights, and triad-related activity - remain more prevalent in the younger age groups. The main difference between these tables and Tables 2.3 and 2.4 is in relation to drug use. While girls were as likely as boys to have used or sold drugs at some stage, they were less likely to have done so in the last year, which suggests that there may be a differential pattern of drug use, with both sexes equally likely to try drugs but males being more likely to persist in using and/or selling them.

2.6 The distribution of delinquency

Knowing the prevalence of various acts among a population does not, of course, tell us much about the overall spread of delinquency; those who admit to using threats may be the same people who are involved in theft, fighting, triads, drug use and so on. Tables 2.7-2.10 give, in summary form, information about *how many different* types of delinquency have been engaged in by what proportion of young people. For the purposes of these tables, problem behaviour and two delinquent activities unlikely to be treated as such in practice have been excluded, leaving only those 16 items which have clear criminal connotations.[13]

---

concretely which triad subgrouping they believed they belonged to. Some core members knew an older youth or adult who had more concrete triad links, but in general it is fair to say that the term 'triad' in the context of juveniles and youth refers more to a diffuse set of subcultural attitudes than to any specific organizational affiliation. Most of the gangs' time was spent 'hanging out' in public locations such as stairwells or playgrounds, playing cards and the like. Equally importantly, despite repeated claims that membership of a triad is membership for life, many youths did in fact dissociate themselves from the subculture as they became older.

[13]. The items used to compile Tables 2.7-2.10 were: threatening others, threatening in order to take money, destroying property, damaging property, fist fights, fights with weapons, not paying bus fare, shoptheft, robbery, blackmail, throwing items from high buildings, triad involvement, driving unlicensed, drug use, drug sales, and drug trafficking. Even so, there is some ambiguity about these terms; for example it remains unclear what triad involvement means in this context. The two delinquent items excluded from these tables, taking money from home and using others' money without authority, may constitute criminal offences, but were discounted here on the assumption that schools and parents would not normally deal with them as offences.

In essence, these tables show that the current situation in Hong Kong is roughly the same as it was in most developed countries twenty or more years ago. On any international comparison (see Section 2.1) our data show a remarkably low prevalence of delinquency.

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

For males, the proportion who had never been involved in delinquency or offending was lower - from 16 to 31% for teenagers - and the proportion who had not been involved in such acts in the last year ran from 41 to 59%.[14] 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.

Among those who had been involved in offending and delinquency, there was a slight tendency among both sexes for the younger respondants to have been involved over their lifetime in a larger number of types of delinquency, and for males, for the younger age groups to have been involved in a wider variety of acts over the last year. However, as mentioned above, it is possible that this reflects age-specific changes of view as to 'what counts' as delinquency, and this should not be read as significant.

2.7 How many times?

It seems from the data concerning the number of different types of acts committed that around a quarter of all teenage females and close to half of all teenage males had been involved in at least one delinquent act in the last year; yet a relatively small proportion of young people may account for the majority of delinquency.

In order to test this proposition we can use another questionnaire item (how many times respondants had ever committed any of the 34 acts) to create crude problem behaviour and delinquency scores. In essence, a response of 'never tried' any particular activity was scored as 0, 'tried once' as 1, 'tried 2-4 times' as 3, and 'tried 5 or more times' as 5. The scores for the questionnaire items were then simply summed, thus giving a theoretical maximum score of 80 for problem behaviour and 90 for delinquency (16 items x 5 points and 18 items x 5 points

---

[14]. 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.

respectively).[15]

It is important to appreciate that this gives only a very rough and probably conservative approximation to the number of 'problem behaviour acts' and 'delinquent acts' committed by any respondant, because it counts more than 5 acts of any particular type as only 5 acts. Even so, such calculations indicate that:

- the median problem behaviour score was 17.4 acts (mean = 23.47 acts). Only 3% had a score of zero, while the top 5% of respondants had committed 15% of all acts and the top 10% had committed 27% of all acts. Half of all problem behaviour acts were committed by the top 21%, who had a score of 39 or above.

- the median delinquency score was 3.1 acts (mean = 8.2 acts). Some 30% had a score of zero, while the top 5% of respondants had committed 30% of all delinquent acts and the top 10% had committed 49% of all acts. Half (51%) of all delinquent acts were committed by only the top 11%, who had a score of 23 or more.

2.8 Conclusions

The findings from our school survey show, as we might have expected, that almost all young people have committed at least one problem behaviour act and more than two-thirds have committed a delinquent act. An 'average' young person has committed about 17 or 18 problem behaviour acts and 3 delinquent acts (and since these figures do not differentiate males and females, we may expect the figures for males to be even higher). However, both problem behaviour and delinquency are most concentrated in a relatively small segment of the youth population, with half of all problem behaviour coming from 21% of youths and half of all delinquency being committed by only 10% of youths.

It is, at this point, worth recalling the quote which opened this chapter. As West pointed out, some degree of delinquency in young people is normal; it is part of growing up, and for that reason alone should not be treated as especially wicked or problematic. The problem is not that normal young people commit one or two offences, and those who are caught for such offences should not be treated harshly for doing what, realistically, most young people do. Our attention and our efforts should be directed to the small proportion of young people who appear to begin a criminal career early, who already have a long track record of delinquency by the time they leave school, and who account for almost half of all juvenile delinquency.

---

[15]. Some questionnaires contained missing data for certain items. For the purposes of this score, any missing item was given a score equal to the mean score across the items where responses were present.

To say this does, of course, raise a number of questions. For example, what relationship, if any, exists between problem behaviour and delinquency? Are those who begin their delinquent careers early different in some way from those who stop after only one or two offences? And are there any particular patterns of delinquency which are associated with specific influences such as triads? These questions are taken up in the following chapters.

Figure 2.1 Measures of delinquency and problem behaviour

Variable		Comment	Mean	Standard Deviation
384	Predel ever count	No. different kinds of problem behaviour ever committed	4.5032 6.29472	3.27275 (females) 3.86029 (males)
385	Predel last year count	No. different kinds of problem behaviour committed in last year	2.95708 4.4187	2.69724 (females) 3.24758 (males)
390	Del+Off ever count	No. different kinds of delinquency ever committed	1.14703 2.29878	1.53786 (females) 2.33121 (males)
391	Del+Off last count	No. different kinds of delinquency committed in last year	0.431963 1.05285	0.92333 (females) 1.67783 (males)
467	Pre-delinquent score	Score of problem behaviour acts ever committed	13.9927 21.9085	12.7616 (females) 15.7757 (males)
468	Delinquent/Off Score	Score of delinquent acts ever committed	2.84384 6.51321	4.85402 (females) 8.61319 (males)
477	SF B4 Factor #1	Grouping #1 of acts based on factor analysis (females only)*	not calculated	(females)
478	SF B4 Factor #2	Grouping #2 of acts based on factor analysis (females only)*	not calculated	(females)
479	SF B4 Factor #3	Grouping #3 of acts based on factor analysis (females only)*	not calculated	(females)
480	SM B4 Factor #1	Grouping #1 of acts based on factor analysis (males only)*	not calculated	(males)
481	SM B4 Factor #2	Grouping #2 of acts based on factor analysis (males only)*	not calculated	(males)
482	SM B4 Factor #3	Grouping #3 of acts based on factor analysis (males only)*	not calculated	(males)
501	Predel (ever-last)	No. different kinds of problem behaviour ever committed but not committed within last year	1.54612 1.87602	1.64584 (females) 1.9992 (males)
502	Del+Off (ever-last)	No. different kinds of delinquency ever committed but not committed within last year	0.715069 1.24593	1.0989 (females) 1.42085 (males)

*. For further details of types of acts contained in these factors refer to Chapter 3.
For variables 477-482, which were created from a factor analysis, the mean and standard devaition are by definition 0 and 1 respectively.

Figure 2.2 Correlations among measures of delinquency and problem behaviour

For variable labels and comments please refer to Figure 2.1

(a) School-TI-YC/Female correlation matrix (analysis uses 1095 cases)
Correlations relating to delinquency are underlined

	384	385	390	391	467	468	477	478	479	501	502
384	1.000										
385	0.865	1.000									
390	0.619	0.550	1.000								
391	0.454	0.518	0.708	1.000							
467	0.928	0.856	0.619	0.502	1.000						
468	0.595	0.555	0.901	0.762	0.649	1.000					
477	0.903	0.835	0.642	0.519	0.943	0.661	1.000				
478	-0.165	-0.133	-0.564	-0.446	-0.183	-0.610	-0.000	1.000			
479	0.133	0.091	-0.117	-0.117	0.163	-0.086	-0.000	0.000	1.000		
501	0.570	0.082	0.330	0.053	0.443	0.274	0.426	-0.111	0.115	1.000	
502	0.485	0.334	0.805	0.150	0.445	0.620	0.463	-0.414	-0.066	0.418	1.000

(b) School-TI-YC/Male correlation matrix (analysis uses 984 cases)
Correlations relating to delinquency are underlined

	384	385	390	391	467	468	480	481	482	501	502
384	1.000										
385	0.856	1.000									
390	0.620	0.565	1.000								
391	0.479	0.527	0.797	1.000							
467	0.913	0.840	0.613	0.497	1.000						
468	0.571	0.547	0.910	0.822	0.628	1.000					
480	0.861	0.802	0.456	0.319	0.917	0.428	1.000				
481	0.299	0.245	0.718	0.647	0.315	0.778	-0.000	1.000			
482	-0.143	-0.161	-0.208	-0.308	-0.157	-0.289	0.000	-0.000	1.000		
501	0.541	0.028	0.278	0.070	0.399	0.214	0.361	0.176	-0.015	1.000	
502	0.450	0.305	0.700	0.126	0.418	0.522	0.372	0.414	0.023	0.374	1.000

Table 2.3 Percentage ever involved in selected delinquent or problem behaviour activities, by age (females)
Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Female
Figures are column percentages
For explanation of labels refer to text

	Valid Responses	Total %	AGE 12-	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21+
Unweighted base	1179	100%	6%	15%	21%	22%	13%	8%	8%	3%	2%	1%
B3:1 Threaten school	1179	6%	5%	12%	8%	6%	6%	1%	4%	0%	0%	0%
B3:2 Threaten other	1176	4%	0%	5%	4%	6%	2%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
B3:3 Threaten money	1176	1%	2%	3%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
B3:4 Destroy property	1177	21%	15%	20%	23%	22%	21%	20%	20%	22%	24%	27%
B3:5 Damage property	1178	11%	8%	11%	10%	14%	10%	13%	12%	7%	10%	7%
B3:6 Fistfight	1176	14%	11%	15%	17%	15%	14%	14%	7%	7%	10%	7%
B3:7 Weapon fight	1178	4%	2%	5%	6%	3%	5%	4%	1%	2%	5%	0%
B3:8 Lying	1173	93%	92%	91%	91%	92%	95%	95%	99%	98%	90%	93%
B3:9 Shoptheft	1174	6%	3%	6%	8%	7%	7%	5%	4%	5%	10%	7%
B3:10 Take from home	1175	27%	25%	24%	29%	28%	29%	25%	23%	28%	43%	20%
B3:11 Use money	1170	8%	6%	10%	6%	8%	9%	6%	10%	8%	5%	7%
B3:12 Robbery	1176	..%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
B3:13 Blackmail	1176	1%	0%	2%	..%	..%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%
B3:14 Runaway	1177	7%	2%	6%	9%	6%	5%	11%	10%	10%	0%	0%
B3:15 Throw down	1174	35%	32%	39%	37%	36%	35%	33%	30%	35%	38%	13%
B3:16 Triad	1176	1%	0%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
B3:17 Smoke	1173	23%	17%	20%	24%	25%	27%	18%	26%	32%	24%	13%
B3:18 Alcohol	1173	47%	23%	34%	47%	50%	55%	55%	48%	59%	52%	47%
B3:19 Flirt	1164	26%	9%	16%	28%	23%	31%	31%	33%	41%	33%	13%
B3:20 Sex	1172	4%	3%	4%	3%	3%	5%	6%	1%	8%	5%	7%
B3:21 Truant	1172	12%	3%	7%	9%	10%	10%	20%	14%	45%	38%	20%
B3:22 Tattoo	1172	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
B3:23 Violent movie	1171	20%	9%	12%	17%	22%	21%	18%	31%	40%	33%	33%
B3:24 Porno movie	1172	19%	6%	9%	11%	16%	21%	23%	33%	63%	52%	53%
B3:25 Porno mag	1173	11%	5%	6%	8%	14%	14%	13%	12%	20%	19%	7%
B3:26 Loiter midnight	1173	28%	11%	20%	26%	26%	36%	40%	35%	44%	43%	33%
B3:27 Gambling	1174	47%	34%	42%	50%	48%	54%	47%	47%	44%	62%	27%
B3:28 Not pay bus	1174	14%	12%	16%	15%	13%	15%	11%	12%	20%	24%	0%
B3:29 Swear	1173	60%	58%	63%	64%	65%	61%	52%	51%	51%	43%	27%
B3:30 Drive unlicensed	1175	1%	0%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	5%	0%	0%
B3:31 Exam cheat	1176	21%	23%	20%	21%	22%	27%	18%	18%	15%	19%	13%
B3:32 Drug use	1176	4%	0%	7%	4%	4%	5%	3%	1%	2%	5%	0%
B3:33 Drug sale	1176	..%	0%	1%	1%	..%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
B3:34 Drug traffic	1175	..%	0%	0%	1%	..%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Rounded to nearest percent. .. = percentage less than 0.5%.

Table 2.4 Percentage ever involved in selected delinquent or problem behaviour activities, by age (males)
Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Male
Figures are column percentages
For explanation of labels refer to text

	Valid Responses	Total %	AGE 12-	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21+
Unweighted base	1098	100%	4%	14%	18%	22%	14%	8%	10%	6%	3%	2%
B3:1 Threaten school	1097	15%	14%	20%	21%	15%	15%	7%	8%	8%	9%	11%
B3:2 Threaten other	1097	10%	16%	8%	12%	10%	12%	9%	5%	5%	12%	11%
B3:3 Threaten money	1096	4%	9%	5%	5%	5%	4%	2%	2%	0%	6%	0%
B3:4 Destroy property	1098	38%	39%	28%	34%	42%	42%	43%	36%	47%	41%	32%
B3:5 Damage property	1098	23%	30%	19%	15%	25%	25%	36%	23%	23%	35%	11%
B3:6 Fistfight	1095	52%	70%	60%	54%	54%	55%	43%	37%	48%	50%	16%
B3:7 Weapon fight	1097	10%	18%	7%	12%	11%	11%	7%	6%	8%	6%	0%
B3:8 Lying	1090	92%	84%	89%	90%	92%	92%	93%	95%	95%	97%	94%
B3:9 Shoptheft	1088	15%	21%	17%	18%	14%	13%	14%	10%	16%	9%	6%
B3:10 Take from home	1090	33%	30%	24%	33%	32%	32%	47%	32%	30%	41%	22%
B3:11 Use money	1081	15%	12%	16%	14%	13%	15%	23%	22%	11%	9%	6%
B3:12 Robbery	1091	2%	9%	4%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	0%	3%	0%
B3:13 Blackmail	1090	2%	11%	4%	1%	1%	2%	3%	1%	0%	3%	0%
B3:14 Runaway	1092	8%	16%	6%	8%	8%	7%	8%	9%	13%	9%	6%
B3:15 Throw down	1092	46%	32%	48%	51%	42%	53%	51%	39%	48%	35%	22%
B3:16 Triad	1093	5%	11%	7%	6%	4%	8%	5%	3%	2%	3%	0%
B3:17 Smoke	1096	35%	27%	24%	30%	33%	44%	37%	37%	45%	47%	42%
B3:18 Alcohol	1091	57%	36%	42%	51%	55%	62%	64%	71%	76%	76%	74%
B3:19 Flirt	1088	35%	16%	20%	25%	30%	38%	45%	61%	60%	48%	42%
B3:20 Sex	1095	7%	20%	6%	6%	5%	8%	8%	11%	3%	9%	17%
B3:21 Truant	1096	20%	18%	6%	12%	12%	21%	23%	34%	54%	44%	53%
B3:22 Tattoo	1090	1%	9%*	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	0%	0%
B3:23 Violent movie	1094	35%	23%	25%	25%	32%	32%	41%	45%	62%	71%	74%
B3:24 Porno movie	1096	37%	30%	18%	26%	31%	37%	43%	53%	70%	76%	68%
B3:25 Porno mag	1097	43%	27%	22%	35%	40%	47%	51%	52%	78%	76%	58%
B3:26 Loiter midnight	1097	44%	34%	30%	33%	37%	45%	58%	64%	67%	65%	74%
B3:27 Gambling	1094	65%	48%	59%	61%	62%	72%	74%	71%	69%	71%	68%
B3:28 Not pay bus	1093	22%	18%	16%	27%	26%	20%	25%	20%	25%	12%	11%
B3:29 Swear	1091	77%	61%	76%	70%	77%	83%	82%	81%	91%	82%	68%
B3:30 Drive unlicensed	1090	5%	7%	3%	7%	3%	6%	2%	8%	10%	9%	5%
B3:31 Exam cheat	1094	27%	18%	20%	25%	25%	28%	28%	28%	47%	41%	37%
B3:32 Drug use	1095	4%	7%	3%	5%	2%	5%	3%	4%	3%	3%	0%
B3:33 Drug sale	1095	1%	7%	0%	2%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	3%	0%
B3:34 Drug traffic	1095	1%	7%	1%	3%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	6%	0%

Rounded to nearest percent. .. = percentage less than 0.5%.

*. Almost certainly refers to temporary, removable tattoos.

Table 2.5 Percentage involved in selected delinquent or problem behaviour activities in last year, by age (females)
Sample base: School-TI-YC/Female
Figures are column percentages
For explanation of labels refer to text

	Valid Responses	Total %	AGE 12-	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21+
Unweighted base	1179	100%	6%	15%	21%	22%	13%	8%	8%	3%	2%	1%
B3:1 Threaten school	1179	3%	3%	6%	3%	3%	1%	1%	2%	0%	0%	0%
B3:2 Threaten other	1176	1%	0%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
B3:3 Threaten money	1176	1%	2%	2%	..%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
B3:4 Destroy property	1177	7%	8%	7%	7%	8%	8%	6%	5%	0%	5%	7%
B3:5 Damage property	1178	3%	5%	3%	2%	5%	3%	3%	3%	0%	5%	0%
B3:6 Fistfight	1176	7%	6%	8%	9%	8%	7%	3%	3%	2%	0%	0%
B3:7 Weapon fight	1178	2%	2%	4%	3%	1%	4%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
B3:8 Lying	1173	75%	68%	72%	72%	73%	80%	74%	88%	85%	71%	73%
B3:9 Shoptheft	1174	1%	0%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%
B3:10 Take from home	1175	11%	9%	11%	10%	11%	12%	9%	10%	13%	10%	7%
B3:11 Use money	1170	3%	5%	4%	1%	3%	4%	2%	6%	3%	0%	0%
B3:12 Robbery	1176	..%	0%	0%	..%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
B3:13 Blackmail	1176	..%	0%	1%	..%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
B3:14 Runaway	1177	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%	4%	5%	0%	0%	0%
B3:15 Throw down	1174	16%	14%	20%	16%	13%	21%	14%	12%	18%	19%	7%
B3:16 Triad	1176	..%	0%	1%	0%	..%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
B3:17 Smoke	1173	12%	9%	13%	16%	13%	10%	8%	9%	12%	10%	7%
B3:18 Alcohol	1173	32%	15%	23%	30%	35%	39%	39%	36%	46%	29%	33%
B3:19 Flirt	1164	19%	5%	14%	20%	17%	22%	23%	24%	27%	19%	13%
B3:20 Sex	1172	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%	4%	6%	1%	8%	5%	7%
B3:21 Truant	1172	8%	3%	5%	6%	6%	3%	13%	12%	40%	33%	20%
B3:22 Tattoo	1172	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
B3:23 Violent movie	1171	14%	5%	9%	11%	14%	14%	12%	28%	35%	29%	20%
B3:24 Porno movie	1172	14%	3%	6%	8%	12%	13%	17%	26%	51%	48%	33%
B3:25 Porno mag	1173	5%	3%	4%	6%	6%	7%	4%	6%	7%	10%	0%
B3:26 Loiter midnight	1173	20%	5%	15%	15%	18%	27%	33%	28%	29%	29%	27%
B3:27 Gambling	1174	30%	22%	25%	29%	30%	36%	28%	34%	24%	38%	27%
B3:28 Not pay bus	1174	5%	5%	6%	5%	5%	5%	5%	6%	2%	10%	0%
B3:29 Swear	1173	41%	34%	47%	44%	46%	42%	28%	35%	29%	38%	7%
B3:30 Drive unlicensed	1175	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%
B3:31 Exam cheat	1176	10%	9%	11%	10%	11%	12%	12%	6%	5%	5%	0%
B3:32 Drug use	1176	2%	0%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	0%	0%	5%	0%
B3:33 Drug sale	1176	..%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
B3:34 Drug traffic	1175	..%	0%	0%	..%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Rounded to nearest percent. .. = percentage less than 0.5%.

Table 2.6 Percentage involved in selected delinquent or problem behaviour activities in last year, by age (males)
Sample base: School-TI-YC/Male
Figures are column percentages
For explanation of labels refer to text

	Valid Responses	Total %	AGE 12-	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21+
Unweighted base	1098	100%	4%	14%	18%	22%	14%	8%	10%	6%	3%	2%
B3:1 Threaten school	1097	7%	7%	12%	11%	8%	7%	1%	4%	3%	9%	0%
B3:2 Threaten other	1097	4%	5%	5%	8%	2%	4%	2%	4%	0%	12%	0%
B3:3 Threaten money	1096	2%	7%	3%	3%	3%	2%	0%	1%	0%	3%	0%
B3:4 Destroy property	1098	17%	32%	13%	16%	16%	19%	19%	11%	20%	15%	16%
B3:5 Damage property	1098	10%	16%	8%	7%	12%	10%	13%	4%	14%	9%	11%
B3:6 Fistfight	1095	23%	41%	33%	32%	24%	23%	11%	6%	8%	12%	0%
B3:7 Weapon fight	1097	5%	16%	4%	8%	5%	5%	3%	2%	2%	3%	0%
B3:8 Lying	1090	77%	68%	68%	71%	77%	78%	81%	90%	86%	94%	82%
B3:9 Shoptheft	1088	3%	10%	6%	4%	3%	1%	1%	2%	0%	0%	0%
B3:10 Take from home	1090	13%	16%	12%	12%	14%	14%	21%	12%	3%	24%	6%
B3:11 Use money	1081	7%	5%	8%	5%	8%	5%	13%	10%	5%	3%	0%
B3:12 Robbery	1091	1%	2%	3%	1%	..%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%
B3:13 Blackmail	1090	1%	9%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
B3:14 Runaway	1092	3%	11%	4%	3%	2%	4%	3%	4%	3%	0%	0%
B3:15 Throw down	1092	27%	27%	29%	23%	26%	39%	26%	23%	28%	15%	17%
B3:16 Triad	1093	2%	5%	5%	2%	1%	1%	3%	0%	2%	0%	0%
B3:17 Smoke	1096	18%	7%	15%	15%	18%	22%	23%	22%	19%	18%	21%
B3:18 Alcohol	1091	42%	23%	28%	30%	40%	44%	52%	59%	63%	62%	58%
B3:19 Flirt	1088	26%	12%	16%	18%	25%	22%	33%	52%	40%	33%	32%
B3:20 Sex	1095	6%	11%	6%	4%	5%	5%	8%	10%	2%	6%	6%
B3:21 Truant	1096	14%	9%	4%	5%	7%	11%	18%	27%	49%	44%	53%
B3:22 Tattoo	1090	1%	9%*	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	2%	0%	0%
B3:23 Violent movie	1094	26%	9%	18%	15%	24%	25%	33%	37%	49%	47%	68%
B3:24 Porno movie	1096	26%	18%	15%	16%	21%	24%	29%	43%	63%	53%	53%
B3:25 Porno mag	1097	28%	20%	15%	23%	28%	32%	25%	32%	53%	50%	47%
B3:26 Loiter midnight	1097	33%	20%	23%	24%	27%	34%	41%	53%	52%	53%	63%
B3:27 Gambling	1094	47%	39%	44%	45%	46%	54%	44%	54%	44%	50%	47%
B3:28 Not pay bus	1093	9%	11%	7%	11%	10%	8%	5%	9%	8%	6%	11%
B3:29 Swear	1091	62%	52%	55%	54%	64%	73%	62%	69%	70%	62%	63%
B3:30 Drive unlicensed	1090	3%	5%	2%	4%	2%	4%	1%	7%	5%	6%	0%
B3:31 Exam cheat	1094	14%	9%	12%	14%	14%	13%	9%	16%	27%	24%	16%
B3:32 Drug use	1095	2%	5%	2%	5%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	0%	0%
B3:33 Drug sale	1095	1%	5%	0%	2%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	3%	0%
B3:34 Drug traffic	1095	1%	7%	0%	2%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%

Rounded to nearest percent. .. = percentage less than 0.5%.

*. Almost certainly refers to temporary, removable tattoos.

Table 2.7 Number of different types of delinquency ever engaged in, by age (females)
Sample base is: School-TI-YC/Female
Figures are column percentages

		Total	12-	13	14	AGE 15	16	17	18	19	20	1+
Unweighted base		1180	65	173	253	263	155	96	98	41	21	15
Total %		100%	6%	15%	21%	22%	13%	8%	8%	3%	2%	1%
No. of different kinds of acts	0	46%	58%	45%	44%	47%	43%	48%	47%	41%	48%	73%
	1	24%	18%	24%	25%	21%	26%	23%	31%	29%	19%	13%
	2	13%	8%	13%	12%	14%	15%	15%	13%	15%	10%	0%
	3	8%	12%	6%	9%	8%	7%	8%	4%	12%	14%	7%
	4	4%	2%	6%	4%	4%	6%	1%	5%	0%	5%	7%
	5	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	1%	3%	0%	2%	5%	0%
	6	2%	0%	2%	2%	3%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	7	1%	0%	2%	2%	2%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	8	..%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	9	..%	0%	1%	0%	..%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	10	..%	0%	0%	..%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Average		1.18	0.85	1.31	1.29	1.26	1.18	1.10	0.90	1.07	1.24	0.60
Standard Devtn		1.58	1.24	1.77	1.71	1.72	1.45	1.48	1.11	1.21	1.55	1.24
Standard Error		0.05	0.15	0.13	0.11	0.11	0.12	0.15	0.11	0.19	0.34	0.32

The maximum number of different kinds of acts that could have been recorded was 16.

Rounded to nearest percent. .. = percentage less than 0.5%.

Table 2.8 Number of different kinds of delinquency ever engaged in, by age (males)
Sample base is: School-TI-YC/Male
Figures are column percentages

		Total	12-	13	14	AGE 15	16	17	18	19	20	21+
Unweighted base		1100	44	149	196	238	159	91	106	64	34	19
Total %		100%	4%	14%	18%	22%	14%	8%	10%	6%	3%	2%
No. of different kinds of act	0	23%	25%	22%	25%	25%	16%	21%	31%	17%	18%	53%
	1	20%	20%	23%	18%	16%	21%	22%	20%	27%	29%	11%
	2	18%	16%	21%	17%	18%	19%	12%	17%	16%	18%	21%
	3	13%	7%	11%	11%	14%	14%	19%	12%	16%	6%	5%
	4	11%	9%	9%	11%	12%	11%	10%	11%	9%	18%	11%
	5	7%	7%	5%	8%	5%	9%	9%	4%	9%	9%	0%
	6	3%	2%	3%	5%	4%	4%	2%	3%	2%	0%	0%
	7	2%	2%	1%	2%	3%	2%	2%	1%	3%	0%	0%
	8	1%	5%	1%	2%	1%	2%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%
	9	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	10	..%	0%	2%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	11	..%	0%	0%	1%	..%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	12	..%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	13	..%	0%	0%	0%	..%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%
	14	..%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	15	..%	2%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	16	..%	2%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Average		2.39	3.11	2.28	2.53	2.37	2.57	2.47	1.93	2.33	2.35	1.11
Standard Devtn		2.41	3.94	2.33	2.68	2.26	2.14	2.31	2.22	1.97	2.48	1.41
Standard Error		0.07	0.59	0.19	0.19	0.15	0.17	0.24	0.22	0.25	0.43	0.32

The maximum number of different kinds of acts that could have been recorded was 16.

Rounded to nearest percent. .. = percentage less than 0.5%.

Table 2.9 Number of different types of delinquency engaged in last year, by age (females)
Sample base is: School-TI-YC/Female
Figures are column percentages

		Total	12-	13	14	AGE 15	16	17	18	19	20	21+
Unweighted base		1180	65	173	253	263	155	96	98	41	21	15
Total %		100%	6%	15%	21%	22%	13%	8%	8%	3%	2%	1%
No. of different kinds of acts	0	73%	77%	69%	71%	74%	68%	76%	74%	78%	76%	87%
	1	18%	12%	17%	19%	17%	21%	17%	19%	22%	14%	13%
	2	5%	8%	8%	6%	3%	5%	5%	5%	0%	5%	0%
	3	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	5%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
	4	1%	0%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	5%	0%
	5	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	6	..%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	7	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	8	..%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	9	..%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Average		0.46	0.40	0.57	0.49	0.46	0.54	0.38	0.33	0.22	0.43	0.13
Standard Devtn		0.98	0.90	1.19	0.97	1.05	1.05	0.89	0.62	0.42	0.98	0.35
Standard Error		0.03	0.11	0.09	0.06	0.06	0.08	0.09	0.06	0.07	0.21	0.09

The maximum number of different kinds of acts that could have been recorded was 16.

Rounded to nearest percent. .. = percentage less than 0.5%.

Table 2.10 Number of different kinds of delinquency engaged in last year, by age (males)
Sample base is: School-TI-YC/Male
Figures are column percentages

			AGE								
	Total	12-	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21+
Unweighted base	1100	44	149	196	238	159	91	106	64	34	19
Total %	100%	4%	14%	18%	22%	14%	8%	10%	6%	3%	2%
0	51%	50%	49%	49%	52%	41%	54%	59%	50%	59%	68%
1	23%	7%	20%	22%	22%	27%	25%	27%	27%	26%	11%
2	13%	18%	15%	12%	12%	16%	8%	7%	16%	3%	21%
3	6%	9%	7%	8%	5%	7%	10%	4%	3%	3%	0%
4	3%	5%	3%	3%	4%	5%	1%	2%	3%	3%	0%
5	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	3%	0%	0%	2%	3%	0%
6	1%	0%	0%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%
7	..%	0%	0%	1%	..%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
8	..%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
9	..%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
10	..%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
11	..%	2%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
12	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
13	..%	0%	0%	0%	..%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
14	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
15	..%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
16	..%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Average	1.10	2.00	1.22	1.24	1.07	1.21	0.92	0.70	0.88	0.85	0.53
Standard Devtn	1.75	3.28	1.83	2.06	1.65	1.41	1.49	1.36	1.15	1.50	0.84
Standard Error	0.05	0.49	0.15	0.15	0.11	0.11	0.16	0.13	0.14	0.26	0.19

The maximum number of different kinds of acts that could have been recorded was 16

Rounded to nearest percent. .. = percentage less than 0.5%.

3. 'PREDELINQUENCY' AND PATTERNS OF DELINQUENCY

In Chapter 2 we made a distinction between self-reported 'problem behaviour' and delinquency. Problem behaviour, while not necessarily a problem for the young person, and not necessarily involving acts likely to be defined and treated as offences, may well constitute a problem for parents, teachers, or others. Almost all young people report that they have engaged in such behaviour, though clearly some have engaged in more than others. Delinquency consists of acts which in most cases would clearly constitute offences. Again, a large proportion of young people have committed one or two such acts though rather few have committed three or more.

It is often assumed by the general public that these two types of behaviour, 'problem behaviour' and delinquency, are linked. For example, 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. Problem behaviour is thus labelled as 'predelinquent', reflecting the perceived likelihood of its developing into delinquency. This raises the question of whether our assumptions about causal linkages are warranted.

Our study suggests that the pattern is actually rather complex. Some individuals clearly do engage in problem behaviour that is 'predelinquent', in the sense that it prefigures their delinquency. But others appear either to jump straight into a lifestyle that embraces both problem behaviour and delinquency, while some engage in delinquency first, and the problem behaviour then follows. Ultimately it is probably not a matter of 'which comes first', but of how and why young people adopt a lifestyle which includes all these kinds of activities. Most dabble at the fringes of this lifestyle, but a few enter it at an early age, and appear to be deeply enmeshed in it.

3.1 Statistical association between delinquency and predelinquency

It is fair to say that there is a broad statistical correlation between being involved in delinquency and being involved in problem behaviour. Tables 3.1 to 3.3 cross-tabulate delinquency and problem behaviour scores for the whole school-TI-YC sample, and for males and females separately.[1] They show that 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 - broadly speaking, scores in the upper half of the range in each case - are associated with higher delinquency scores. An association

[1]. These scores are derived from grouped data on the number of problem behaviour acts and delinquent acts that individuals reported having committed. For details of how the scores were created, see the discussion in Chapter 2.

between the scores does not, however, amount to proof of a causal relationship.

A second line of approach would be to see whether there is a sequencing of events. We could expect, if indeed becoming involved in problem behaviour leads on to delinquency, to see some a relationship between problem behaviour reported prior to last year and delinquency reported within the last year. The measures are not perfect because they relate to the *number of different kinds* of acts rather than the actual number of acts committed, and reports of acts most recently committed within the last year does not preclude their having also been committed in previous years. Even so, we can calculate the number of different kinds of problem behaviours and delinquent acts committed only prior to the last year, and those most recently committed within the last year.

These correlations were given in Figure 2.2. We would expect most of them to be high and, with the exception of some correlations involving the variables generated by factor analysis (and discussed later) most are. The very highest correlations are of course between different measures of problem behaviour, and between different measures of delinquency, though we can still see moderately high correlation between some problem behaviour measures and delinquency measures. Yet the correlation between problem behaviour types prior to the last year, and delinquency types most recently committed within the last year, is so low as to indicate that there is no association. There is, on the other hand, a moderate level of correlation between delinquency prior to the last year and problem behaviour within the last year. In summary, the correlations are:

	Females	Males
problem behaviour types prior to last year (v. 501) x delinquency types within the last year (v. 391)	0.053	0.070
delinquency prior to last year (v. 502) x problem behaviour within last year (v. 385)	0.334	0.305

Clearly, engaging in a wider variety of problem behaviours in the past is not related to committing a wide variety of delinquent acts within the last year, though the reverse may well be true. However, we should remember that these data deal with the last occasion on which acts were committed, so that reporting an act as having last occurred within the last year does not preclude its commission in previous years; subtracting the number of types of act committed within the last year from those last committed in previous years is thus to some extent a measure of what young people have ceased to commit rather than what they have only begun to commit recently.

A cautious interpretation of our data would thus be that there is no relationship between *desisting from problem behaviour and having committed delinquency more recently*, but there is a relationship between *desisting from delinquency and having been involved more recently in problem behaviour*.

While this is not conclusive evidence that problem behaviour follows rather than precedes delinquency, it certainly raises doubts about the current assumption that problem behaviour is a pathway into delinquency. It is on the face of it more likely that while most young people go through a phase of problem behaviour during which they may commit one or two delinquent acts, some go more deeply into a lifestyle which includes both kinds of activities. For those individuals, delinquency and problem behaviour may come together into a lifestyle in which substantial autonomy over one's own time and leisure activities is its own reward, the hallmark of a preparedness to engage in delinquency, and an environment which provides opportunities for delinquency.

3.2 Problem behaviour, delinquency, and the offender sample

One part of the data-set on offenders allows us to investigate the relationship between problem behaviour and delinquency further. The offender interviews enabled us to collect time-sequence information about life events, and this is presented in Figure 3.4. The figure enables us to make two important points.

First, those who ended up in the care or custody of CSD or SWD typically started their offending career rather early, 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 (whether due to the family moving or the school expelling them 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 at least, 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.

Second, however, by the age of about 17 the proportions of young people who reported various problems has increased dramatically. Most, as we might expect, had left school and started work by that age, so we would expect the average number of reported events to have increased. However, the rise in reported rates of truancy, academic problems, and behaviourial 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. These figures suggest that while for some individuals, school and other problems occur prior to the first

offence and can be seen as indicative of problem behaviour preceding delinquency, this process takes place before age 12 or 13. And they also suggest that for another, equally large, group the participation in problem behaviour either occurs for the first time, or becomes deeper, following the first offence.

3.3 Separating different dimensions of delinquency; a factor analysis

One further question is that of what kinds of delinquency appear to cluster together. This can be investigated using principal component analysis, which is designed to identify 'factors' which explain as much as possible of the variance in the sample. That is, the analysis essentially shows us how many different patterns of delinquency and problem behaviour it is reasonable to separate out and consider as distinct dimensions of delinquency, and the relative strength of those patterns.

For this analysis we used the responses indicating how many times respondents had committed the various acts.[2] However, because the patterns were likely to be different for males and females (for example we would not necessarily expect to see a female delinquent pattern based on violent acts, whereas there might reasonably be one for males), the two groups were analyzed separately.

For females, three factors accounted for over one third (35%) of the variance in the sample while seven would be needed to explain more than 50%. While not high, this is usually regarded as acceptable for data of this kind. The rotated factor matrix (reproduced as Figure 3.5) suggests that different activities were clustered in the following patterns:

SF B4 #1: destroying property, fistfights, lying, taking money from home, throwing objects from a height, smoking, alcohol use, flirting, truancy, watching violent or pornographic films and reading pornographic magazines, staying out past midnight, gambling, swearing, and cheating in exams (all positive loadings)[3]

---

[2]. These question (B4:1-34 in the questionnaire) asked how often individuals had committed each of 34 specific acts. The available responses were never, once, 2-4 times, and 5 or more times.

[3]. No significance attaches to whether loadings are positive or negative unless there is a mix of both positive and negative loadings in the same factor. However, if all variables have negative loadings this means that in subsequent analyses, positive correlations between the factor and other variables (age, socio-economic status etc.) would be shown in correlation matrices as negative loadings. A second point to bear in mind is that after rotation of the factors (as was done to arrive at these three factors and the three male factors), there is no

SF B4 #2: threats/bullying at school, elsewhere, and for money; shoptheft, robbery, blackmail, and drug use (all negative loadings)

SF B4 #3: sex, and drug sales (both positive loadings)

In essence, SF B4 #1 includes problem behaviour variables while SF B4 #2 includes the delinquent behaviours - further confirmation, if any is needed, that problem behaviour and delinquency are qualitatively different dimensions of behaviour. One behaviour, damaging property, does not load significantly onto any of the three factors but is spread across all of them. Others, such as running away and not paying bus fares, do load primarily onto one factor (factor #1 in each case) but too little of their variance is explained for them to appear significant. And in the case of drug trafficking, too few in the sample admitted to it for the results to be significant (and in the case of getting tattoos, none of the female sample reported this behaviour).

The analysis for males throws up a slightly different, and more complex, pattern of associations between activities (Figure 3.6). The first three factors explain more of the variance (41%), while six would be needed to explain over 50%. Three activities, fall out of the analysis with too little of their variance being explained by the three factors; they are taking money from home, getting a tattoo, and not paying bus fares. The rotated factor matrix indicates that one factor again revolves around problem behaviour and another around delinquency, but the third factor comprises a mix of robbery and drug-related behaviours. In essence the factors are as follows:

SM B4 #1: destroying property, lying, throwing objects from a height, smoking, alcohol use, flirting, truancy, watching violent and pornographic films, reading pornographic magazines, staying out past midnight, gambling, swearing, and cheating in exams (all positive loadings).

SM B4 #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 (all positive loadings).

SM B4 #3: robbery, sex, driving without a license, drug use, selling drugs, and drug trafficking (all negative loadings).

---

guarantee that the first factor contributes most to an explanation of the variance in the sample.

Thus SM B4 #1 is essentially a problem behaviour factor; #2 groups together a variety of offences involving either dishonesty or aggression; and #3 links together robbery and all kinds of involvement in drugs (though the question did not distinguish between different kinds of drugs, and explicitly included easily-obtainable items such as cough mixtures). However it is worth noting that even at our chosen cutoff point below which we determined that variables were not significant, destroying property and robbery both loaded onto two factors. If we allow that robbery is not that common, we are left with the idea that destroying property - that is, vandalism - is common to both problem behaviour and delinquent patterns of activity.

3.4 Male and female delinquency: the main differences

The previous sections have made several points about what exactly we are seeking to explain. It may be useful, before proceeding further, to summarize them.

Male *delinquency* can be divided into two broad types (labelled SM B4 #2 and SM B4 #3), one of which is 'specialized' to the extent that the variables loading onto it are mainly concerned with drugs. Female *delinquency* does not break down so clearly into this pattern; one factor comprises almost all kinds of delinquency including drug use, while the other is related primarily to dealing in drugs. This is most likely to be because female delinquency is comparatively rare and even with a rather large sample, the data-set does not contain enough instances of it for a useful breakdown of female delinquency into two factors to occur.

In the case of both males and females, *problem behaviour* clearly factors out as a qualitatively different dimension of activity from delinquency, though the types of acts that load onto the problem behaviour factors are similar for both sexes (though the male factor contains two additional items not carried in the female factor).[4] We know from the findings presented in

---

[4]. It will be remembered that in Chapter 2 we used our own judgement to create a distinction between problem behaviour and delinquency. The factor analyses largely, though not completely, replicate that distinction. Four items originally evaluated as problem behaviour did not emerge in the SFB4#1 and SMB4#1 factors; threats at school, running away, sex, and getting tattoos (though there were very few cases of the last) now loaded onto the '#2' and '#3' factors. For females, three items (fistfights, taking money from home, and throwing items from high buildings) originally considered as offences loaded onto the problem behaviour factor. For males, only the last of these items loaded onto problem behaviour. The distinction between our own evaluations and the factor analyses is perpetuated in later chapters since the measures 'problem behaviour ever count', 'problem behaviour score', 'delinquency ever count' and 'delinquency score' are based on the former, while the factor

the first part of this chapter that some young people engage in both problem behaviour and delinquency. But to return to the starting-point of this chapter, it does not appear to be the case that problem behaviour is automatically the beginning of a slippery slope into delinquency. Typically, young people who begin to exhibit problem behaviour will not move 'upwards' into significant levels of delinquency. They may - and most young people do - commit one or two sporadic delinquent acts. But we can expect that they will grow up into normal adults. Others begin to engage in delinquency at an early age and commit more of it; for them, as our offender data show, while the delinquency may follow on from problem behaviour it is equally likely that the reverse is the case, or that the two begin at around the same time. The implication is that any attempt to predict delinquency on the basis of problem behaviour must be seen as mistaken.

The next issue to deal with is, of course, whether any social factors can be identified which correlate with delinquency. This is the subject of the following two chapters.

---

scores are also treated as measures of delinquency. As it turned out, it was usually possible to explain higher proportions of the variance in the case of the measures based on our own judgement than on those based on the factors.

Table 3.1 Crosstabulation of problem behaviour and delinquency scores
Sample Base: School-TI-YC/All
Pre-delinquent Score = Var(s) 467
Delinquent/Off Score = Var(s) 468
(Count/Row %/Column %)

		Delinquency score				
		0-3	3-9	9-27	27-81	Row Total
Problem behaviour score	0-3:	188	14	2		204
		92.2	6.9	1.0		
		16.3	2.0	0.5		9.0
	3-9:	414	99	10	1	524
		79.0	18.9	1.9	0.2	
		35.9	14.4	2.6	2.3	23.0
	9-28:	481	394	126	2	1003
		48.0	39.3	12.6	0.2	
		41.7	57.4	32.2	4.5	44.1
	28-87:	71	180	253	41	545
		13.0	33.0	46.4	7.5	
		6.2	26.2	64.7	93.2	23.9
Column :						
Total :		1154	687	391	44	2276

Table 3.2 Crosstabulation of problem behaviour and delinquency scores (females)
Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Female
Pre-delinquent Score = Var(s) 467
Delinquent/Off Score = Var(s) 468
(Count/Row %/Column %)

		Delinquency score				
		0-3	3-7	7-17	17-44	Row Total
Problem behaviour score	0-3:	104	8			112
		92.9	7.1			
		14.8	3.0			9.5
	3-9:	276	53	12		341
		80.9	15.5	3.5		
		39.4	19.8	7.1		28.9
	9-25:	279	155	67	4	505
		55.2	30.7	13.3	0.8	
		39.8	57.8	39.6	9.8	42.8
	25-74:	42	52	90	37	221
		19.0	23.5	40.7	16.7	
		6.0	19.4	53.3	90.2	18.7
Column :						
Total :		701	268	169	41	1179

Table 3.3 Crosstabulation of problem behaviour and delinquency scores (males)
Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Male
Pre-delinquent Score = Var(s) 467
Delinquent/Off Score = Var(s) 468
(Count/Row %/Column %)

		Delinquency score				
		0-3	3-9	9-27	27-87	Row Total
Problem behaviour score	0-3:	60	6	2		68
		88.2	8.8	2.9		
		15.0	1.6	0.7		6.2
	3-9:	112	43	7	1	163
		68.7	26.4	4.3	0.6	
		28.0	11.3	2.5	3.0	14.9
	9-28:	188	217	93	1	499
		37.7	43.5	18.6	0.2	
		47.0	56.8	33.0	3.0	45.5
	28-87:	40	116	180	31	367
		10.9	31.6	49.0	8.4	
		10.0	30.4	63.8	93.9	33.5
Column :						
Total :		400	382	282	33	1097

Figure 3.4 Percentages who had experienced selected life events by the time of their first offence, and by the time of interview
Sample base: male offenders
Repeat occurrences of events removed

	Count/% who had experienced event prior to first offence		Count/% who had experienced event by the time of interview	
Type of event	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Move to HK	58	17.42%	59	17.72%
Move within HK	142	42.64%	186	55.86%
Bereavement	81	24.32%	133	39.94%
Parents divorce	71	21.32%	80	24.02%
Health, family	39	11.71%	67	20.12%
Health, self	23	6.91%	28	8.41%
Mental health, family	6	1.80%	8	2.40%
Mental health, self	2	0.60%	6	1.80%
Run away from home	91	27.33%	167	50.15%
Cohabiting	22	6.61%	83	24.92%
Suicide attempt	6	1.80%	19	5.71%
Change of school	99	29.73%	138	41.44%
Leave/drop out of school	113	33.93%	264	79.28%
Truant	130	39.04%	210	63.06%
Academic problem	127	38.14%	188	56.46%
School behaviour problem	96	28.83%	149	44.74%
Other school-related event	25	7.51%	43	12.91%
Start work	104	31.23%	258	77.48%
Change work	81	24.32%	218	65.47%
Period of unemployment	30	9.01%	116	34.83%
Dismissed from work	21	6.31%	58	17.42%
Problem at work	16	4.80%	54	16.22%
Other work-related event	2	0.60%	10	3.00%
Join gang	137	41.14%	202	60.66%
Leave gang	19	5.71%	81	24.32%
Join triad	100	30.03%	204	61.26%
Drug use	49	14.71%	140	42.04%
Outreach contact	39	11.71%	90	27.03%
Total	333	100.00%	333	100.00%
Average number of events per person		5.19		11.66

Average age at time of first offence: 12.5 years
Average age at time of interview: 17.0 years

Figure 3.5 Rotated factor matrix showing groupings of different problem behaviour and delinquent activities (females)
Sample Base: Female/Sch-TI-YC (1096 cases)
Values between +/-0.4 removed for clarity

	Factor SF B4 #		
Variable	1	2	3
B4:1 Threaten school	.	-0.49	.
B4:2 Threaten other	.	-0.50	.
B4:3 Threaten money	.	-0.62	.
B4:4 Destroy property	0.54	.	.
B4:5 Damage property	.	.	.
B4:6 Fistfight	0.46	.	.
B4:7 Weapon fight	.	.	.
B4:8 Lying	0.51	.	.
B4:9 Shoptheft	.	-0.46	.
B4:10 Take from home	0.51	.	.
B4:11 Use money	.	.	.
B4:12 Robbery	.	-0.65	.
B4:13 Blackmail	.	-0.56	.
B4:14 Runaway	.	.	.
B4:15 Throw down	0.54	.	.
B4:16 Triad	.	-0.55	.
B4:17 Smoke	0.66	.	.
B4:18 Alcohol	0.66	.	.
B4:19 Flirt	0.56	.	.
B4:20 Sex	.	.	0.52
B4:21 Truant	0.53	.	.
B4:22 Tattoo	.	.	.
B4:23 Violent movie	0.60	.	.
B4:24 Porno movie	0.61	.	.
B4:25 Porno mag	0.62	.	.
B4:26 Loiter midnight	0.64	.	.
B4:27 Gambling	0.65	.	.
B4:28 Not pay bus	.	.	.
B4:29 Swear	0.62	.	.
B4:30 Drive unlicensed	.	.	.
B4:31 Exam cheat	0.41	.	.
B4:32 Drug use	.	-0.51	.
B4:33 Drug sale	.	.	0.65
B4:34 Drug traffic	.	.	.

Variance explained by 3 factors: 35.007%

Figure 3.6 Rotated factor matrix showing groupings of different problem behaviour and delinquent activities (males)
Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Male (984 cases)
Values between +/-0.4 removed for clarity

Variable	Factor SM B4 # 1	2	3
B4:1 Threaten school	.	0.58	.
B4:2 Threaten other	.	0.68	.
B4:3 Threaten money	.	0.71	.
B4:4 Destroy property	0.43	0.43	.
B4:5 Damage property	.	0.55	.
B4:6 Fistfight	.	0.45	.
B4:7 Weapon fight	.	0.60	.
B4:8 Lying	0.52	.	.
B4:9 Shoptheft	.	0.53	.
B4:10 Take from home	.	.	.
B4:11 Use money	.	0.43	.
B4:12 Robbery	.	0.67	-0.40
B4:13 Blackmail	.	0.65	.
B4:14 Runaway	.	0.55	.
B4:15 Throw down	0.47	.	.
B4:16 Triad	.	0.57	.
B4:17 Smoke	0.57	.	.
B4:18 Alcohol	0.65	.	.
B4:19 Flirt	0.58	.	.
B4:20 Sex	.	.	-0.40
B4:21 Truant	0.46	.	.
B4:22 Tattoo	.	.	.
B4:23 Violent movie	0.61	.	.
B4:24 Porno movie	0.70	.	.
B4:25 Porno mag	0.72	.	.
B4:26 Loiter midnight	0.64	.	.
B4:27 Gambling	0.61	.	.
B4:28 Not pay bus	.	.	.
B4:29 Swear	0.65	.	.
B4:30 Drive unlicensed	.	.	-0.63
B4:31 Exam cheat	0.46	.	.
B4:32 Drug use	.	.	-0.59
B4:33 Drug sale	.	.	-0.82
B4:34 Drug traffic	.	.	-0.77

Variance explained by 3 factors: 40.573%

4. DELINQUENCY AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS: THE SCHOOL SAMPLE

4.1 Explaining delinquency: some preliminary considerations

Previous studies in Hong Kong have suggested a variety of factors which may be related to delinquency. They include lower socio-economic status, poor housing conditions, low self-esteem, low attachment to parents, poor school performance, inappropriate leisure activities such as spending time in video game centres, exposure to or consumption of pornographic materials, and having delinquent associates.[1] Some of these factors, such as inappropriate leisure activities and consumption of pornographic material, have been held to be part of a 'problem behaviour lifestyle' that is predictive of delinquency, though our own initial exploration of this issue (in Chapter 3) suggested that the situation was more complex.

Attempts to explain delinquency, however, must start by taking account of its prevalence. In Chapter 2 we indicated that around a quarter of all teenage females and close to half of all teenage males had been involved in at least one delinquent act in the last year; around 70% of all young people have committed at least one non-trivial delinquent act; but over half of all delinquency was committed by only 11% of young people. In the light of this, trying to explain why young people commit *one or two* delinquent acts is not unlike trying to explain why most adults occasionally use alcohol or exceed speed limits when they drive. In so far as an explanation is possible it is likely to be trivial. However, just as it is possible to pose a spectrum of behaviour from 'social drinking' to alcohol dependence, or from 'keeping up with the traffic' to reckless driving, and try to identify factors that account for differences in such behaviours, it is possible to identify factors which separate 'normal' rates of delinquency from high rates. This is the approach we take in this, and the next, chapter.

Such factors may of course be related to one another, and exert indirect effects on delinquency rates. It is necessary, ultimately, to carry out a series of multiple regression analyses which describe which variables appear to explain, either directly or indirectly, the variance in delinquency rates and then to build a model which explains those findings. This is the task of Chapter 5. The prior task, undertaken here, is to identify the variables that can most usefully be entered into such an analysis. The following sections, dealing primarily with the school sample, review a range of candidates including socio-economic factors, family factors, school factors, self-esteem, and leisure activities. In addition, there is a brief review of the question of the extent to which delinquency is detected, and by whom.

---

[1]. A fuller discussion of these factors appeared in Chapter 1.

4.2 Socio-economic factors

There is no direct way to define 'social class' in Hong Kong because it is not a 'class society' in the way that countries such as the UK clearly are. The nearest approximation to the concept of class is usually considered to be measured by father's occupation and mother's education.

Most measures of delinquency, however, do not appear to be related to either of these variables, either for boys or girls. 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. This is an important point because it flies in the face of most previous studies, both from Hong Kong and abroad; summaries of relevant statistics appear in Figures 4.1 and 4.2.[2]

The few relationships which do appear significant apply, with only one exception, to males; and the variable which appears significant in terms of the largest number of different measures of delinquency and problem behaviour is the mother's education. Tables 4.3 and 4.4 show (for males) the near-significant relationship between father's occupation and delinquency last year, and the significant relationship between delinquency score and mother's education. These tables summarize our data by showing the mean and standard deviation of the various delinquency measures, rather than providing a full cross-tabulation, but in both cases it is clear that delinquency is distributed in an unusual pattern. The number of different types of delinquency committed in the last year is lowest for children of manual workers and higher where fathers are non-manual workers, professionals, or homemakers. And higher delinquency scores occur where the mother has a tertiary education. These patterns are repeated throughout almost all our self-report data: the distribution of delinquency is typically either U-shaped, with higher levels of self-reported delinquency at the top and

---

[2]. Virtually all studies of juvenile delinquency assert that detected delinquents are overwhelmingly lower-class, though acknowledge that middle-class youths are given more latitude, with their delinquency sometimes being redefined as 'high spirits'. Cheung and Ng (1988) found modest levels of correlation between family socio-economic status and both delinquent behaviour and association with delinquent friends, though their measure of SES was Pedro Ng's (1987) 'Family Material Possessions Index'. Cheung and Ng claim that this is a 'very strong and valid indicator, because material consumption is a way of life in Hong Kong and it cuts across class lines' (by which they presumably mean that it distinguishes between classes); but they caution, rather strangely in the light of this endorsement, that it 'is not a *sufficient* indicator of socio-economic status' (1988: 36, emphasis supplied).

bottom of the social scale and lowest in the middle, or else the higher levels occur at the top end of the social scale.

It is, however, unlikely that both high and low socio-economic status in and of themselves can be seen as causal factors in relation to delinquency. The most likely intervening variable - that is, the variable which explains this distribution of delinquency across class - is the amount of time young people spend with their parents. This is discussed further below.

Other socio-economic factors, such as home ownership (whether categorized by private, public, HOS, temporary, dormitory, or simply by rented versus owned) or amount of rent or mortgage show no significant relationship to self-reported delinquency for either sex. This is not wholly surprising because housing type has come to be a problematic variable to work with in Hong Kong. The disparity between public and private sector rentals or mortgage payments is so large that many otherwise well-off families in private housing have relatively little disposable income, while some families with better educated and professional parents remain in public housing because of the high cost of private sector accommodation.

4.3 Contact with parents

How frequently juveniles see their parents does seem to have a strong relationship to delinquency. Figure 4.5 summarizes the situation for a variety of different measures of self-reported delinquency. For males, almost all the 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, there is a different pattern, in that 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.

Tables 4.6-4.8 illustrate selected significant relationships in more detail. 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.

Two further points are worth making about these findings. First, the linkage between delinquency and seeing one's parents explains most if not all of the U-shaped distribution of delinquency across social class, since it appears that the amount of time youths and parents spend together is related to parental occupation (Tables 4.9 and 4.10). Second, it would be all too easy to suppose that this distribution comes about because professional and executive fathers are too occupied with their work, or social functions, to spend time with their children. But this may not be the case. Since Tables 4.9 and 4.10 only show us associations between factors, it may well be that the children of professional parents spend more time out of the home.

Moreover, simple measures of the time spent with parents tell us nothing about the quality of that time or indeed what the young people are doing when they are not in the company of their parents.

In practice, as Figure 4.11 shows, those who see their parents less do not necessarily appear to be spending more time with friends rather than engaging in home-based activities. However, it may be that those who do spend more time out of the home are more likely to engage in 'disreputable pleasures' which are more clearly linked to delinquency. Later in this chapter we scrutinize young people's leisure patterns more closely, with this possibility in mind.

4.4 Self-esteem

It has sometimes been suggested that delinquents, or young people who exhibit problem behaviour, have lower self-esteem than other young people. This has been seen as significant in terms of pathways into delinquency. For example Cheung and Ng (1988) and Ng (1994) argue that poor attachment to school and parents may result in low self-esteem, which may make young people vulnerable to closer associations with delinquents, thus leading to delinquency.[3]

We tested the association between problem behaviour, delinquency, and self-esteem using an adaptation of a standard and widely-available measure, Rosenberg's self-esteem scale (Rosenberg 1965; reprinted in Robinson and Shaver 1973).[4]

The results are simple to report: among the school sample at least, there are no observable relationships. This statement holds whatever measure of problem behaviour or delinquency is

---

[3]. However, Ng (1994) endorses the 'differential association' model, which does not suggest any specific link between low self-esteem and delinquency other that the indirect one in which low self-esteem leads to association with other (delinquent) persons who also lack self-esteem. Delinquency then occurs as the 'newcomer' adopts the values and attitudes of his or her new peers, not having the self-esteem to challenge them. A number of other possibilities are of course conceivable, such as that persons with low self-esteem seek peer groups into which they will be accepted, so that their self-esteem rises; that they become involved with such peers as an act of rebellion against the situation which gave rise to low self-esteem; or that their delinquency is intended as an attention-seeking act. The converse possibility may of course also be true, namely that a sense of guilt or shame may be associated with delinquency (especially if caught), leading to poor self-esteem.

[4]. In fact we used an adaptation of the Chinese version of this scale, made available to us by the Correctional Services Department.

used, and whether the scale is scored as intended, scored in a variety of alternative ways, or used as the basis for a factor analysis in which one or both of the two principal factors (which essentially measure positive and negative self-images) were correlated with any of the problem behaviour and delinquency measures.[5]

In short - and one must bear in mind that most young people can be considered 'delinquent' in that they have committed at least one delinquent act - young people who report higher rates of problem behaviour or delinquency do not differ significantly from those who report lower rates. This point will be discussed more fully in later chapters which deal also with the data for detected offenders in the CSD and SWD samples.

4.5 School and education

It is widely assumed that there is a relationship between doing poorly in school and having poor attachment to school; that students who do poorly and have little attachment to school are likely to pose disciplinary problems in the classroom or play truant; and that those who pose such problems or play truant are more likely than other young people to get involved in delinquency. However our data suggests that such assumptions must be treated with suspicion.

Our questionnaire to the school-TI-YC sample asked a range of questions about attitudes towards schooling.[6] They included 15

---

[5]. This scale comprises 10 statements; subjects are asked to respond to each in one of four ways: 'strongly agree', 'agree', disagree', and 'strongly disagree'. However in scoring no distinction is made between agreeing and strongly agreeing, or disagreeing and strongly disagreeing. In each case, two answers are considered 'right' and two 'wrong'. The original scoring instructions require some of the 10 items to be discarded and some others combined, creating a scale running from zero to 3 based on one point for each 'right' answer. The alternatives we also tried (in addition to factor analysis) were (a) to retain the items which would otherwise be discarded, thus creating a scale running from zero to 6; (b) scoring each question individually, thus creating a scale from zero to 10, and (c) correlating each individual item on the scale with various measures of problem behaviour and delinquency. These different alternatives came up with essentially the same results, that is, no relationship between self-esteem and problem behaviour or delinquency for the self-report sample. Where Rosenberg scores are presented in this report they are based on alternative (a), which respects the original combinations of items but includes the items the strict scoring procedure would normally discard.

[6]. If the respondent had changed schools, or already left school, we asked them about the last school they had studied

items asking for evaluations of lessons and teachers, and bearing in mind the argument that many young people may experience difficulty in being taught and assessed in a second language (English), we asked whether school tests were in English and whether the student had difficulty with English. They also included 16 items designed to measure relationships with schoolmates along two dimensions; how other students acted towards the respondent (positively or negatively) and how the respondent acted towards other students (positively or negatively). In addition we asked students to rate their own academic performance against others in their year, and their school against other schools in their community. These two ratings were then combined into a broad measure of the student's academic performance in relation to others.

These measures were subjected to factor analysis (for which the whole sample, males and females, was used). For the attitudes to school, four factors appeared important and together explained 55% of the variance; for the questions on attitudes to classmates there appeared to be only two main factors, which jointly explained 39% of the variance (Figure 4.12). In essence the factors were as follows:

- Factor A2#1 can be treated as a variable for 'anti-school attitudes';

- Factor A2#2 and A2#4 both seemed to tap feelings that the school sees the student negatively;

- Factor A2#3 principally taps the students' confidence in their English abilities.

- Factor A3#1 indicated that the student felt positively towards other students and vice versa, while

- Factor A3#2 tapped negative feelings towards others and perceptions of others' negative feelings towards the student.

An inspection of correlations between these factors and various measures of delinquency (Figure 4.13) indicates that for girls, only factor A2#1 (anti-school attitudes) appears to be related to problem behaviour and delinquency. For boys, however, more factors seem relevant. In addition to factor A2#1 being related to problem behaviour and delinquency, factors A2#2 (perception that the school sees the student negatively) and A3#2 (negative feelings to others, perceptions that others see one negatively) both correlated with several measures of delinquency.

One final measure included in Figure 4.13 (labelled 'Academic' in the Figure) was a combined measure of self-perceived academic performance in relation to the student's year

---

in.

group and the school's academic performance in relation to other schools.[7] The lack of any strong associations between their academic self-rating and problem behaviour or delinquency suggests that in general, those who exhibit such behaviour believe that they are doing averagely well in school - perhaps despite poor relationships with both the school and their classmates.[8]

4.6 Leisure activities and friends

Our questionnaire asked a battery of questions about what kinds of leisure activities students engaged in, how much time they spent on each of them, the amount of time spent with friends and perceptions of friends. The results are fairly complex but give some interesting clues about problem behaviour and delinquent lifestyles, and (we shall argue) support the contention that at least one youth subculture exists which is tolerant of some - though not all - kinds of delinquency.

We asked respondents how much of their leisure time they

---

[7]. In each case the rating was from 1 (much lower than most) to 5 (much higher than most). We looked at several alternative ways combining these ratings; the one which gave the best correlations with delinquency and problem behaviour, and which is used in the Figure, simply adds the two ratings together. Thus the (self-perceived) best students in the best schools scored 10, the worst students in the worst schools scored 2. The average score for boys was 5.88 (standard deviation 1.72), and for girls, 6.06 (standard deviation 1.48).

[8]. Of wider interest, and perhaps more importance, than our concerns with delinquency, scrutiny of basic descriptive statistics from this section of our questionnaire paints a depressing picture of social life among peers. Around 2% report that they are threatened by all, or all except one or two, of their classmates, while around 10% report that they themselves threaten at least one or two of their classmates. Around 3.5% of students report that they are (a) ignored, and (b) disliked by all, or all except one or two, of their classmates, while around 55% report that they themselves ignore at least one or two of their classmates, and 75% report that they themselves dislike at least one or two of their classmates. Around 5% report that they are laughed at by all, or all except one or two, of their classmates, while nearly 60% report that they themselves laugh at least one or two of their classmates. While we may accept that not everyone in a class will or should like all their classmates, and that some degree of uncivil behaviour is normal among schoolchildren, there is clearly a small group of young people who for whatever reason receive a great deal of such incivility from the majority of their classmates. How this is likely to affect their development remains an open question.

spent engaging in each of 38 specific leisure activities.[9] Figures 4.14 and 4.15 show that virtually none of the leisure activities, in themselves, have a strong direct correlation with measures of problem behaviour or delinquency.[10] However, a factor analysis suggests that the activities fell into clusters, some of which can be described either as lifestyles, or as centring around certain core interests such as sports. Some of these clusters of activities may well be directly or indirectly correlated with delinquency.

For both sexes, almost half the variance (48%) in leisure activities can be explained by five factors.[11] The rotated factor matrix for these five factors is reproduced in Figure 4.16. In summary, the five factors are:

Factor 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 (all positive loadings).

This factor revolves mainly around games and mass media entertainments, some of which were almost by definition home-

---

[9]. In order to get around the problem of respondents selecting a time period so as to emphasize only the activities they enjoyed, we asked specifically about the week prior to the questionnaire being administered. However, for persons in custody we asked about any 'normal' week prior to custody. Respondents were asked to identify what proportion of their leisure time - from none to three-quarters or more - they spent on each activity. However this was treated as no more than a rough estimate of the amount of time spent on each activity relative to other activities. The list of activities included a wide range of items, from housework and reading schoolbooks, to going to karaoke or movies, organized youth activities and sports, relatively informal activities such as loitering, chatting, or spending time in shopping malls etc, through to problem behaviour and delinquent activities such as going to electronic games centres, gambling, and taking drugs.

[10]. The exceptions are (for boys), going to electronic games centres and smoking, and to a lesser extent loitering and drinking. All these are anyway considered as problem behaviours for young teenagers. Interestingly, taking drugs as a pastime, while regarded in itself as delinquent, does not correlate with any of the broader-based measures of delinquency or problem behaviour.

[11]. A factor analysis based on males only produces virtually identical results, suggesting that leisure activities are clustered in the same way for both males and females. However, as later chapters show, a factor analysis on male offenders does show a slightly different grouping of activities.

based (e.g. playing with one's computer), though others could be pursued either in or out of the home (e.g. karaoke in this list could mean going to a karaoke parlour or using a home karaoke set). Only one item in the list, going to electronic games centres, unequivocally involved leisure time out of the home.

Factor G1#2: loitering in public places, playing mahjong, other gambling, getting tattoos, drug abuse, and smoking; but also going to night school/part-time education (all positive loadings).

This factor is at first sight a strange one, since it links together several 'problem behaviours' (gambling, drug abuse) with the ostensibly conformist activity of attending part-time education (this may reflect our definition of night school which included interest classes as well as academic learning). In any event, given our own concern with delinquency, we have labelled this factor a 'gambling and drug use' leisure pattern.

Factor G1#3: reading newspapers and schoolbooks, doing household chores, studying (all positive loadings).

We can describe this broadly as a 'studious' use of leisure time. The fourth factor is, by contrast, a very active one primarily loading on sports and outdoor pastimes:

Factor 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)

Finally, there is a factor which may be described as a pattern of 'socializing in public places':

Factor G1#5: going to public places, loitering, chatting and chatting on the phone, and eating and drinking away from home (all positive loadings).

For females, G1#3 (a studious lifestyle) is moderately negatively correlated, and G1#5 (socializing in public places) is moderately positively correlated, with most measures of problem behaviour and delinquency. For males, the impacts are smaller; there is a negative relationship between G1#3 and only certain measures of problem behaviour, and a positive one between G1#5 and certain problem behaviour measures. However, G1#2 (which revolves around gambling and drug use) is moderately to strongly correlated for males with most measures of both problem behaviour and delinquency (Figure 4.17).

These findings are interesting because they appear to make a distinction between what kinds of socializing young people do in public places. 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, since it is associated with hanging around the kinds of places where illegal gambling is likely to be carried on (though interestingly, it does *not* pick up on the venues which are most often cited as 'crucibles of delinquency', namely electronic games centres and karaoke parlours). These appeared in G1#1, which had no significant relationship to any measure of delinquency or problem behaviour.[12]

In order to refine this initial picture of what now appears to be an association between delinquency and participation in activities that seem to add up to some form of delinquent lifestyle or subculture, we can use some additional information concerning 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.

The results of an analysis on activities and time spent with friends are summarized in Figure 4.18 and Tables 4.19-20. Two points are noteworthy. First, those who have a high delinquency score do tend to socialize more often in places such as illegal gambling stalls, karaoke parlours, dance halls and billiards halls, and electronic games centres. Those with low delinquency scores, on the other hand, give a wider range of locations for socializing with friends but cite electronic games centres, etc., much less often (Table 4.19). One example shows the strength of this trend: 55% of those with a delinquency score of 20 or above say they socialize with friends (at least some of the time) around illegal gambling stalls; only 9% of those with a score of 1-4, and 5% of those with a score of zero, socialize around such stalls. Second, while some young people clearly spend a great deal of time with their friends engaging in ordinary pursuits, 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.

One further set of data is also relevant at this point. Scrutiny of the available data on delinquency and relationships with friends (Figure 4.21) shows that higher problem behaviour

---

[12]. This should not, however, be taken to mean that delinquents do not use such places. The reason why they do not appear in the factors more closely linked to delinquency reflects the respective distributions of delinquent acts (with most acts committed by a small proportion of young people) and such leisure activities (simply going to these places is fairly widespread). We can, on the basis of Table 4.19, draw a distinction between simply going to electronic games centres etc. and 'hanging out' or socializing with friends there, with the latter being more common for delinquents.

and delinquency scores are in general associated with:

- being happiest associating with a girlfriend (for boys) or a street gang in one's spare time[13]

- for problem behaviour, having a large number of friends (7 or more); and for delinquency either having 7 or more friends *or* having no friends (the summary statistics in Figure 4.21 do not show this, but the relationship between delinquency and number of friends is U-shaped)

- being likely to have first met one's friends in recreational centres such as billiards rooms, or on the street

- for problem behaviour, being more likely to socialize with friends at gambling stalls, billiards or dance houses, and electronic games centres; higher levels of delinquency are associated primarily with gambling and billiards/dance centres, and only secondarily with karaoke and electronic games centres.

- higher levels of both problem behaviour and delinquency are associated with being more likely to evaluate one's friends as adventurous, daring, having a strong group allegiance, and being rich and welcoming. Higher problem behaviour and delinquency scores are also associated with evaluations of the relationship with friends as getting benefit from them; mutual manipulation; having common interests; and 'other'. Lower scores were associated with 'they are good to me', 'I care for them', and mutual help.[14]

What, then, is the overall picture that these data draw? In many respects it describes a situation similar to that outlined in previous research. 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), describe their friends as a 'street gang', and see those friends perhaps in a slightly cynical light.

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. This is the 'subculture' referred to at the beginning of this

---

[13]. Though interestingly, while there were significant correlations between problem behaviour and delinquency, and spending time with a street gang, there was no relationship between problem behaviour, delinquency, and the proportion of friends who were identified as triads.

[14]. Details of the available responses from which these choices were made are given in the key to Figure 4.21.

section. However, three cautions need to be mentioned. First, some delinquents do not participate in this subculture; the finding that higher rates of delinquency for males are correlated not only with having many friends, but also at the other end of the scale with having no friends, clearly indicates that there is more than one pathway to delinquency. Second, many of the items discussed above, taken individually, have at best a moderate association with delinquency. Moreover, many of them are activities that we would expect most young people to engage in to some extent; it is only those who spend most of their leisure time doing these things who turn out to have high delinquency scores. And third, the picture we have drawn thus far addresses associations between factors rather than causes. The fact that problem behaviour and delinquency are both associated with meeting one's friends in particular locales, such as electronic games centres, does not mean that going to such places leads young people into problem behaviour and then to delinquency. As we have already seen in Chapter 3, if young people become involved in delinquency this typically either pre-dates or comes around the same time as their problem behaviour. It is thus conceivable that the normal sequence of events is the reverse of our normal assumptions, that is, once a young delinquent enters into a lifestyle that includes problem behaviour, he or she is more likely to hang around places such as electronic games centres where other sympathetic young people may congregate - and this would explain the kind of situation seen in many such places, where large numbers of young people use such places, perhaps on a regular and frequent basis, but not usually for more than one or two hours at a time, while a small core of delinquents spend a large part of their leisure time hanging out there together.

In consequence, while our data would be consistent with differential association theory it could also be seen as consistent with a 'labelling' perspective. Individuals may fall in with a 'bad crowd', hang around electronic games centres, and become involved in delinquency; but it is equally plausible that young people who are delinquent, and have time on their hands (perhaps because of truancy) find that crowd and those activities more congenial, or at least accessible. There can be, in short, an attraction towards such settings and people; a lack of realistic alternatives; and an element of allowing oneself to be led - perhaps knowingly, if one reflects on it - into a lifestyle which incorporates (further) delinquency.

4.7 Attitudes

It is often suggested that young people with a track record of delinquency have different attitudes towards family obligations, the police, and the law than do 'normal' young people, while their involvement in a delinquent subculture may affect their views on the seriousness of crimes. Accordingly we collected data on young people's attitudes, the factor analyses for which are reproduced as Figures 4.22 to 4.24. In essence, we presented respondents with 16 statements about parents, the criminal

justice system, and law; they were asked to state whether they thought these statements were true.[15] In addition we presented respondents with a list of 20 offenses and asked them to rate their seriousness on an 11-point scale.[16]

For the questions concerning family, criminal justice, and law, a factor analysis using three factors accounted for 47% of the variance.[17] In essence the three factors were:

Factor C1#1: this tapped views about whether the Hong Kong criminal justice system (laws, magistrates and judges, police) is fair.

Factor C1#2: this tapped views about filial and parental obligations.

Factor C1#3: perhaps the most interesting of the three factors, this tapped feelings of how immediately relevant or distant individuals felt the law was to their lives.

There were some minor differences between males and females in their perceptions of the seriousness of particular offenses, but in essence the three factors in each case tapped views about fairly similar classes of offence:[18]

SFC2#1/SMC2#1: these essentially dealt with 'ordinary' property crime.

SFC2#2/SMC2#2: these factors loaded mainly onto 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: for both males and females this factor comprised three non-violent, fraudulent, offenses which do not directly harm identifiable victims: practising as a lawyer without a license,

---

[15]. The response options were: true all the time, most of the time, sometimes, seldom, or never.

[16]. The list was intended to reflect violent, property, and 'white collar' crimes of differing levels of seriousness and prevalence.

[17]. This analysis was based on the total sample (males and females, school-TI-YC and offenders). There were no significant differences between males and females.

[18]. The percentage of variance explained by three factors was the same for males and females: 59%.

providing false tax returns, and selling stolen goods.

The extent to which these factors are associated with delinquency can be seen in Figure 4.24.

For females, the key attitudinal factors are C1#3 (relevance of law) and SFC2#1 (attitudes to property crimes). The former is based on a scale in which higher scores indicate the statements are less often true, but all the items loading onto C1#3 are statements in which disagreement (i.e. high scores) indicate law-abiding attitudes. Hence the negative correlations mean that the less relevant individuals feel law is to their lives, the more they are likely to have been involved in delinquency and problem behaviour. The latter factor, SFC2#1, loads mainly on property crime; higher scores indicate perceptions of the offenses being more serious and all the factor loadings are positive. Thus the negative correlation here means that those females who are more involved in delinquency see property crime as less serious.

For males the situation is slightly more complex. The relationship between delinquency and C1#3 remains as for the females, that is, feeling that the law is less relevant correlates with higher levels of delinquency and problem behaviour. However, all of the SMC2 factors have some relationship with subsets of delinquency measures. SMC2#1, ratings of property crime as serious, are negatively correlated with problem behaviour but not delinquency. Meanwhile, SMC2#2 (ratings of violent crime) loaded negatively in the factor analysis; hence the positive correlation means that those who see violent crime as less serious are more likely to have been involved in delinquency.

Finally, the attitudinal data faces the same problem as the data on leisure activities; do delinquent attitudes cause delinquent behaviour, does becoming delinquent change one's attitudes, or are both true? This question will be discussed further in Chapter 5.

4.8 Informal and formal social control: were they caught?

We would, other things being equal, expect that young people who are caught engaging in delinquent acts would find it an uncomfortable experience, though perhaps one with complex effects on future delinquency. Some may desist from at least some future delinquency; others, perhaps those with a longer track record of delinquency or who somehow have less to lose by being delinquent and less to gain by conformity, might react in the opposite way, rebelling against attempts to impose authority and committing further delinquent acts.

It is not possible to test these contentions through our school-TI-YC self-report data, but it is important to record one fact: 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, as indicated above, 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.

It is true that these data do not give us any indication of what was said or done by parents or other family members when the young person was caught.[19] 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 continue to monitor their younger members and do not simply allow them to go their own way.

4.9 Summary and discussion

In this chapter we have identified a number of factors that appear on the face of it to be associated with delinquency. In summary, higher rates of delinquency appear to be associated with:

---

[19]. Although we asked respondents to indicate what they thought parents would do if they caught them engaging in particular delinquent acts it remains unclear how parents did actually react if or when they caught their children in such acts. We have to bear in mind that in the school-TI-YC sample most respondents had *not* engaged in the most of the acts for which this data was provided, and hypothetical questions tend not to generate very reliable answers. Only where delinquents had in fact been caught is the data likely to be more reliable.

- less frequent contact with parents. This leads to the unanticipated and unusual situation that those who see their parents less often, and who show higher rates of delinquency, are more likely to come from both ends of the social spectrum rather than the middle. That is, they tend to be the children of families where fathers are professional or non-manual workers, where the father appears not be employed, or where there are other unusual circumstances such as elderly (for instance retired) parents with adolescent children.

- anti-school attitudes were related to delinquency; but so too were perceptions that the school, and classmates, treated the individual negatively. However, delinquents were just as likely as others to assess their own class ranking and school as average, despite evaluating the school negatively.

- delinquents typically spent more time away from the home than others; they led a more sociable lifestyle, but their leisure activities were more firmly rooted in a range of 'disreputable' places, primarily illegal gambling stalls, karaoke parlours, electronic games centres and billiards or dance halls. They were often happiest when in the company of comrades in a street gang (but, interestingly, not necessarily with persons they identified as triads). They had often met these friends in the places where they spent their leisure time. While they assessed their friends as adventurous and daring there was also a cynical side to their friendships, which they often described as 'mutual manipulation'.

- despite the comments above, our data suggest that there is also a (small) group of 'loners' who reported having no friends. Their delinquency may be caused by factors different to those that seem to apply generally.

- despite the widely-held view that families in contemporary Hong Kong have difficulty in controlling their younger members, or take too little interest in them, it did appear that delinquency as well as problem behaviour was very often detected by the family. What families then did about it remains unknown.

The points above simply note the kinds of associations between factors that our data show. They say nothing about causality. In each case there is a question of 'which came first'? For example it may be that in some cases, young people may become involved in delinquency through a chain of events that starts with negative perceptions of school; yet in others, it may be that the schools act negatively towards students they have identified as delinquents, thus creating a vicious cycle of disaffection with school which, mediated through a number of other factors, may lead indirectly to (further) delinquency. The same can be said of the young people's leisure patterns. It is clear that a 'subculture' of leisure exists, built around extensive peer

socializing in 'disreputable' places such as electronic games centres. Yet it would be a mistake to assume on the basis of correlations alone that 'differential association' is the operative explanation. It is equally if not more plausible to suggest that some kind of labelling effect is at work. Young people who gravitate towards such a lifestyle may do so because their track record of delinquency has already closed off other options and other kinds of friends, while spending large amounts of leisure time in such places marks them out as disreputable individuals.

This chapter has, then, described patterns of behaviour that correlate with delinquency, but also opened up a series of questions about its social causes. The following chapter, relying partly on a series of multiple regressions and partly on interpretative model-building, offers a concrete explanation for delinquency.

Figure 4.1 Summary of relationships between socio-economic variables and selected measures of delinquency (males)
Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Male
T-test of equal mean & variance: one-way analysis of variance

Criterion variable #280 Father's occupation

Variable	P value	Variable	P value
#384 Problem behaviour ever count	0.5549	#385 Problem behaviour last year count	0.5926
#390 Delinquency ever count	0.3768	#391 Delinquency last year count	0.0762
#467 Problem behaviour score	0.1965	#468 Delinquency score	0.1030
#480 SM B4 Factor #1	0.5888	#481 SM B4 Factor #2	0.0313*
#482 SM B4 Factor #3	0.5930		

Criterion variable #278 Father's education

Variable	P value	Variable	P value
#384 Problem behaviour ever count	0.2617	#385 Problem behaviour last year count	0.4694
#390 Delinquency ever count	0.1462	#391 Delinquency last year count	0.0686
#467 Problem behaviour score	0.5201	#468 Delinquency score	0.0705
#480 SM B4 Factor #1	0.7080	#481 SM B4 Factor #2	0.2336
#482 SM B4 Factor #3	0.0001**		

Criterion variable #281 Mother's occupation

Variable	P value	Variable	P value
#384 Problem behaviour ever count	0.3348	#385 Problem behaviour last year count	0.3215
#390 Delinquency ever count	0.7389	#391 Delinquency last year count	0.9830
#467 Problem behaviour score	0.2245	#468 Delinquency score	0.4645
#480 SM B4 Factor #1	0.3627	#481 SM B4 Factor #2	0.0569
#482 SM B4 Factor #3	0.9928		

Criterion variable #279 Mother's education

Variable	P value	Variable	P value
#384 Problem behaviour ever count	0.0542	#385 Problem behaviour last year count	0.3289
#390 Delinquency ever count	0.0532	#391 Delinquency last year count	0.0511
#467 Problem behaviour score	0.0087**	#468 Delinquency score	0.0037**
#480 SM B4 Factor #1	0.0455*	#481 SM B4 Factor #2	0.0031**
#482 SM B4 Factor #3	0.0004**		

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

Figure 4.2 Summary of relationships between socio-economic variables and selected measures of delinquency (females)
Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Female
T-test of equal mean & variance: one-way analysis of variance

Criterion variable #280 Father's occupation

Variable	P value	Variable	P value
#384 Problem behaviour ever count	0.1258	#385 Problem behaviour last year count	0.4619
#390 Delinquency ever count	0.1528	#391 Delinquency last year count	0.1528
#467 Problem behaviour score	0.4863	#468 Delinquency score	0.2998
#477 SF B4 Factor #1	0.2209	#478 SF B4 Factor #2	0.2330
#479 SF B4 Factor #3	0.3994		

Criterion variable #278 Father's education

Variable	P value	Variable	P value
#384 Problem behaviour ever count	0.3828	#385 Problem behaviour last year count	0.2698
#390 Delinquency ever count	0.8726	#391 Delinquency last year count	0.9011
#467 Problem behaviour score	0.3290	#468 Delinquency score	0.8256
#477 SF B4 Factor #1	0.4939	#478 SF B4 Factor #2	0.8501
#479 SF B4 Factor #3	0.0069**		

Criterion variable #281 Mother's occupation

Variable	P value	Variable	P value
#384 Problem behaviour ever count	0.0663	#385 Problem behaviour last year count	0.3204
#390 Delinquency ever count	0.6579	#391 Delinquency last year count	0.8636
#467 Problem behaviour score	0.1755	#468 Delinquency score	0.8783
#477 SF B4 Factor #1	0.1131	#478 SF B4 Factor #2	0.1181
#479 SF B4 Factor #3	0.0989		

Criterion variable #279 Mother's education

Variable	P value	Variable	P value
#384 Problem behaviour ever count	0.3004	#385 Problem behaviour last year count	0.4743
#390 Delinquency ever count	0.2271	#391 Delinquency last year count	0.2915
#467 Problem behaviour score	0.4337	#468 Delinquency score	0.3278
#477 SF B4 Factor #1	0.4861	#478 SF B4 Factor #2	0.7324
#479 SF B4 Factor #3	0.4274		

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

Table 4.3 Father's occupation and variable #391 delinquency last year count (males)
Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Male
T-test of equal mean & variance: one-way analysis of variance

		Delinquency last year count			
Father's occupation	Level	Count	Mean	Std Dev	Variance
Professional/senior executive	1	90	1.278	1.558	2.401
Non-manual	2	224	1.33	1.905	3.614
Manual	3	550	0.9945	1.737	3.013
Homemaker	4	83	1.229	1.755	3.044
Retired	5	36	0.8056	1.091	1.157
Others	6	68	0.8529	1.225	1.478
Total		1051	1.093	1.72	2.956

One-Way Analysis of Variance

Variation	SS	DF	MS	
Explained	29.45	5	5.89	F=2.00 P val=0.0762
Residual	3077	1045	2.945	
Total	3107	1050		

Note: 'delinquency last year count' is the number of different kinds of delinquent acts committed within the last year.

Table 4.4 Mother's education and variable #468 delinquency score (males)
Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Male
T-test of equal mean & variance: one-way analysis of variance

		Delinquency score			
Mother's education	Level	Count	Mean	Std Dev	Variance
Tertiary (degree)	1	30	10.55	12.84	159.3
Tertiary (not degree)	2	16	13.38	21.46	431.6
Matriculated	3	61	6.344	10.43	106.9
Secondary	4	367	6.352	7.342	53.75
Primary	5	508	6.434	7.735	59.71
KG or less	6	73	7.188	9.888	96.43
Total		1055	6.675	8.523	72.58

One-Way Analysis of Variance

Variation	SS	DF	MS	
Explained	1263	5	252.7	F=3.52 P val=0.0037
Residual	7.531e+004	1049	71.79	
Total	7.657e+004	1054		

Note: 'Delinquency score' is a score based on the total number of delinquent acts reported by respondants as ever having been committed

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 ariable #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

		#468 Delinquency score			
F6B:1 Father/often	Level	Count	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	
Explained	2015	2	1008	F=15.18 P val=0.0000
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

		#468 Delinquency score			
F6B:1 Mother/often	Level	Count	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	
Explained	3350	2	1675	F=26.72 P val=0.0000
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

		#468 Delinquency score			
F6B:1 Father/often	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	
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		

Table 4.9 Association between father's occupation and frequency of seeing father (males)
Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Male
(Count/Row %/Column %)

Father's occupation		#297 F6B:1 Father/often: More often than: Once a day (1)	Once a week (2)	Once a month (3)	Row Total
Professional/senior executive	1:	59	17	4	80
		73.8	21.3	5.0	
		7.5	19.1	7.3	8.6
Non-manual	2:	163	25	13	201
		81.1	12.4	6.5	
		20.6	28.1	23.6	21.5
Manual	3:	437	33	27	497
		87.9	6.6	5.4	
		55.3	37.1	49.1	53.2
Homemaker	4:	59	8	3	70
		84.3	11.4	4.3	
		7.5	9.0	5.5	7.5
Retired	5:	28	3	1	32
		87.5	9.4	3.1	
		3.5	3.4	1.8	3.4
Others	6:	44	3	7	54
		81.5	5.6	13.0	
		5.6	3.4	12.7	5.8
Column Total	:	790	89	55	934

Chi-sq=26.7 Degrees of Freedom=10 P value=0.0029

Table 4.10 Association between father's occupation and frequency of seeing father (females)
Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Female
(Count/Row %/Column %)

Father's occupation		#297 F6B:1 Father/often: More often than: Once a day (1)	Once a week (2)	Once a month (3)	Row Total
Professional/senior executive	1:	63	10	6	79
		79.7	12.7	7.6	
		7.7	11.6	9.1	8.1
Non-manual	2:	140	21	11	172
		81.4	12.2	6.4	
		17.1	24.4	16.7	17.7
Manual	3:	437	37	31	505
		86.5	7.3	6.1	
		53.4	43.0	47.0	52.0
Homemaker	4:	86	6	7	99
		86.9	6.1	7.1	
		10.5	7.0	10.6	10.2
Retired	5:	43		2	45
		95.6		4.4	
		5.3		3.0	4.6
Others	6:	50	12	9	71
		70.4	16.9	12.7	
		6.1	14.0	13.6	7.3
Column Total	:	819	86	66	971

Chi-sq=22.3 Degrees of Freedom=10 P value=0.0136

Figure 4.11 Association between time spent with family and time spent with friends
Nonparametric program

Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Female

Variable #371 G10a Hrs out with friends and

#297 F6B:1 Father/often: Spearmans correlation=0.0293 Degrees of freedom=981 P value=0.3591
#298 F6B:2 Mother/often: Spearmans correlation=0.0863 Degrees of freedom=1035 P value=0.0054

Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Male

Variable #371 G10a Hrs out with friends and

#297 F6B:1 Father/often: Spearmans correlation=0.0371 Degrees of freedom=928 P value=0.2581
#298 F6B:2 Mother/often: Spearmans correlation=0.0294 Degrees of freedom=939 P value=0.3681

Figure 4.12 Summary of principal component analyses, attitudes to school and schoolmates
Principal component analysis
Values between +/-0.4 removed for clarity

Attitudes to school: rotated factor matrix (4 factors)
Sample base: all cases, male and female (2617 cases)

Variable	Factor A2# 1	2	3	4
A2:1 Lessons are interesting for me	0.47	.	0.48	.
A2:2 Lessons are difficult for me	.	.	-0.65	.
A2:3 Lessons are useful for later life	0.52	.	.	.
A2:4 Teachers have clear rules they expect me to keep	0.69	.	.	.
A2:5 Teachers are friendly towards me	0.65	.	.	.
A2:6 Teachers expect a lot of work from me	.	.	.	.
A2:7 Teachers help me when I experience difficulty	0.61	.	.	.
A2:8 Teachers are interested in me as a person	0.66	.	.	-0.42
A2:9 Teachers are fair to me	0.63	.	.	.
A2:10 Teachers show disapproval when I do work poorly	.	0.84	.	.
A2:11 Teachers show disapproval when I behave badly in class	.	0.84	.	.
A2:12 Teachers show approval when I do my work properly	.	.	.	-0.86
A2:13 Teachers show approval when I behave well	.	.	.	-0.85
A2:14 School tests are in English	.	.	0.51	.
A2:15 I have difficulty in English	.	.	-0.70	.

Cumulative % of variance explained by 4 factors: 55.067%

Attitudes to schoolmates: rotated factor matrix (2 factors)
Sample base: all cases, male and female (2595 cases)

Variable	A3 Factor # 1	2
A3:1 There are students in my class who like me	0.59	.
A3:2 There are students in my class who help me	0.68	.
A3:3 There are students in my class who trust me	0.67	.
A3:4 There are students in my class who telephone me	0.59	.
A3:5 There are students in my class who ignore me	.	0.59
A3:6 There are students in my class who dislike me	.	0.57
A3:7 There are students in my class who tease me	.	0.55
A3:8 There are students in my class who bully me	.	0.50
A3:9 There are students in my class whom I like	0.62	.
A3:10 There are students in my class whom I help	0.60	.
A3:11 There are students in my class whom I trust	0.65	.
A3:12 There are students in my class whom I telephone	0.61	.
A3:13 There are students in my class whom I ignore	.	0.71
A3:14 There are students in my class whom I dislike	.	0.66
A3:15 There are students in my class whom I tease	.	0.58
A3:16 There are students in my class whom I bully	.	0.53

Cumulative % of variance explained by 2 factors: 39.707%

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	-0.071	-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 4.14 Correlations between leisure activities and selected measures of delinquency (females)

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	SFB4#1	SFB4#2	SFB4#3
G1:1 Read newsp	-0.114	-0.119	-0.079	-0.084	-0.129	-0.088	-0.114	0.056	-0.025
G1:2 Read comic	0.148	0.157	0.179	0.147	0.139	0.151	0.151	-0.113	-0.077
G1:3 Read magaz	0.163	0.132	0.133	0.097	0.136	0.104	0.159	-0.007	-0.082
G1:4 Read schoo	-0.159	-0.171	-0.179	-0.162	-0.186	-0.172	-0.184	0.106	0.007
G1:5 Watch TV	0.101	0.044	0.137	0.077	0.093	0.105	0.097	-0.100	-0.079
G1:6 Watch vide	0.137	0.098	0.156	0.087	0.140	0.133	0.144	-0.108	-0.036
G1:7 Listen radi	0.098	0.057	0.104	0.063	0.088	0.075	0.096	-0.045	-0.057
G1:8 Listen hifi	0.168	0.134	0.188	0.140	0.173	0.153	0.175	-0.106	-0.041
G1:9 Play music	-0.015	-0.042	0.033	0.012	-0.011	0.003	-0.016	-0.038	0.023
G1:10 Use compu	-0.043	-0.028	0.031	0.030	-0.005	0.034	-0.019	-0.105	-0.009
G1:11 Play kara	0.189	0.160	0.199	0.106	0.190	0.165	0.177	-0.189	-0.008
G1:12 Play card	0.125	0.086	0.175	0.105	0.144	0.140	0.133	-0.145	-0.031
G1:13 Other hob	-0.050	-0.092	0.039	-0.022	-0.028	0.026	-0.026	-0.046	0.004
G1:14 Household	-0.043	-0.101	0.006	-0.062	-0.055	-0.032	-0.041	0.029	-0.043
G1:15 Study	-0.152	-0.188	-0.140	-0.126	-0.176	-0.132	-0.168	0.085	0.036
G1:16 Sleep/rest	0.074	0.062	0.065	0.028	0.088	0.049	0.087	-0.011	-0.007
G1:17 Watch movie	0.149	0.114	0.160	0.110	0.155	0.130	0.147	-0.125	0.039
G1:18 TV centre	0.364	0.331	0.355	0.279	0.387	0.312	0.357	-0.284	0.103
G1:19 Public pl	0.231	0.175	0.207	0.158	0.227	0.187	0.227	-0.122	0.004
G1:20 Loiter	0.323	0.285	0.328	0.270	0.340	0.309	0.336	-0.214	0.008
G1:21 Mass game	0.116	0.050	0.161	0.081	0.100	0.125	0.100	-0.130	0.019
G1:22 Chatting	0.207	0.179	0.211	0.162	0.205	0.193	0.204	-0.116	0.029
G1:23 Chat phone	0.283	0.263	0.251	0.212	0.280	0.248	0.282	-0.138	0.002
G1:24 Mahjong	0.243	0.217	0.264	0.224	0.252	0.245	0.242	-0.207	0.031
G1:25 Gambling	0.191	0.161	0.194	0.143	0.230	0.184	0.216	-0.099	0.099
G1:26 Religous	-0.045	-0.065	-0.017	-0.014	-0.048	-0.022	-0.047	0.002	-0.038
G1:27 Organised	-0.015	-0.055	0.002	-0.030	-0.016	-0.019	-0.028	-0.004	0.094
G1:28 Night sch	0.038	0.025	0.003	0.043	0.026	-0.001	0.029	0.014	0.003
G1:29 Eating ou	0.207	0.195	0.167	0.141	0.211	0.156	0.207	-0.102	-0.008
G1:30 Drink pub	0.225	0.180	0.229	0.178	0.220	0.197	0.216	-0.161	0.011
G1:31 Tattoo	-0.016	-0.028	0.027	0.022	-0.023	0.004	-0.023	-0.062	-0.030
G1:32 Drug abus	0.079	0.030	0.149	0.084	0.091	0.154	0.066	-0.217	0.197
G1:33 Smoking	0.382	0.400	0.356	0.316	0.442	0.384	0.398	-0.315	0.244
G1:34 Ball game	0.004	-0.044	0.040	-0.021	-0.025	-0.003	-0.024	-0.043	-0.021
G1:35 Other spo	-0.014	-0.061	0.045	-0.020	-0.037	0.005	-0.028	-0.051	-0.047
G1:36 Camping	0.073	0.050	0.106	0.054	0.075	0.052	0.076	-0.039	-0.008
G1:37 Other out	0.034	-0.018	0.065	0.028	0.022	0.050	0.024	-0.052	0.026

Notes:
- G1:38 ('other') omitted due to large numbers of missing values
- values greater than +/-0.200 underlined for clarity

Figure 4.15 Correlations between leisure activities and selected measures of delinquency (males)

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	SMB4#1	SMB4#2	SMB4#3
G1:1 Read newsp	-0.034	-0.052	-0.063	-0.049	-0.035	-0.067	-0.035	-0.042	-0.009
G1:2 Read comic	0.129	0.135	0.203	0.163	0.162	0.205	0.102	0.151	-0.117
G1:3 Read magaz	0.142	0.129	0.169	0.167	0.150	0.178	0.106	0.116	-0.129
G1:4 Read schoo	-0.112	-0.150	-0.096	-0.111	-0.131	-0.094	-0.105	-0.046	0.078
G1:5 Watch TV	-0.014	-0.030	0.061	0.059	-0.001	0.059	-0.021	0.061	-0.011
G1:6 Watch vide	0.056	0.041	0.140	0.140	0.077	0.149	0.022	0.129	-0.102
G1:7 Listen radio	0.050	0.021	0.070	0.055	0.057	0.078	0.035	0.042	-0.081
G1:8 Listen hifi	0.099	0.103	0.116	0.111	0.113	0.135	0.107	0.028	-0.130
G1:9 Play music	0.029	-0.026	0.102	0.112	0.024	0.115	-0.049	0.097	-0.222
G1:10 Use compu	-0.017	-0.006	0.051	0.079	-0.015	0.071	-0.040	0.033	-0.135
G1:11 Play kara	0.113	0.118	0.165	0.189	0.138	0.167	0.072	0.098	-0.222
G1:12 Play card	0.082	0.070	0.166	0.188	0.108	0.194	0.027	0.184	-0.123
G1:13 Other hob	-0.004	-0.052	0.043	0.066	-0.003	0.052	-0.052	0.103	-0.037
G1:14 Household	-0.063	-0.079	0.032	0.061	-0.064	0.025	-0.111	0.100	-0.029
G1:15 Study	-0.057	-0.098	-0.066	-0.069	-0.075	-0.055	-0.068	-0.018	0.020
G1:16 Sleep/res	0.024	0.002	0.062	0.038	0.048	0.057	0.018	0.061	-0.027
G1:17 Watch mov	0.112	0.054	0.100	0.062	0.127	0.107	0.062	0.140	-0.043
G1:18 TV centre	0.252	0.245	0.286	0.254	0.278	0.293	0.204	0.211	-0.147
G1:19 Public place	0.118	0.094	0.174	0.163	0.157	0.177	0.108	0.129	-0.090
G1:20 Loiter	0.263	0.270	0.291	0.286	0.320	0.296	0.244	0.210	-0.134
G1:21 Mass game	0.083	0.039	0.175	0.128	0.096	0.166	0.024	0.169	-0.110
G1:22 Chatting	0.176	0.157	0.196	0.169	0.196	0.204	0.133	0.149	-0.127
G1:23 Chat phone	0.157	0.151	0.141	0.143	0.170	0.155	0.141	0.065	-0.123
G1:24 Mahjong	0.182	0.178	0.284	0.313	0.228	0.327	0.106	0.284	-0.209
G1:25 Gambling	0.205	0.184	0.323	0.325	0.261	0.353	0.138	0.277	-0.257
G1:26 Religous	0.064	-0.002	0.118	0.097	0.080	0.116	0.028	0.129	-0.054
G1:27 Organised	-0.024	-0.050	0.053	0.053	-0.025	0.016	-0.048	0.050	-0.038
G1:28 Night sch	0.069	0.060	0.104	0.117	0.080	0.099	0.057	0.076	-0.052
G1:29 Eating ou	0.152	0.105	0.202	0.127	0.179	0.205	0.116	0.146	-0.143
G1:30 Drink pub	0.178	0.143	0.248	0.191	0.195	0.246	0.129	0.181	-0.137
G1:31 Tattoo	0.063	0.056	0.172	0.193	0.063	0.153	-0.001	0.168	-0.092
G1:32 Drug abus	0.109	0.085	0.294	0.316	0.141	0.326	-0.017	0.349	-0.248
G1:33 Smoking	0.349	0.345	0.430	0.395	0.412	0.442	0.263	0.375	-0.224
G1:34 Ball game	0.024	0.039	0.062	0.070	0.036	0.046	0.020	0.038	-0.020
G1:35 Other spo	0.012	-0.031	0.092	0.094	0.021	0.090	-0.024	0.100	-0.072
G1:36 Camping	0.023	0.004	0.151	0.166	0.017	0.143	-0.060	0.149	-0.179
G1:37 Other out	0.047	0.009	0.147	0.120	0.037	0.149	-0.028	0.156	-0.113

Notes:
- G1:38 ('other') omitted due to large numbers of missing values
- values greater than 0.200 underlined for clarity

Figure 4.16 Principal component analysis, leisure activities
Sample base: School-TI-YC, males and females
Analysis uses 2059 cases
Rotated factor matrix (5 factors, values less than +/-0.4 removed for clarity)

Variable	Factor G1# 1	2	3	4	5
G1:1 Read newspapers	.	.	0.52	.	.
G1:2 Read comics	0.62	.	.	.	.
G1:3 Read magazines	0.53	.	.	.	.
G1:4 Read school books	.	.	0.78	.	.
G1:5 Watch TV	0.47	.	.	.	.
G1:6 Watch video	0.66	.	.	.	.
G1:7 Listen to radio	0.51	.	.	.	.
G1:8 Listen to hifi	0.57	.	.	.	.
G1:9 Play musical instrument	0.42	.	.	.	.
G1:10 Use computer	0.50	.	.	.	.
G1:11 Play karaoke	0.51	.	.	.	.
G1:12 Play cards/chess	0.49	.	.	.	.
G1:13 Other hobbies	.	.	.	-0.42	.
G1:14 Household chores	.	.	0.45	.	.
G1:15 Study	.	.	0.76	.	.
G1:16 Sleep/rest	.	.	.	.	.
G1:17 Watch movie	0.47	.	.	.	.
G1:18 TV centre	0.48	.	.	.	.
G1:19 Go to public place	.	.	.	.	0.64
G1:20 Loiter	.	0.47	.	.	0.40
G1:21 Mass games	.	.	.	-0.50	.
G1:22 Chatting	.	.	.	.	0.69
G1:23 Chatting on phone	.	.	.	.	0.72
G1:24 Mahjong	.	0.53	.	.	.
G1:25 Gambling	.	0.54	.	.	.
G1:26 Religous activities	.	.	.	.	.
G1:27 Organised youth activiti	.	.	.	-0.53	.
G1:28 Night school	.	0.61	.	.	.
G1:29 Eating outside	.	.	.	.	0.63
G1:30 Drink pubs/lounges	.	.	.	.	0.67
G1:31 Tattoo	.	0.79	.	.	.
G1:32 Drug abuse	.	0.80	.	.	.
G1:33 Smoking	.	0.62	.	.	.
G1:34 Ball games	.	.	.	-0.68	.
G1:35 Other sports	.	.	.	-0.76	.
G1:36 Camping	.	.	.	-0.57	.
G1:37 Other outdoor	.	.	.	-0.72	.

Variable G1:38 'Other' not included in analysis.
Cumulative % of variation explained by 5 factors: 48.139%.

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

Figure 4.18 Summary of correlations between leisure activities and time spent with friends

Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Female

Variable #371 G10a Hrs out with friends and

	Spearmans correlation	Degrees of freedom	P value
#325 G1:1 Read newspapers	-0.0207	1135	0.4847
#326 G1:2 Read comics	0.1158	1135	0.0001**
#327 G1:3 Read magazines	0.0723	1134	0.0148*
#328 G1:4 Read school books	-0.1083	1133	0.0003**
#329 G1:5 Watch TV	0.0835	1131	0.0049**
#330 G1:6 Watch video	0.1179	1131	0.0001**
#331 G1:7 Listen to radio	0.1217	1136	0.0000**
#332 G1:8 Listen to hifi	0.2071	1134	0.0000**
#333 G1:9 Play musical instrument	0.0489	1132	0.1000*
#334 G1:10 Use computer	0.0279	1132	0.3472
#335 G1:11 Play karaoke	0.1870	1133	0.0000**
#336 G1:12 Play cards/chess	0.0990	1135	0.0008**
#337 G1:13 Other hobbies	-0.0415	1126	0.1633
#338 G1:14 Household chores	0.0317	1134	0.2861
#339 G1:15 Study	-0.0891	1135	0.0027**
#340 G1:16 Sleep/rest	0.0775	1135	0.0089**
#341 G1:17 Watch movie	0.1590	1136	0.0000**
#342 G1:18 TV centre	0.1878	1135	0.0000**
#343 G1:19 Go to public place	0.2300	1132	0.0000**
#344 G1:20 Loiter	0.1403	1132	0.0000**
#345 G1:21 Mass games	0.1001	1135	0.0007**
#346 G1:22 Chatting	0.2496	1135	0.0000**
#347 G1:23 Chatting on phone	0.3147	1134	0.0000**
#348 G1:24 Mahjong	0.1619	1132	0.0000**
#349 G1:25 Gambling	0.0400	1123	0.1802
#350 G1:26 Religous activities	-0.0365	1131	0.2195
#351 G1:27 Organised youth activities	-0.0009	1131	0.9758
#352 G1:28 Night school	0.0577	1130	0.0524
#353 G1:29 Eating outside	0.1500	1132	0.0000**
#354 G1:30 Drink pubs/lounges	0.2232	1134	0.0000**
#355 G1:31 Tattoo	0.0090	1135	0.7630
#356 G1:32 Drug abuse	0.0423	1133	0.1540
#357 G1:33 Smoking	0.1504	1134	0.0000**
#358 G1:34 Ball games	0.0538	1135	0.0695
#359 G1:35 Other sports	0.0692	1132	0.0197*
#360 G1:36 Camping	0.0918	1134	0.0019**
#361 G1:37 Other outdoor	0.1211	1127	0.0000**
#362 G1:38 Other	0.0517	803	0.1427

Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Male

Variable #371 G10a Hrs out with friends and

	Spearmans correlation	Degrees of freedom	P value
#325 G1:1 Read newspapers	-0.0028	1056	0.9264
#326 G1:2 Read comics	0.1722	1055	0.0000**
#327 G1:3 Read magazines	0.0587	1052	0.0567
#328 G1:4 Read school books	-0.1301	1050	0.0000**
#329 G1:5 Watch TV	0.0289	1056	0.3472
#330 G1:6 Watch video	0.1156	1050	0.0002**
#331 G1:7 Listen to radio	0.0834	1055	0.0067**
#332 G1:8 Listen to hifi	0.1631	1054	0.0000**
#333 G1:9 Play musical instrument	-0.0143	1051	0.6427
#334 G1:10 Use computer	0.0275	1053	0.3719
#335 G1:11 Play karaoke	0.1690	1051	0.0000**
#336 G1:12 Play cards/chess	0.1157	1051	0.0002**
#337 G1:13 Other hobbies	0.0224	1051	0.4679
#338 G1:14 Household chores	-0.0286	1049	0.3542
#339 G1:15 Study	-0.0906	1053	0.0032**
#340 G1:16 Sleep/rest	0.0629	1054	0.0411
#341 G1:17 Watch movie	0.1920	1054	0.0000**
#342 G1:18 TV centre	0.1978	1054	0.0000**
#343 G1:19 Go to public place	0.1420	1053	0.0000**
#344 G1:20 Loiter	0.1985	1051	0.0000**
#345 G1:21 Mass games	0.1397	1054	0.0000**
#346 G1:22 Chatting	0.2038	1051	0.0000**
#347 G1:23 Chatting on phone	0.1582	1054	0.0000**
#348 G1:24 Mahjong	0.1696	1052	0.0000**
#349 G1:25 Gambling	0.1295	1035	0.0000**
#350 G1:26 Religous activities	-0.0458	1053	0.1372
#351 G1:27 Organised youth activities	-0.0036	1052	0.9074
#352 G1:28 Night school	0.0386	1052	0.2105
#353 G1:29 Eating outside	0.1510	1055	0.0000**
#354 G1:30 Drink pubs/lounges	0.2247	1050	0.0000**
#355 G1:31 Tattoo	-0.0053	1055	0.8642
#356 G1:32 Drug abuse	0.0106	1055	0.7305
#357 G1:33 Smoking	0.1598	1055	0.0000**
#358 G1:34 Ball games	0.1412	1058	0.0000**
#359 G1:35 Other sports	0.1104	1057	0.0003**
#360 G1:36 Camping	0.0355	1057	0.2480
#361 G1:37 Other outdoor	0.1168	1049	0.0001**
#362 G1:38 Other	0.0737	794	0.0378

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

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 Score	Total	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15
		Type of place (see location codes at foot of page)														
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%	23%	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)	Level	#468 Delinquency score 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)	Level	#468 Delinquency score 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 Spearmans correlation=0.3307 Degrees of freedom=1137 P value=0.0000
#468 Delinquency score Spearmans 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 Spearmans correlation=0.3225 Degrees of freedom=1057 P value=0.0000
#468 Delinquecy score Spearmans correlation=0.2244 Degrees of freedom=1058 P value=0.0000

Figure 4.21 Selected relationships between attitudes, perceptions of friends, leisure activities, and delinquency

Key:
- 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)

Sample Base: Female School: Analysis uses 1179 cases (only significant relationships are shown)
Dependent variable is 467 Problem behaviour score

Variable No.	T value	P value	Variable No.	T value	P value
508 G4 School friends	2.02	0.0440	510 G4 Boy/girl friend	6.37	0.0000
511 G4 Gang	6.45	0.0000	512 G4 Alone	2.86	0.0043
524 G7 Hardworking	-3.8	0.0002	527 G7 Frank	-2.04	0.0421
528 G7 Like to play	6.31	0.0000	536 G8 Other	2.31	0.0209
538 G9 Cinema	2.83	0.0048	543 G9 Karoke/skating	2.66	0.0079
546 G9 TV centre	5.11	0.0000	550 G9 School	-3.04	0.0024

Dependent variable is 468 Delinquency score

Variable No.	T value	P value	Variable No.	T value	P value
509 G4 Friends outside	2.71	0.0068	511 G4 Gang	5.62	0.0000
512 G4 Alone	2.01	0.0445	514 G6 School	-2.51	0.0122
515 G6 Working places	-2.98	0.0030	523 G7 Have guts	2.4	0.0167
524 G7 Hardworking	-2.15	0.0314	527 G7 Frank	-2.24	0.0255
528 G7 Like to play	4.22	0.0000	530 G8 They are kind to	-2.05	0.0401
534 G8 Have same interest	4.46	0.0000	546 G9 TV centre	2.58	0.0099

Sample Base: Male School: Analysis uses 1096 cases (only significant relationships shown)
Dependent variable is 467 Problem behaviour score

Variable No.	T value	P value	Variable No.	T value	P value
506 G4 Parents	-2.44	0.0148	507 G4 Brothers & sisters	-2.71	0.0068
509 G4 Friends outside	2.76	0.0059	510 G4 Boy/girl friend	3.12	0.0018
511 G4 Gang	3.7	0.0002	514 G6 School	-2.69	0.0072
516 G6 Neighbourhood	-2.41	0.0161	524 G7 Hardworking	-2.89	0.0040
525 G7 Strong allegianc	2.14	0.0324	526 G7 Rich and welcome	2.6	0.0094
528 G7 Like to play	2.33	0.0199	529 G7 Like to make jok	2.1	0.0364
531 G8 I get materialis	2.23	0.0258	537 G9 Youth centre	-2.8	0.0052
538 G9 Cinema	2.51	0.0121	546 G9 TV centre	4.53	0.0000

Figure 4.21 continued...

Dependent variable is 468 Delinquency score

Variable No.	T value	P value	Variable No.	T value	P value
507 G4 Brothers & sisters	-2.15	0.0317	511 G4 Gang	2.93	0.0035
514 G6 School	-4.27	0.0000	517 G6 Family relations	2.29	0.0222
519 G6 Entertainment pl	2.96	0.0031	527 G7 Frank	-2.45	0.0143
537 G9 Youth centre	-2.56	0.0105	544 G9 Disco/snooker	2.11	0.0348
546 G9 TV centre	3.09	0.0021			

Note: T and P values originally generated as solution 1 of multiple regressions of all G4, G6, G7, G8, G9 answers. Negative T-values show an *inverse* relationship to delinquency and problem behaviour scores.

Figure 4.22 Principal component analysis, attitudes to family and criminal justice
Sample base: all cases, male and female
Analysis uses 2557 cases
Rotated factor matrix (3 factors, values less than +/-0.4 removed for clarity)

Variable	Factor C1# 1	2	3
Parents can't teach children anything	.	.	.
Young people should care for parent health	.	0.73	.
Young people should take of elderly parent	.	0.74	.
Parent should teach children to behave	.	0.78	.
Parent should take care of their children	.	0.73	.
You should support friends who have done wrong	.	.	.
Students should obey school rules	.	0.48	.
Students should play truant if unhappy	.	.	0.57
HK laws are fair	-0.91	.	.
HK judges are fair	-0.92	.	.
Police treat offenders fairly	-0.82	.	.
HK has one law for the rich, another for the poor	.	.	.
'Law is at a distance but the fist is near'	.	.	0.63
Obey/disobey laws doesn't matter if you're happy	.	.	0.73
I'll break unfair laws	.	.	0.69
You shouldn't break laws for personal interest	.	.	.

Cumulative % of eigenvalues (3 factors) = 46.555

Figure 4.23 Principal component analysis, ratings of seriousness of crimes
Rotated factor matrices (3 factors, values between +/-0.4 removed for clarity)

Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Female (analysis uses 1121 cases)

Variable	Factor SFC2# 1	2	3
1 Practice law without licence	.	.	-0.74
2 False tax info	.	.	-0.80
3 Selling stolen goods	.	.	-0.69
4 Kill stranger on impulse	.	-0.58	.
5 Cheat $1k from boss	0.74	.	.
6 Armed robbery	.	-0.57	.
7 Steal $1k from parents	0.78	.	.
8 Steal cars for fun	0.63	-0.41	.
9 Steal $200 cash	0.86	.	.
10 Burglary $200 cash	0.76	.	.
11 Rape	.	-0.74	.
12 Sell dope/pills	.	-0.64	.
13 Attack stranger weapon	.	-0.73	.
14 Bribe credit card info	0.47	-0.51	.
15 Shoptheft	0.62	-0.43	.
16 Steal car to China	0.42	-0.48	.
17 Kill parents on impulse	.	-0.73	.
18 Burglary karaoke set	0.65	.	.
19 Fake credit card $1000	0.74	.	.
20 Throw things down	0.58	.	.

Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Male (analysis uses 1027 cases)

Variable	Factor SMC2# 1	2	3
1 Practice law without licence	.	.	-0.70
2 False tax info	.	.	-0.78
3 Selling stolen goods	.	.	-0.70
4 Kill stranger on impulse	.	-0.69	.
5 Cheat $1k from boss	0.70	.	.
6 Armed robbery	.	-0.72	.
7 Steal $1k from parents	0.68	.	.
8 Steal cars for fun	0.62	.	.
9 Steal $200 cash	0.82	.	.
10 Burglary $200 cash	0.77	.	.
11 Rape	.	-0.56	.
12 Sell dope/pills	.	-0.70	.
13 Attack stranger weapon	.	-0.74	.
14 Bribe credit card info	0.52	-0.45	.
15 Shoptheft	0.62	.	.
16 Steal car to China	0.43	-0.41	-0.47
17 Kill parents on impulse	.	-0.75	.
18 Burglary karaoke set	0.68	.	.
19 Fake credit card $1000	0.75	.	.
20 Throw things down	0.51	.	.

Cumulative % of eigenvalues, 3 factors: females, 59.225%; males, 59.475%.

Figure 4.24: Correlations between attitudinal factors, delinquency, and problem behaviour

Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Female (analysis uses 1002 cases)

	Problem behavior ever	Problem behavior last yr	Delinq ever	Delinq last yr	Problem behavior score	Delinq score	SFB4#1	SFB4#2	SFB4#3
SFC2 #1	-0.246	-0.252	-0.220	-0.195	-0.244	-0.220	-0.233	0.114	-0.049
SFC2 #2	0.030	0.012	0.090	0.081	0.045	0.095	0.023	-0.147	-0.010
SFC2 #3	0.101	0.104	0.050	0.084	0.075	0.051	0.108	0.057	-0.049
C1 #1	-0.146	-0.156	-0.097	-0.067	-0.156	-0.100	-0.156	0.004	0.006
C1 #2	0.155	0.126	0.165	0.119	0.134	0.135	0.144	-0.074	0.008
C1 #3	-0.373	-0.374	-0.316	-0.278	-0.379	-0.304	-0.368	0.129	0.004

Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Male (analysis uses 885 cases)

	Problem behavior ever	Problem behavior last yr	Delinq ever	Delinq last yr	Problem behavior score	Delinq score	SMB4#1	SMB4#2	SMB4#3
SMC2 #1	-0.195	-0.201	-0.152	-0.176	-0.218	-0.142	-0.216	-0.023	0.085
SMC2 #2	0.091	0.065	0.229	0.257	0.109	0.277	-0.060	0.312	-0.287
SMC2 #3	0.120	0.150	0.196	0.185	0.136	0.209	0.108	0.168	0.011
C1 #1	-0.190	-0.180	-0.194	-0.138	-0.236	-0.199	-0.208	-0.097	0.095
C1 #2	0.092	0.106	0.156	0.163	0.085	0.151	0.025	0.144	-0.119
C1 #3	-0.253	-0.270	-0.262	-0.261	-0.251	-0.256	-0.221	-0.170	0.053

Correlations greater than +/-0.200 underlined for clarity.

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:

```
FEMALES:  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

MALES:        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:

```
FEMALES:  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

MALES:        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
```

5. EXPLAINING DELINQUENCY: THE SCHOOL SAMPLE

The previous chapter identified a number of factors associated with juvenile delinquency, and argued that while many of the associations observed have also been found in previous studies, those studies jumped rather too quickly to the conclusion that they were 'causes' of delinquency.

In this chapter we present the results of several multivariate regressions which enable us to identify the mix of factors which can offer the best 'prediction' of delinquency within our sample.[1] In fact we can go a little further than this, because we have identified several patterns of delinquency (SFB4#2 for females, SMB4#2 and SMB4#3 for males: see Chapter 3) which may be best explained by different mixes of variables.

The findings from the regression analyses raise the question of *why* such factors would be 'predictors' of delinquency. The statistical analysis is thus only half the work; the remainder is a matter of deduction, inference, and judgement. The second part of the chapter therefore comprises a wider-ranging discussion and interpretation of the findings.

5.1 The input into the analyses

Given the range of different measures of delinquency we have available to us, there are seven multiple regressions worth reporting on. In brief, they are:

- 'delinquency ever', which measures the number of different *kinds* of delinquency ever committed (males and females),[2]

---

[1]. 'Prediction' in this sense means that the multivariate regression attempts to identify the mix of variables which, when combined, offers the closest 'fit' with the distribution of delinquency. It should not be taken to imply that these factors can be compiled into a predictive system for the purposes of identifying from current information those who are most likely to offend in future.

[2]. 'Delinquency last year', which measures the number of different kinds of delinquency committed within the last year, is not reported here because the results could be misleading. There are two problems. First, patterns of delinquency tend to be age-dependent, so that the kinds of delinquency being explained for younger people are not the same as those for older people. Second, as indicated in Chapter 2, we cannot assume that the older members of our sample have followed the same pathways into delinquency as the younger ones, because it was the younger ones who typically reported more delinquency. In consequence, while we can enter age into the regression for 'delinquency ever' and remain fairly confident about the results, it is more problematic to assume that 'delinquency last year' is measuring

- 'delinquency score', which is based on (though not directly a count of) the total number of delinquent *acts* ever committed (males and females),

and three variables which are created from factor analyses of the types of self-reported delinquency:

- SFB4#2, which essentially measures theft/bullying (whether at school, elsewhere, or for money), robbery and blackmail, shoptheft, and drug use (females only),

- SMB4#2, comprising threats/bullying, vandalism (destroying and damaging property), fights (both with fists and weapons), shoptheft, using others' money without permission, robbery and blackmail, and triad activities (in addition it included running away from home) (males only), and

- SMB4#3, comprising all three drug-related activities (using, selling, trafficking), along with robbery and driving without a license (this factor also included sexual activities) (males only).

A second issue has to do with which factors are worth putting into the regression. Most of the variables have been discussed in Chapter 4, and the general criterion we adopted was that if one of a sequence of factors (for example, A2#1 or G1#1) was included, then all the other factors derived from the same analysis were also included. Several items, such as the self-esteem score and the number of triad friends, were included because of the interest in such matters in Hong Kong, even though they were shown in Chapter 4 not to have strong direct correlations with delinquency.[3] The list of variables entered into each regression was identical, save for the factors that were specific to males or females.[4] It is given as Figure 5.1.

---

a stable set of behaviours.

[3]. However, fathers' and mothers' occupation and education were not included on the grounds that any significance shown by these variables was simply derived from their correlations with how often they saw their children. Their inclusion could thus show spurious results.

[4]. One of the problems with regression analyses is that they require the data-set to be very complete. If data is missing on any case, for any of the variables used in the analysis, the case is not included in the analysis. This can in some circumstances result in less than half of the cases being analyzed. To minimize this problem, after every 'sweep' of the analysis (that is, as variables were progressively dropped as having too little explanatory power), the data-set was searched again to see whether any cases existed for which any missing values lay only in the variables that had been excluded; if so,

5.2 Delinquency ever committed and delinquency score

Looking across the multivariate regressions as a whole (Figures 5.2 to 5.8), it appears possible to explain roughly half of the variance in delinquency for males ('delinquency ever' and 'delinquency score'); a little less than half of the variance for females on the same measures; and around one-third of the variance for both males and females on the factor-based measures, which are essentially measures of clusters of offence types. This is generally regarded as an acceptable level of explanation for social-science data, especially since the cutoff P value we used was 0.01 - often regarded in this kind of research as excluding some less strong but still useful correlations.[5] Yet even at this level, the number of variables appearing in the final analyses - between 7 and 15 - remains high.

In total, some 34 variables appear in the final variable-lists of at least one of the multivariate regressions. However, leaving aside the factor-based measures of delinquency for the moment, only six factors correlated systematically with the two general measures ('delinquency ever count' and 'delinquency score') for both males and females. Four of these were factor-based variables:

- G1#2, gambling and drugs, loitering in public places (positive on all measures)

- G1#5, socializing in public places (positive on all measures)

- A2#2, feelings of being seen negatively by school (negative on all measures)

- SFC2#3/SMC2#3 (females and males respectively, positive on all measures).

Thus the more young people 'hang around' in public places, and more specifically, follow a lifestyle that involves hanging around illegal gambling stalls and the like, and drug-taking, the more likely it is that they are delinquent. The inclusion of factor A2#2 in the list is interesting; as indicated in Chapter 4, this factor taps perceptions that the school sees the respondent negatively, rather than vice versa. Although there is no direct correlation between delinquency and truancy, it is a

---

such cases were included in subsequent sweeps. Thus, for example, the analysis of 'delinquency ever' for females started with only 643 cases, but since new cases could be added as the number of variables was reduced, the final set of variables was created using 1001 cases.

[5]. However, using a $P<0.05$ cutoff point for males 'delinquent ever', for example, adds an additional five variables (18 rather than 13) but gives only an increase of only 1% in the variance explained.

fair bet that much of the 'hanging around' that G1#2 and G1#5 tap into occurs during school hours and that those who are playing truant are doing so not necessarily because they have a positive reason for doing so but because it is their way of coping with what they perceive as rejection by the school. Thirdly, the inclusion of the SF/SM C2#3 factors in this list is interesting. These factors loaded negatively in the factor analyses, so it is lower ratings of the seriousness of professional, non-violent offences with no identifiable victims that predict higher rates of delinquency. There is no obvious or clear-cut reason why this should be so. It may simply be a reflection of the point discussed below (in relation to the factor-based measures) that those involved in more violent crime do in fact perceive violent crimes as more serious than those who are not. Because the kinds of crimes are different - violent versus professional and non-violent - they load on different factors, yet what we are essentially seeing is respondents evaluations of the relative importance or unimportance of crime types *in relation to the kinds of crimes they commit themselves.*[6]

The two remaining common variables are both to do with being caught:

- delinquency caught by family members (positive on all measures), and

- delinquency caught by the police, teachers, social workers or other adults (positive on all measures).

Strictly speaking, the inclusion of these variables in the final variable-set simply tells us that because those who have committed delinquent acts have usually been caught for at least some of them, identifying which ones have been caught is a good way of identifying which ones have been involved in higher levels of delinquency.[7] However, it opens up the question - discussed

---

[6]. Though cf. Sykes and Matza (1961), who argue that *when caught*, young delinquents frequently seek to excuse or 'neutralize' the significance of their behaviour by pointing inter alia to the allegedly greater damage done to society by the actions of white-collar criminals. It is however likely that attitudes towards both violent crime and professional, non-violent crime are rather different to those that would be shown in an American study and the 'techniques of neutralization' would differ correspondingly.

[7]. In fact the multivariate regressions were run twice, with and without the four independent variables relating to being caught by parents or others for problem behaviour and delinquency. Virtually identical results were obtained from both, though when these variables are excluded the frequency of contact with mother and father do appear in the list of variables with $P<0.01$. The data presented in this chapter relate to the regressions including the four 'caught' variables.

later in this chapter - of whether those who are detected (whether by their family or the police) have become involved in more delinquency as a result; that is, whether or not it is possible to identify a 'vicious cycle' of delinquency, repression, and more delinquency.

Finally, it is worth reflecting on the variables that did *not* appear in the final variable-sets from the regressions. In line with previous analyses, self-esteem disappeared quite early on in the regression. The frequency of seeing one's father disappeared, though as footnoted above, this appears to be because being caught by one's parents is a strong proxy measure of how much time one spends with one's parents and the strength of that relationship. The amount of hours spent with friends also disappeared from the analysis, as did the amount of socializing with friends in places such as dance and billiards halls and karaoke parlours. Electronic games centres only appeared on one case, the delinquency score for females. We already know, however, that those who reported higher levels of delinquency spend less time with parents and more time in 'disreputable' places; it is likely, therefore, that all these variables (except self-esteem) are to a large extent indirect or partial reflections of others which turned out to have more explanatory significance, namely the 'lifestyle' factors - high scores on G1#3 and G1#5 necessarily imply spending a fair amount of time hanging around in public places.[8]

5.3 'Delinquency ever count' and 'delinquency score'; variables specific to one sex

Scrutiny of the two primary measures of delinquency, 'delinquency ever count' and the delinquency score, indicates that a reasonably large number of variables applied only or mainly to males but not females, or vice versa.

Those which *only* applied to males were: A3#2, C1#1 and C1#3, G9 'playground/park/street', and G9 'other'. A3#2 tapped negative feelings between students and their classmates. Higher scores on C1#1 indicated more negative feelings about the fairness of the criminal justice system, while higher scores on C1#3 indicated that individuals felt the law to be more remote from or less relevant to their own lives. The two G9 variables concerned where

---

[8]. The issue here is simply that while the variables dealing with such leisure activities were loaded directly into the regression, they also load either explicitly or indirectly onto G1#1, G1#2, and G1#5. The question thus becomes one of whether going to karaoke parlours, gambling stalls, or electronic games centres are more important in their own right or as components of broader lifestyle patterns. The results suggest that for males the latter is the case, while for females participation in these lifestyles is more limited and the direct association can (though only in one measure of delinquency) come to the fore.

respondents socialized with friends, and it is clear from these - as with some of the lifestyle variables discussed above - that the more delinquent young people spend significantly more time hanging around on the street, or in the case of the G9 'other' variable, in a variety of off-street places where presumably they felt comparatively safe from supervision.

Those which applied *mainly* to males were: G1#1 (also to 'delinquency ever count' for females', and G1#3 (also to delinquency ever count and SFB4#2 for females). The effects here are mixed. G1#3 relates to a more studious lifestyle and the negative T-values in the tables indicate that higher scores on this factor were associated with lower rates of delinquency. In essence, studying hard precludes delinquency. G1#1 was described in Chapter 4 as a lifestyle revolving around home-based and mass-media entertainments including readings comics and magazines, and watching television and videos. This is positively associated with the delinquency score, 'delinquency ever count', and SMB4#3, the robbery and drug-use factor.

Those which applied *only* to females were: A2#1, SFC2#1, G8 'material benefit', G8 'have same interests', G8 'other', G9 'TV centre', and problem behaviour caught by family. A2#1 comprised anti-school attitudes. SFC2#1 was a factor dealing with ratings of property crime; the negative T-value here indicates that those with higher levels of delinquency saw property crime as less serious. The 'G8' questions related to evaluations of friends; females with higher delinquency scores thus were more likely than others to see their friends as having the same interests as them, and providing them with material benefits. The G9 variable concerning socializing in electronic games centres probably stands out with females but not males because while, for the latter, G1#1 was significant and this is one of the activities loading onto this lifestyle factor, G1#1 as a complete 'package' of activities did not appear so significant for females.

The two variables which applied *mainly* to females were G4 'gang', that is, enjoying spending time with a gang (this also applied to SMB4#3, the male robbery and drug-use delinquency pattern), and G7 'like to play' (also associated with delinquency ever count for males). It may be that the former shows up as a specific variable for females because it is already covered by the lifestyle 'G1' factors in the case of males.

How can we explain these differences between males and females? It is likely in two cases (G9 'TV centre' and G4 'gang' for females) that variables came to the fore because they were specifically correlated with delinquency, while with males they formed part of a package of activities which, as a package, showed a stronger correlation. So far as school is concerned, we saw above that a perception that school sees one negatively is a crucial variable, but in addition, male delinquency was correlated with negative relationships with classmates while female delinquency correlated with anti-school attitudes. Placed alongside other information on evaluations of friends (female delinquents were more likely to perceive friends as having

similar interests and providing material benefits), it looks as though we cannot talk in broad terms about issues such as 'association with delinquent peers'. Males and females, if they associate with delinquent peers, have different views both of 'straight' and 'delinquent' associations, with the latter typically having both a more playful, co-operative, and perhaps closer relationship with delinquent peers and an anti-*school* attitude while males have a looser, more self-interested, and anti-*classmate* attitude. To put it crudely, female delinquency appears to relate to a *delinquent but social* set of relationships, while for males a more *antisocial* set of associations seems more common.

5.4 The factor-based delinquency measures

The three 'special' measures of particular types of delinquency (two for males, one for females) produced rather different sets of explanatory variables to those that applied to the more general delinquency measures.

Females who engaged in a specific 'package' of theft/bullying, robbery and blackmail, shoptheft, and drug use (SFB4#2) also scored positively on a wide range of variables. These included: the lifestyle factors G1#2 and G1#5 (respectively relating to socializing in 'disreputable' and 'normal' public places), G4 'parents' and G4 'gang' (that is, they were least happy with being either of these; but no positive preferences for being with anyone proved significant in the final variable-set), G6 'streets' (that is, they were least likely to have first met friends on the street, but did not have any particular other places where they had first met friends),[9] and being caught either by parents or others (in other words they were likely to have been caught in the past). There was also a positive association with the attitudinal factor SFC2#2 - which perhaps surprisingly indicated that females involved in what are, for females, comparatively violent offences in fact saw violent offences as more serious than did other females. Finally, there was the expected negative association with G1#3, the 'studious' lifestyle.

The male factor SMB4#2 may be seen as roughly equivalent to the female factor, since it also comprised threats/bullying, robbery and blackmail, and shoptheft - though it also included vandalism, fights, using others' money without permission, and triad activities (but excluded drug use).[10] However, the variables that turned out to be significant were very different. This was the only measure of delinquency for which not seeing a parent frequently (in this case, the mother) appeared to have

---

[9]. The same was true of SMB4#3 for males; however, no particular place for having first met friends appeared to be positively significant for higher levels of delinquency.

[10]. It also included running away from home.

some direct importance. There were positive associations with gang behaviour and some indications of a particular view of friends (they were seen as *not* being frank and open, nor as liking to make jokes). In this factor, unlike SMB4#3, the robbery/drug-use factor, there was a negative association with age; in other words those who were more likely to engage in this particular pattern of behaviour were younger.

For the drug and robbery factor, SMB4#3, there were only a few strong associations. Like the female factor, SFB4#2, this factor was negatively associated with a studious lifestyle, positively associated with having first met friends through the streets, and positively associated with age (that is, those who engaged in this pattern of behaviour were likely to be older) and with being caught by the police. Finally, as with SFB4#2 for females, and despite the fact that robbery was one of the items loading onto the factor, there was a recognition of the seriousness of violent crime.

5.5 Building an explanation for delinquency

The regression analyses help us identify the mix of variables which, together, best matches the distribution of delinquency in our sample and which can be treated as probable 'causes' of delinquency. The logical question that follows is: *why* would they cause delinquency? To answer this question we have to return to the range of theoretical perspectives outlined at the beginning of this report, in Chapter 1.

Braithwaite (1989) offers a merging of several theoretical perspectives which, with some modifications, does accord with the findings we have presented in this chapter and previous ones. He suggested that the factors leading to a first offence were probably those described by Hirschi's (1969) control theory, that is, a lack of a 'stake' in conventional society, brought about by a lack of attachment to school, work, family, etc. In the Hong Kong context these factors clearly have to be modified.

It appears from our own data that higher rates of delinquency are to some extent associated with how much or how little time young people spend with their parents. When the 'caught by parents/police' variables are removed, the amount of time with parents replaces them in the final variable-sets. Hence the consistent high correlations between being caught by family, and self-reported delinquency, appear to suggest that in families where parents and young people spend more time together it is more likely that any delinquency by the latter will be detected by the former. While this gives no support to the argument that delinquents are *usually* out of parental control or supervision, it does suggest that those who are supervised least are more likely to get into trouble. What appears to be equally crucial, however, is what young people do when they are out of the home. Those with higher delinquency scores do typically engage in a lifestyle which revolves around spending time with friends 'hanging around' in public places, or more seriously, hanging

around 'disreputable' places. There appear to be no particular patterns as to where they met these friends, and for males, no particularly strong and uniform findings as to what they think of their friends (though for females, friends are evaluated as playful, having the same interests, and offering material benefits).

These findings could be seen as consistent with a differential association model, as Ng (1988, 1994) has repeatedly suggested. They could arise, that is, because young people who spend time out of the house are likely to come into contact with 'bad elements' who draw them into the kind of lifestyle where delinquency is 'normal'. Yet in Chapter 3 we suggested that at least some elements of problem behaviour did not pre-date delinquency but probably came at around the same time as, or even after, the beginnings of a delinquent 'career'. It seems likely therefore that there is also a case to be made for the assertion that 'birds of a feather flock together'; that is, some young people who have 'sampled' delinquency either positively gravitate towards places where other young people like them can be found, or negatively, find that a 'labelling' process closes off the opportunity to associate with non-delinquents thus leading to their further involvement in a delinquent lifestyle. In short, our data would support a broader model in which differential association and control theory (more or less as mirror images of each other), and labelling can all be pathways into participation in a youth *subculture* which tolerates delinquency.[11]

Moving on to school, our data suggest a pattern rather different to that reported for the UK by, for example, Downes (1966), Parker (1974), or Willis (1977). These studies of delinquency and youth subcultures suggest that young delinquents see school as a middle-class institution which does not attend to their interests or needs, and which is too often geared around certifying their academic failure. They use the last few years of schooling to play truant and have fun before starting a meaningless and dead-end job, and their dissociation from the values projected by school leads to an overemphasis on short-term gratification. Moreover, they may use their time out of school to acquire particular criminal expertise; Parker's study reports

---

[11]. Differential association has been criticized on the grounds that its original formulation proposed that people absorb the values and attitudes of those around them unreflectively and uncritically. In other words there was no conception of people as being able to make a positive choice towards or away from delinquency. Our use of differential association must therefore be qualified with the observation that most people can and do reflect on what is happening to them and can choose their future course of action based on those reflections. However, as Matza (1969) observes, people can 'postpone choice', that is, choose to be passive recipients of others' attitudes etc., until something happens that requires them to make a choice between committing a delinquent act or breaking ties with their (delinquent) friends.

on one group of young people who learned how to steal car radios and quickly became expert at it.

None of this appears to hold true in the Hong Kong context. The delinquents in our sample saw the schools as rejecting them, not the other way round. And while the females did express anti-school attitudes, the males did not form cliques with schoolmates and attempt to subvert the school regime; rather, they both rejected and were rejected by their schoolmates and sought more sympathetic associations elsewhere. Again, therefore, the perspective which best fits our data cannot *exclude* differential association, but nonetheless emphasizes a control perspective (young people who feel rejected feel they have little 'stake' in conventional values), alongside labelling effects and subculture operating in a mutually reinforcing manner.

The key question that arises out of these considerations is: what exactly is the subculture? Can we describe it? It has no clear-cut boundaries, but seems to consist mainly of 'just hanging around', perhaps hoping that something exciting will happen.[12] For some, local places - perhaps an electronic games centre - become meeting points and they spend a substantial amount of time there. For others, places such as illegal gambling venues are attractive.

The subculture for males appears to subscribe to a fairly cynical view of the police, courts, and law; and to the view that for much of what goes on in their everyday life - which might well include arguments, fights, and petty theft among themselves - the law is not relevant while 'the fist is near'.

Although males may see their friends as 'playful', most of our data can be summarized by the simple statement that they do not appear to *like* their friends that much, despite the amount of time they spend together. Females in the subculture, however, appear from our data to have closer and more positive relations with friends.

Studies of subcultures elsewhere have pointed to the development of specific subcultural 'styles', in terms of dress, music preferences, slang, etc. In so far as there is any discernable style in Hong Kong youth subcultures it is probably

---

[12]. Cf. the description of youth street gangs in the UK, in Corrigan (1979). Corrigan focuses on the non-existence of unsupervised activity acceptable to young people, their social life on the streets, and the degree of irritation caused to local people and the authorities by such apparently unstructured behaviour. However, in line with the observations made earlier concerning gambling stalls, electronic games centres, etc., we should perhaps draw a line between the simple fact of going to such places often and a more motivated use of these places as spots to 'hang around' and socialize with friends.

based on an idealized conception of triads.[13] Actual identification with triads was, ironically enough, primarily confined to one of the factor-based measures, SMB4#2. While this comprised a cluster of fairly serious offending behaviours, it explained less overall variance than the broader measures of delinquency, and was not closely related to 'socializing in public' measured through the lifestyle factors. It was, however, more closely associated with preferring to spend time with a gang and, perhaps worryingly, did appear to be more prevalent in the younger age groups.

It is worth reiterating at this point that most young people, whether they lack contact with parents or not, whether they are rejected by parents or not, and whether they participate in the marginal youth subculture or not, 'taste' offending at least once. Most are not caught and do not continue. Moreover, not all young people who lack a stake in conventional society, or even all those who have delinquent associates, become routinely involved in offending. There are elements of opportunism, accident, misjudgement, and so forth which mean that our best predictions of delinquency - let us say, of those likely to commit three or more offences - would be right only about half the time. In other words, if we used these variables to predict delinquency we would predict roughly twice as many of these delinquents as there actually are.

Our own model of juvenile delinquency, then, is one which combines a variety of different theoretical perspectives each of which has a limited sphere of application:

1. Several factors, singly or in combination, may precipitate the occurrence of delinquency. They are: feelings of rejection by the school (and/or, for males, feelings of rejection by classmates); and the use of free time to socialize in public places with friends who turn out to be 'bad elements'. For some (though not all) young people this time is created through a lack of time spent with parents. In short, the kinds of people who begin the path towards delinquency are those who do not have a sense of a 'stake' in conventional life and its rewards. But there is also an element of choice involved. They do not have to associate with these people; they must be sufficiently intrigued or entertained by their associates to be prepared to postpone making moral judgements about them and their activities.

2. Around or shortly after the first time they become involved in delinquency, several things happen. Their families may catch them and there may be arguments. They may drop into

---

[13]. Our data, however, only indirectly confirm the earlier findings of Lo (1986) and Cheung (1990), both of which suggest that male juvenile delinquents allege that they follow what they claim to be a triad-influenced lifestyle while the extent of any actual adult triad influence appeared to be rather remote.

a lifestyle that comes to be defined as 'problem behaviour'. For females, delinquency is associated with being caught by families for problem behaviour, which suggests that there may be a vicious cycle of confrontation and arguments with parents, leading to further problem behaviour and more delinquency. While the delinquents do not lose their motivation for schooling, they perceive their school (and for males, schoolmates) as acting increasingly negatively towards them. All these factors lead to further delinquency.

3. Those who become enmeshed in a delinquent lifestyle are likely to play truant, hang around illegal gambling stalls, electronic games centres, and places where other young people like them tend to congregate. Ultimately the use of such places as 'refuges' from wider social constraints is replaced by a more positive use of them as meeting places - one might almost say clubhouses - for groups of delinquents. This is not to say that what they actually do in the places changes significantly; but the amount of time they spend there, who they spend it with, and how they would explain their motivation to spend time there are all likely to change subtly over time.

4. Perhaps ironically, males who end up committing more serious and violent delinquent acts often do not follow this pattern, but appear to be more closely involved with gangs and *not* to be involved in the kinds of lifestyle activities covered by factors G1#2 and G1#5.

5. Finally, females who become involved in delinquency appear to have more supportive and co-operative relationships with their friends than do the males, who on the whole have playful, but not particularly trusting, relationships with their friends.

In short, initial rejection or lack of a sufficient level of interest in young people by 'significant others' - schools, parents and so on provides a motivation to associate with delinquents (control theory and differential association), though the specific occurrence of the first delinquent act may be prompted by any of a wide range of factors which, while perhaps not random, cannot easily be captured by quantitative analysis. This can lead to entry into a set of activities which in turn are likely to result in the individual being labelled as a 'bad element' (labelling theory). The labelling then provides motivation to turn more strongly towards the subculture as a source of friends and rewards (subculture theory). Since this process is mutually reinforcing, further labelling produces further involvement in the subculture and a reduced stake in conventional society. At any point in this process it is in theory possible to turn back - though whether it is so easy in practice is another issue. However, some, typically younger and/or more violent delinquents, appear to follow a variant of this path in which their offending is more closely associated with what they describe as gangs; they travel further and more

quickly into high levels of delinquency.

This, then, is the general picture which broadly accounts for the findings from our school-TI-YC data. The next and obvious question is whether the data from detected offenders confirms it. This is the topic of the following chapter.

Figure 5.1 List of factors entered into multiple regressions

Variable	Variable
Time with parents/family/friends:	
297 F6B:1 Father/often	298 F6B:2 Mother/often
366 G5 No. of friends	371 G10a Hrs out with friends
372 G10b Hrs leisure family/alone	373 G10c Hrs do homework
374 G10d Hrs do private tutoring	375 G10e Hrs work for money
376 G11 How many triad friends	
Lifestyle/leisure factors:	
409 Tot G1 Factor #1	410 Tot G1 Factor #2
411 Tot G1 Factor #3	412 Tot G1 Factor #4
413 Tot G1 Factor #5	
School/self esteem factors:	
466 Rosenberg Score (self-esteem)	469 Tot A2 Factor #1
470 Tot A2 Factor #2	471 Tot A2 Factor #3
472 Tot A2 Factor #4	473 Tot A3 Factor #1
474 Tot A3 Factor #2	476 Academic (add)
Attitudinal factors:	
495 SF C2 Factor #1 (FEMALES ONLY)	496 SF C2 Factor #2 (FEMALES ONLY)
497 SF C2 Factor #3 (FEMALES ONLY)	498 SM C2 Factor #1 (MALES ONLY)
499 SM C2 Factor #2 (MALES ONLY)	500 SM C2 Factor #3 (MALES ONLY)
503 Tot C1 Factor #1	504 Tot C1 Factor #2
505 Tot C1 Factor #3	
Friends: G4 (happiest with), G6 (where first met), G7 (characteristics of), G8 (relationship with), G9 (where socialize with):	
506 G4 Parents	507 G4 Brothers & sisters
508 G4 School friends	509 G4 Friends outside school
510 G4 Boy/girl friend	511 G4 Gang
512 G4 Alone	513 G4 Other
514 G6 School	515 G6 Workplace
516 G6 Neighbourhood	517 G6 Family relations
518 G6 Through friends	519 G6 Entertainment places
520 G6 Streets	521 G6 Other
522 G7 Adventurous	523 G7 Have guts
524 G7 Hardworking	525 G7 Strong group allegiance
526 G7 Rich and welcome	527 G7 Frank
528 G7 Like to play	529 G7 Like to make jokes
530 G8 They are kind to me	531 G8 I get material benefit
532 G8 We help each other	533 G8 Make use of each other
534 G8 Have same interests	535 G8 I care about them
536 G8 Other	537 G9 Youth centre
538 G9 Cinema	539 G9 Playground/park/street
540 G9 My home	541 G9 Friend's home
542 G9 Gambling places	543 G9 Karoke/skating
544 G9 Disco/snooker	545 G9 Coffee shop/restaurant
546 G9 TV centre	547 G9 School clubs
548 G9 Fast food stores	549 G9 Plaza, shopping mall
550 G9 School	551 G9 Other

Figure 5.1 continued...

Previously caught:	
552 Prob. behav. caught family	553 Delinq caught family
554 Prob. behav. caught Pol/Te/SW/OA*	555 Delinq caught Pol/Te/SW/OA*
Other:	
275 Age	

*. Police, teachers, social workers, other adults.

Figure 5.2 Multivariate regression, delinquency ever committed, males
School-TI-YC/Males
Dependent variable is 390 Delinquency ever count
Figure shows factors remaining significant at P<0.01

Variable No.	Regression Coefficient	Std. Error Reg. coef.	Beta	T value	P value
409 Tot G1 Factor #1	0.2166	0.0577	0.0929	3.76	0.0002
410 Tot G1 Factor #2	0.2768	0.0564	0.13	4.91	0.0000
411 Tot G1 Factor #3	-0.2548	0.0612	-0.106	-4.16	0.0000
413 Tot G1 Factor #5	0.2712	0.0619	0.108	4.38	0.0000
470 Tot A2 Factor #2	-0.1939	0.0599	-0.0814	-3.24	0.0013
474 Tot A3 Factor #2	0.2406	0.0586	0.107	4.11	0.0000
500 SM C2 Factor #3	0.3714	0.0605	0.154	6.14	0.0000
503 Tot C1 Factor #1	-0.1891	0.061	-0.078	-3.1	0.0020
505 Tot C1 Factor #3	-0.2663	0.0637	-0.107	-4.18	0.0000
528 G7 Like to play	0.3547	0.134	0.0654	2.65	0.0083
539 G9 Playground/park/	0.3667	0.125	0.0725	2.94	0.0034
551 G9 Other	0.9265	0.27	0.0837	3.43	0.0006
553 Del/Off Caught fami	0.6677	0.072	0.232	9.27	0.0000
555 Del/Off Caught Pol/	0.8138	0.0607	0.358	13.4	0.0000

Intercept (constant)	1.535		
Multiple correlation (R)	0.724		
Std. error of estimate	1.666		
Explained variance (R2)	0.525	Adjusted	0.516

Analysis of Variance for the Regression

Source of Variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean square	F value	P value
Regression model	14	2503	178.8	64.4	0.0000
Residual	817	2269	2.777		
Total	831	4772			

Figure 5.3 Multivariate regression, delinquency score, males
School-TI-YC/Males
Dependent variable is 468 Delinquency Score
Figure shows factors remaining significant at P<0.01

Variable No.	Regression Coefficient	Std. Error Reg. coef.	Beta	T value	P value
409 Tot G1 Factor #1	1.168	0.218	0.135	5.35	0.0000
410 Tot G1 Factor #2	1.371	0.211	0.174	6.51	0.0000
411 Tot G1 Factor #3	-1.058	0.229	-0.119	-4.61	0.0000
412 Tot G1 Factor #4	0.6928	0.215	0.0822	3.22	0.0013
413 Tot G1 Factor #5	1.198	0.234	0.129	5.12	0.0000
470 Tot A2 Factor #2	-0.7614	0.226	-0.0862	-3.37	0.0008
474 Tot A3 Factor #2	1.129	0.22	0.136	5.13	0.0000
500 SM C2 Factor #3	1.351	0.229	0.151	5.89	0.0000
505 Tot C1 Factor #3	-0.9148	0.239	-0.0989	-3.82	0.0001
539 G9 Playground/park/	1.36	0.469	0.0725	2.9	0.0038
551 G9 Other	4.602	1.02	0.112	4.49	0.0000
553 Del/Off Caught fami	2.083	0.273	0.195	7.64	0.0000
555 Del/Off Caught Pol/	2.761	0.229	0.327	12	0.0000

Intercept (constant)	4.279		
Multiple correlation (R)	0.711		
Std. error of estimate	6.295		
Explained variance (R2)	0.506	Adjusted	0.498

Analysis of Variance for the Regression

Source of Variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean square	F value	P value
Regression model	13	3.314e+004	2549	64.3	0.0000
Residual	818	3.241e+004	39.62		
Total	831	6.555e+004			

Figure 5.4 Multivariate regression, delinquency factor SMB4#2, males
School-TI-YC/Males
Dependent variable is 481 SM B4 Factor #2
Figure shows factors remaining significant at P<0.01

Variable No.	Regression Coefficient	Std. Error Reg. coef.	Beta	T value	P value
298 F6B:2 Mother/often	0.1887	0.0601	0.09	3.14	0.0017
474 Tot A3 Factor #2	0.1613	0.0253	0.186	6.38	0.0000
500 SM C2 Factor #3	0.1291	0.0261	0.14	4.94	0.0000
511 G4 Gang	0.692	0.148	0.133	4.69	0.0000
513 G4 Other	0.9558	0.273	0.105	3.5	0.0005
527 G7 Frank	-0.1715	0.0545	-0.0923	-3.15	0.0017
529 G7 Like to make jok	-0.1552	0.054	-0.082	-2.87	0.0042
551 G9 Other	0.4296	0.136	0.096	3.15	0.0017
553 Del/Off Caught fami	0.2288	0.0336	0.197	6.82	0.0000
555 Del/Off Caught Pol/	0.3112	0.0321	0.288	9.71	0.0000
275 Age	-0.05426	0.0123	-0.127	-4.4	0.0000

Intercept (constant)	0.5149		
Multiple correlation (R)	0.622		
Std. error of estimate	0.7164		
Explained variance (R2)	0.387	Adjusted	0.382

Analysis of Variance for the Regression

Source of Variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean square	F value	P value
Regression model	11	252.3	22.93	44.7	0.0000
Residual	778	399.3	0.5132		
Total	789	651.5			

Figure 5.5 Multivariate regression, delinquency factor SMB4#3, males
School-TI-YC/Males
Solution #275 Dependent variable is 482 SM B4 Factor #3
Figure shows factors remaining significant at P<0.01

Variable No.	Regression Coefficient	Std. Error Reg. coef.	Beta	T value	P value
409 Tot G1 Factor #1	-0.1392	0.0307	-0.133	-4.54	0.0000
411 Tot G1 Factor #3	0.1065	0.0324	0.0976	3.29	0.0011
471 Tot A2 Factor #3	0.167	0.0332	0.152	5.03	0.0000
499 SM C2 Factor #2	-0.2035	0.0324	-0.186	-6.27	0.0000
520 G6 Streets	-0.8074	0.203	-0.116	-3.98	0.0001
555 Del/Off Caught Pol/	-0.4899	0.0316	-0.458	-15.5	0.0000
275 Age	-0.05077	0.015	-0.1	-3.38	0.0008

Intercept (constant)	0.9854		
Multiple correlation (R)	0.577		
Std. error of estimate	0.8805		
Explained variance (R2)	0.333	Adjusted	0.330

Analysis of Variance for the Regression

Source of Variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean square	F value	P value
Regression model	7	316.7	45.24	58.4	0.0000
Residual	819	634.9	0.7752		
Total	826	951.5			

Figure 5.6 Multivariate regression, delinquency ever committed, females
Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Female
Dependent variable is 390 Del+Off ever count
Figure shows factors remaining significant at P<0.01

Variable No.	Regression Coefficient	Std. Error Reg. coef.	Beta	T value	P value
409 Tot G1 Factor #1	0.1861	0.0388	0.111	4.79	0.0000
410 Tot G1 Factor #2	0.2774	0.0448	0.143	6.19	0.0000
411 Tot G1 Factor #3	-0.1897	0.0384	-0.117	-4.94	0.0000
413 Tot G1 Factor #5	0.2526	0.0366	0.163	6.9	0.0000
470 Tot A2 Factor #2	-0.101	0.0375	-0.0623	-2.69	0.0073
495 SF C2 Factor #1	-0.149	0.0363	-0.0959	-4.11	0.0000
497 SF C2 Factor #3	0.1147	0.0363	0.0727	3.16	0.0016
511 G4 Gang	1.741	0.429	0.0942	4.06	0.0001
528 G7 Like to play	0.2759	0.0924	0.0706	2.99	0.0029
531 G8 I get materialis	0.7759	0.237	0.0755	3.27	0.0011
534 G8 Have sam interes	0.8324	0.194	0.0993	4.28	0.0000
552 Predel Caught famil	0.09285	0.0195	0.12	4.77	0.0000
553 Del/Off Caught fami	0.8777	0.0549	0.393	16	0.0000
555 Del/Off Caught Pol/	0.6671	0.0954	0.164	6.99	0.0000

Intercept (constant)	0.6063		
Multiple correlation (R)	0.699		
Std. error of estimate	1.109		
Explained variance (R2)	0.488	Adjusted	0.481

Analysis of Variance for the Regression

Source of Variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean square	F value	P value
Regression model	14	1158	82.73	67.2	0.0000
Residual	987	1215	1.231		
Total	1001	2373			

Figure 5.7 Multivariate regression, delinquency score, females
Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Female
Dependent variable is 468 Delinquent/Off Score
Figure shows factors remaining significant at P<0.01

Variable No.	Regression Coefficient	Std. Error Reg. coef.	Beta	T value	P value
410 Tot G1 Factor #2	1.046	0.152	0.168	6.9	0.0000
413 Tot G1 Factor #5	0.6902	0.126	0.139	5.46	0.0000
469 Tot A2 Factor #1	0.4888	0.133	0.0929	3.66	0.0003
470 Tot A2 Factor #2	-0.4053	0.128	-0.0778	-3.17	0.0016
495 SF C2 Factor #1	-0.47	0.123	-0.0941	-3.81	0.0001
497 SF C2 Factor #3	0.3749	0.124	0.0739	3.02	0.0026
511 G4 Gang	6.481	1.45	0.109	4.47	0.0000
528 G7 Like to play	1.107	0.313	0.088	3.53	0.0004
531 G8 I get materialis	2.347	0.804	0.0711	2.92	0.0036
536 G8 Other	3.225	0.986	0.0792	3.27	0.0011
546 G9 TV centre	1.832	0.565	0.0829	3.25	0.0012
552 Predel Caught family	0.2799	0.0662	0.112	4.23	0.0000
553 Del/Off Caught family	2.469	0.186	0.343	13.3	0.0000
555 Del/Off Caught Pol/	2.151	0.324	0.165	6.64	0.0000

Intercept (constant)	1.028		
Multiple correlation (R)	0.656		
Std. error of estimate	3.764		
Explained variance (R2)	0.430	Adjusted	0.424

Analysis of Variance for the Regression

Source of Variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean square	F value	P value
Regression model	14	1.054e+004	752.7	53.1	0.0000
Residual	987	1.398e+004	14.17		
Total	1001	2.452e+004			

Figure 5.8 Solution #520 Dependent variable is 478 SF B4 Factor #2, P<0.01
Sample Base: School-TI-YC/Female
Dependent variable is 478 SF B4 Factor #2
Figure shows factors remaining significant at P<0.01

Variable No.		Regression Coefficient	Std. Error Reg. coef.	Beta	T value	P value
410	Tot G1 Factor #2	-0.1124	0.0248	-0.124	-4.52	0.0000
411	Tot G1 Factor #3	0.07194	0.0207	0.0953	3.48	0.0005
413	Tot G1 Factor #5	-0.06238	0.0198	-0.0862	-3.15	0.0017
496	SF C2 Factor #2	-0.06426	0.0223	-0.0784	-2.88	0.0041
506	G4 Parents	-0.1833	0.0596	-0.0826	-3.08	0.0022
511	G4 Gang	-1.373	0.219	-0.173	-6.27	0.0000
520	G6 Streets	-0.6545	0.155	-0.116	-4.22	0.0000
534	G8 Have sam interes	-0.4507	0.108	-0.112	-4.18	0.0000
553	Del/Off Caught fami	-0.1668	0.0295	-0.153	-5.66	0.0000
555	Del/Off Caught Pol/	-0.6206	0.0513	-0.326	-12.1	0.0000
275	Age	0.04469	0.00983	0.123	4.54	0.0000
	Intercept (constant)	-0.5022				
	Multiple correlation (R)	0.580				
	Std. error of estimate	0.5931				
	Explained variance (R2)	0.336	Adjusted	0.332		

Analysis of Variance for the Regression

Source of Variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean square	F value	P value
Regression model	11	167.3	15.21	43.2	0.0000
Residual	939	330.4	0.3518		
Total	950	497.7			

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

Key to 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

Variable		males				females		
		390	468	481	482	390	468	478*
298	F6B:2 Mother/often				+			
409	Tot G1 Factor #1	+	+		+	+		
410	Tot G1 Factor #2	+	+			+	+	+
411	Tot G1 Factor #3	-	-		-	-		-
412	Tot G1 Factor #4		+					
413	Tot G1 Factor #5	+	+			+	+	+
469	Tot A2 Factor #1						+	
470	Tot A2 Factor #2	-	-		-	-		
471	Tot A2 Factor #3				-			
474	Tot A3 Factor #2	+	+	+				
495	SF C2 Factor #1 (FEMALES)				-	-		
496	SF C2 Factor #2 (FEMALES							+
497	SF C2 Factor #3 (FEMALES)				+	+		
499	SM C2 Factor #2 (MALES)			+				
500	SM C2 Factor #3 (MALES)	+	+	+				
503	Tot C1 Factor #1	-						
505	Tot 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	Prob. behav. caught family					+	+	
553	Delinq caught family	+	+	+		+	+	+
555	Delinq caught other	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
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.

6. BECOMING A REPEAT OFFENDER

6.1 Tapping recidivism

Investigating the issue of recidivism is an onerous task. Equipped with longitudinal data, life history research studies (Blumstein et al. 1985) attempt to tackle the problem by comparing and contrasting the criminal careers of a group of 'desisters' (those with one or two arrests and a low probability of recidivism) with a group of 'persisters' (those with three or more arrests and a high probability of recidivism). These studies have revealed invaluable data on why some young people stop offending and others graduate into an adult career in crime.

Ideally, studies of recidivism require longitudinal data on the life histories of offenders.[1] The time-frame of this research made the collection of such data impossible and we have therefore to base our findings on accounts of the major events in the offenders' lives and retrospective self-reports of their criminal careers up to the time of interview. Moreover, statistical techniques such as multivariate regression cannot be used with confidence on the small number of female offenders in our sample. This chapter deals exclusively, therefore, with male offenders.

One way of investigating recidivism, faced with the lack of longitudinal data, is to break the offender sample into two groups, making use of the classifications developed from the longitudinal research described above. One group can be categorized as *newcomers*, who have been arrested for either one or two crimes. Given that we know from the 1992 CSD and SWD recidivism studies[2] that less than 20% of juvenile offenders will

---

[1]. Although Hong Kong's ILOSS database provides information on the past detected offences, convictions, sentences, etc. for young offenders it is essentially an administrative rather than a research tool. By definition it contains no information on offenders for their undetected offences; and while it contains socio-economic information it appears, on the basis of our own analyses of lifestyle patterns, that much of the most important data in terms of explanations of offending are not collected. This limits its usefulness for our purposes.

[2]. These studies faced similar problems to our own in distinguishing between recidivists and non-recidivists. The CSD report defined recidivists as those re-convicted within one year after discharge and the SWD report classified recidivists as those re-convicted within the follow-up period of the relevant sentence or order. Thus both these studies made use of very brief follow-up periods, when the young offender was still under either CSD or SWD after-care supervision. Their definitions of recidivists and non-recidivists thus can provide only a very limited understanding of the differences between the two categories of offenders.

reoffend within one year after discharge, it is reasonable to assume that most of this group will not become recidivists. The other group can be designated as *repeaters*, who have been arrested on three or more occasions. Hence this group have all been recidivists. Thus, while a comparison of these two groups cannot tap the issue of recidivism directly, it does provide us with an acceptable conceptual framework from which to investigate the differences between those young people who are quite likely to cease offending and those who have become more deeply involved in a criminal career.

This chapter makes use of the above classification to examine the patterns of offending in the male offenders' sample and in particular addresses the question of whether or not *repeaters* engage in more serious or violent criminal activities than *newcomers*. We then further explore the differences between *newcomers* and *repeaters* in terms of their social background, family relations, experiences at school or work, peer-leisure networks and lifestyle. A multivariate analysis is then used to confront the focal concern of this chapter - what factors lead to repeat offending and why?

6.2 Patterns of offending

Longitudinal research studies (Farrington 1992) have shown that 'persisters' tend to start their criminal careers at an earlier age than 'desisters', and engage more frequently in criminal activities during the course of their careers. Similarly, in this research, while there is no significant difference in the mean age of *newcomers* and *repeaters* in the male offenders' sample (16.93 years with a standard deviation of 2.26), *repeaters*:

- began their offending career at a significantly earlier age (Table 6.1), and
- reported significantly higher offending 'counts' (Table 6.2) and 'scores' (Table 6.3), which implies that they have both tried a wider variety of crimes and committed some of them more frequently.

In the rest of this section, we will try to explore, firstly, the types of crimes which are most popular among young offenders based on their own self-report accounts, and secondly, whether or not these crimes become more serious as young people commit themselves to a criminal career.

6.2.1 Do repeaters engage in serious delinquent activities more frequently than newcomers?

Young offenders were asked how often they engaged in a wide range of both 'problematic' and 'delinquent' acts. These data produced three factors which explained 39.65% of the variance in young

offenders' responses.[3]

Factor MOB4#2 symbolizes 'problematic' behaviour, including such items as watching pornographic or violent films, reading pornography, gambling, and flirting. Given that most of these activities are a fairly normal part of male working class subculture, it is not surprising to discover that young offenders participate in these pursuits fairly regularly. Not unexpectedly, there is *no* significant difference between *newcomers* and *repeaters* regarding this type of behaviour (Table 6.4).

Factor MOB4#1 (Table 6.5) includes most of the minor delinquent type crimes such as bullying, fist fighting, vandalism and shop theft. Triad association and truancy is also linked with these activities. Most young offenders have tried these acts once or twice but it will be seen that except for truancy and fist fighting, the item means are much lower than those for the 'problematic' behaviour which appeared in factor MOB4#2. Nevertheless a distinction between *newcomers* and *repeaters* does appear here; the latter have tried the delinquent activities in factor MOB4#1 significantly more frequently than *newcomers* (P=0.0000).

Factor MOB4#3 (Table 6.6) encapsulates a range of more serious type crimes, including such items as drug trafficking, robbery, and fighting with weapons.[4] Most of the serious items in this factor have a mean score of less than two, indicating that young offenders have tried them less often. Sexual intercourse, taking soft drugs, and fighting with weapons are the exceptions to this observation. Again, *repeaters* have tried the crimes in this factor significantly more frequently than *newcomers* (P=0.0000).

6.2.2 How violent are young offenders' crimes? Do repeaters attempt more violent crimes than newcomers?

Legal definitions of crimes such as robbery and assault give little indication of the actual level of violence involved in these crimes. Section I of our interview schedule for offenders allowed us to collect more qualitative data about the seriousness of young offenders' crimes and to question whether or not the level of violence increased as young people became more involved in a criminal lifestyle.[5] The analysis that follows traces the

---

[3]. Cf. the factors SMB4#1, SMB4#2, and SMB4#3 produced from the same list of questions for school-TI-YC males. See also the more general discussions of factor analysis in Chapter 3, and Appendix A.

[4]. It will be seen that truancy and triad association appear both in this factor and in MOB4#1.

[5]. Offender interviews included two sections, labelled H (life history and offence history) and I (specific information

offending history of a group of male offenders from their first offence to their most recent one in order to answer this question.

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). However, by the time of their most recent offence, the differential had changed somewhat. A higher percentage of young offenders reported that they had engaged in crimes against the person, and there is no significant difference between *newcomers* and *repeaters* in this respect. It can also be seen that 'other' crime, which includes activities such as possession of dangerous drugs and having sex with an underage girl, has become more prevalent.

Table 6.7 would appear to indicate that young offenders become more prone to violence as they progress through their criminal careers. But just how violent are young people's crimes? Tables 6.8 and 6.9 show the level of violence and injury to the victim involved in young offenders' *most recent* 'crimes against the person'. From Table 6.8 we can see that the majority of such crimes involve verbal threats and fist fighting (48%). Although 33% admit to 'threatening with weapons', the actual use of weapons is rare (14%). There is no significant difference in the level of violence reported by *newcomers* and *repeaters*. Further, turning to Table 6.9, we can see that in those cases where the victim was actually hurt, the level of injury was generally of a minor nature - as one might expect given that most assaults involve verbal threats or fist fighting rather than the use of weapons. The difference in levels of injury reported by *repeaters* and *newcomers* are not significantly different.

On the basis of these data, we can reasonably conclude that the majority of young people's 'crimes against the person' do not pose a serious threat to the public and that *repeaters* are no more prone to violence than *newcomers*.

6.3 The role of the family: newcomers *versus* repeaters

6.3.1 What is the socio-economic background of male offenders?

Unlike the 1992 CSD and SWD recidivism studies (referred to in Chapter 1), in this research we found no significant difference in the socio-economic background of *newcomers* and *repeaters*. The fathers of offenders tend to be manual workers (57.8%) whose level of education ranged between primary (44.9%) and secondary (33.7%). Mothers are likely to be housewives (43.2%) or manual workers (31.3%), with a slightly lower educational level than

---

on first offence, first offence for which caught, and most recent offence), in addition to the self-administered questionnaire also given to the school-TI-YI sample and divided into sections A-G. A more detailed description of the interview schedule appeared in Chapter 1.

their husbands (49.8% of mothers fell into the 'primary' and 25.8% into the 'secondary' category). Offenders' families tend to live in public housing (57.9%) and the mean family income is in the range $9,000-11,999.[6]

6.3.2 How much contact do young offenders have with their families?

The majority of male offenders live with both parents (83.84%) and see them at least once a day (75.94%). However, following the pattern seen in the school-TI-YC sample, *repeaters* tend to have significantly less contact with their parents, particularly their fathers (Table 6.10).[7] Nevertheless, the quality of contact between young offenders and their families is a debatable issue; only 6.29% of offenders expressed a wish to spend their leisure time with parents.

6.3.3 Do repeaters have more family/health problems than newcomers?

Prior to their first offence, there appears to be little difference in the number of health/family problems experienced by *repeaters* and *newcomers*. Both groups report an increase in general health/family problems between their first offence and the time of the research, through given the time-span this is unlikely to have any particular relevance (Tables 6.11 and 6.12). More significantly, both groups show an increased tendency to attempt suicide and run away from home. On some items, such as suicide attempts, the number of young people reporting the item is so small that it is difficult to gauge whether or not the dramatic increase reflected in the statistics is of any real significance.

---

[6]. There is some difficulty in making a direct comparison with the school-TI-YC sample, for which it was shown in Chapter 2 that the majority had committed at least one offence. However in that sample, the mean level of delinquency (measured by 'delinquency ever count' and 'delinquency score') suggested that higher rates of delinquency were if anything distributed in a slightly U-shaped fashion with higher rates of delinquency at the top and bottom of the social scale. The implication is that the socio-economic situation of those in CSD/SWD custody is somewhat lower than that of many if not most of the higher-scoring self-reported delinquents in the school-TI-YC sample.

[7]. In the school-TI-YC sample higher rates of delinquency were associated with seeing parents less frequently. See Figures 4.5 to 4.8.

6.3.4 Do lax parental attitudes encourage young people to commit crime?

Several of the major research studies conducted in Hong Kong (Ng et al. 1975; Chow et al. 1987) have concluded that inappropriate parental child-rearing attitudes and methods unintentionally propel young people into a life of crime. Yet we found little evidence to support this conclusion. Offenders were asked to imagine how their parents would react if they caught them engaged in a number of problem behaviour and delinquent activities. Four factors explained 53.6% of the variance in young offenders' responses to this series of questions (Tables 6.13 to 6.16). Yet in none of these factors was there a significant difference between the response of *newcomers* and *repeaters*. This implies that both types of offender would expect to receive more or less the same level of parental chastisement for any type of anti-social misconduct. We found no evidence that the *repeaters* believed that their parents would adopt a more liberal or tolerant approach to their children's misbehaviour.[8]

In general, male offenders expected to face disapproval from their parents (usually in the form of being reminded of the negative consequences of their behaviour rather than physical punishment) for engaging in any one of the activities which appeared in these four factors, but obviously some forms of misconduct were likely to incur a greater level of parental wrath than others.

Factor MOB2#2 includes several of the main status-type offences, particularly those relating to 'sexual experimentation' such as watching pornographic films, reading pornography and flirting. Smoking, drinking alcohol and gambling also appear in this factor. Young offenders feel that they are likely to face disapproval from their parents for indulging in such behaviour. However, flirting, watching a violent film and drinking alcohol have a slightly greater chance of being tolerated, whereas gambling and sex-related activities are expected to receive a much sterner reaction.

Factor MOB2#4 brings together another group of status-type offences, particularly those associated with young people's problematic behaviour at home and at school. Once again the young offender would expect to receive a negative parental response to any one of the items in this factor. However, the greatest levels of parental criticism would arise from running away from home, truancy, triad association, and cheating in exams.

Factor MOB2#1 incorporates several of the less serious delinquent activities. Here one finds bullying, fighting, destroying public property, and shop theft. Young offenders would expect parental reactions to be consistently more severe towards the criminal acts which appear in this factor. Interestingly, but

---

[8]. The 1992 CSD recidivism study suggested, albeit on the basis of interviewers' assessments, that this was the case.

not surprisingly, 'taking money from home' is expected to incur the greatest level of parental wrath.

Lastly, factor MOB2#3 includes a number of fairly violent and drug-related crimes. Not surprisingly most of the items in this factor would meet with strong parental disapproval, particularly those connected with drug-trafficking, robbery, and blackmail. Triad association and driving without a licence evoke a slightly less negative parental reaction.

It would appear from the above findings that young offenders are aware that as their criminal activities increase in seriousness, they can expect to face a much sterner reaction from their parents. One could interpret from this that perceived parental leniency is unlikely to be a factor which leads them to become committed to a life of crime.

6.4 The role of school

6.4.1 What kind of relationship do young offenders have with their teachers?

Male offenders do not perceive their relationship with teachers in a totally positive light, nor do they find much interest in school work. Question A2 of the questionnaire provided young offenders with the opportunity to express their views on this relationship in greater detail, producing two main factors which explained 38.4% of the variance in male offenders' responses. Factor MOA2#1 describes a positive relationship in which teachers are caring, fair, helpful, and full of praise (Table 6.17). In general, however, young offenders see their teachers as displaying these characteristics only some of the time. The negative side of teacher-student relations appears in factor MOA2#2, which portrays the teacher with high standards backed up by punitive sanctions when the student fails to follow them (Table 6.18). Young offenders felt their teachers often behaved in this way. There was no significant difference between *newcomers* and *repeaters* in their assessment of teacher-student interaction.

6.4.2 What kind of relationship do young offenders have with their classmates?

Question A3 asked young offenders a battery of questions about their relationship with classmates. This question produced two factors which explained 41.8% of the variance in responses. Factor MOA3#1 describes a positive relationship with peers while factor MOA3#2 paints the alternative negative portrait (Table 6.19 and 6.20). Again, no significant difference was found in the views of *newcomers* and *repeaters*.

6.4.3 Do repeaters experience more problems at school and at work than newcomers?

Prior to their first offence, slightly fewer *repeaters* than *newcomers* had left school and started work. Given that *repeaters* started their offending career at a much earlier age than *newcomers*, this is hardly surprising. However, for *repeaters*, the commission of their first offence appears to have been a significant turning point for the emergence of problems at school and at work. From this point in time, *repeaters* who remained at school report a higher incidence of behaviourial problems than *newcomers*, generally in the form of conflicts with teachers over conduct and academic performance (Table 6.21).

It is difficult to reach any clear conclusions about the differences between *newcomers* and *repeaters* in relation to problems at work. For one thing it is not clear how much work experience the different groups have actually had. What is clear is that around two-thirds of both groups report 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. These figures at least raise the possibility that some relationship exists between offending, lifestyle, and work experience. The precise nature of that relationship - for example whether work problems are more often a direct consequence of offending and lifestyle, or of stigmatization and labelling attached to their heavier involvement in the criminal justice system - remains an open question.

6.5 Self-esteem and life values

Several research studies (e.g. Rutter and Giller 1983) have contended that young offenders have low levels of self-esteem and a distorted set of attitudes towards societal norms and rules. Given this contention, one might expect that as young people become more committed to a life of crime both their self-esteem and pro-social attitudes would show a marked decline.

However, in this research, although offenders had slightly lower self-esteem scores compared to the total male school sample (possibly linked to their negative experiences within the criminal justice system), we found little significant difference between *newcomers* and *repeaters* in terms of their level of self-esteem.

6.5.1 Do young offenders acquire a more distorted attitude towards societal norms and rules as they become more involved in a life of crime?

The young offenders in this research study appear to adopt a relatively positive approach (with no significant difference between *newcomers* and *repeaters*) towards societal norms and rules, but they do have some criticisms to make of the criminal

justice system. In question C1 they were provided with a list of statements which attempted to explore their normative assessment of the role of the family, school and legal system. This question produced three factors which explained 45.89% of the variance in male offenders' responses. Broadly speaking, the loadings on these factors corresponded with those found among the school-TI-YC sample (see Chapter 4). Factor MOC1#1 includes those items which reflect the 'obligations' of parents to children, children to parents and finally children to school (Table 6.22). Male offenders feel strongly that family obligations should be adhered to 'all of the time' or at the very least 'most of the time'. However they are less certain about school-related matters. Whilst young offenders agree that in general school rules should be followed and that students should attend school even when they are unhappy, they also feel that there are occasions when these norms may justifiably be broken. This is no doubt linked to some of their negative experiences with teachers outlined earlier.

Factor MOC1#2 relates to young offenders' beliefs about the fairness or otherwise of the Hong Kong criminal justice system. Young offenders have had direct experience of the operation of this system and so their beliefs are based not so much on abstract idealistic notions of justice, but the perceived reality of contact. In general they express grave doubts about the fairness of the system (Table 6.23).

Factor MOC1#3 reflects young offenders' views on law and order issues. Given that they regard the criminal justice system as being sometimes unfair, it is not surprising to find that at times they see the need to move beyond the law and resort to physical force, if they are to achieve justice and/or happiness (Table 6.24).

6.5.2 Do young offenders develop more tolerant attitudes towards violent crime as they become more committed to a criminal career?

Question C2 asked young offenders to state how seriously they viewed a range of crimes from minor property offences to rape and murder. This question produced three factors which explained 58.16% of the variance in male offenders' responses. Factor MOC2#1 mainly relates to property and 'white collar' type crimes. But it also includes selling soft drugs. The three most serious crimes identified by young people in this category are car theft, bribery and selling soft drugs, whilst the least serious are minor thefts and defrauding one's employer. This factor does produce significant differences (P=0.0002) between *newcomers* and *repeaters*, with the former tending to view all these crimes from a slightly more serious standpoint (Table 6.25).

Factor MOC2#3 comprises a number of fraud-type crimes, some of which also appear in the previous factor. It is interesting to note the way some young offenders associate stealing cars to smuggle to China along with property crimes, whilst others link it to deception. Young offenders take a fairly serious view of the fraudulent crimes in this factor, rating them as more serious

than many of the property crimes included in factor MOC2#1 (Table 6.26).

Factor MOC2#2 reflects the type of crime which the general population tend to regard as being the most serious, such as murder, armed robbery, and rape. Similarly, young offenders view such crimes in a very serious light, a perspective which is equally shared by both *newcomers* and *repeaters* (Table 6.27).

6.6 Friends, leisure, and lifestyle

6.6.1 With whom do young offenders like to spend their leisure?

Male offenders prefer to spend their leisure with their girlfriends (46.8%), the gang (24.9%), or friends outside school (13.5%).[9] They spend an average of 33 hours a week[10] socializing in such friendship networks as opposed to 24 hours with their families or alone.[11] The main difference between *newcomers* and *repeaters* is that the latter expressed a much stronger preference to spend their leisure with the gang (Table 6.28).[12]

The importance of the gang for *repeaters* is further evidenced by the life history data (section H of the interview schedule), 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, it is also interesting to note that by the time the research was conducted, the number of *repeaters* (61.5%) and *newcomers* (59.7%) who had joined a gang had more or less levelled off.

6.6.2 How do young offenders get to know their friends?

Few offenders met their friends at school (30%) or at work (21.3%). Friendships are much more likely to develop in the neighbourhood or streets (38.7%), at entertainment places (34.2%), or via existing friends (48.9%). *Repeaters* are significantly more likely to have met their friends at entertainment places, for example billiard rooms (Table 6.29).

---

[9]. Questions G4-G9 allowed for multiple responses, so here the percentages are based on the number of respondents who answered yes to *each* item and therefore do not add up to 100%.

[10]. Standard deviation 31.23. These figures indicate that the offender sample were similar to the most delinquent members of the school-TI-YC sample in the number of hours spent socializing with friends; see Table 4.20.

[11]. Standard deviation 26.6.

[12]. In the school-TI-YC sample, gang membership was primarily linked to a pattern of more violent delinquency. See the discussion of factor SMB4#2 in Chapter 5.

6.6.3 What type of friends do young offenders have?

Young offenders appear to enjoy the company of fun-loving friends who are 'playful' (52.9%) and 'like to make jokes' (39%). Yet at the same time these friends are 'adventurous' (13.2%), 'daring' (19.2%), and have a 'strong allegiance to the group' (32.7%). Very few are described as 'hard-working' (7.8%). Relations with friends are mainly built on the basis of 'mutual help and support' (52.9%), rather than 'material benefit' (5.1%). For the majority of young offenders at least half of their friends are involved in triads. However *repeaters* have a significantly higher number of triad friends (Table 6.30). This significance of triad associations in the lives of *repeaters* is also supported by the life history (section H) data. While, prior to their first offence, only 35.8% of *repeaters* had joined a triad, at the time the research was conducted the figure had risen to 69%. (The comparable figures for *newcomers* are 28.7% and 52.8%). Given that *repeaters* began offending at an earlier age than *newcomers*, one can assume that their triad connections also started earlier and have had longer to expand.

6.6.4 Where do young offenders socialize with their friends and how do they spend their leisure?

The most popular places to go with friends are TV games centres (65.2%), the cinema (49.2%), skating/karaoke (47.1%), playgrounds or parks (41.4%), and discos/snooker rooms (36.6%). The popularity of these types of entertainment spots was confirmed by question G1, which asked young offenders how much of their spare time they spent in a range of leisure activities. This question produced two factors (which explained 37.41% of the variance in responses). Factor MOG1#2 is the antithesis of the average male offender. It describes the 'studious', 'normalized' youth who spends his leisure studying, going to church and participating in organized youth activities. Male offenders spend very little of their leisure time engaged in these kinds of activities (Table 6.31). Factor MOG1#1, on the other hand, describes what would be defined in social work circles as 'marginal youth subculture'. It portrays a young person who spends his leisure time engaged in 'aimless' pleasure pursuits such as watching videos, listening to music, drinking alcohol and reading comics. Commercialized entertainment establishments such as TV games centres, karaoke lounges and shopping centres are also a strong attraction to the youthful members of this subculture. Male offenders spend between a quarter and a half of their leisure time involved in these kinds of activities (Table 6.32).

The attraction of 'marginal youth subculture' is significantly stronger for *repeaters* compared to *newcomers* (P=0.0221). When one looks in more detail at the specific activities in which *repeaters* are more inclined to engage, it includes such as items as 'going to TV games centres' (P=0.0075), 'going to public places' (P=0.0009), 'loitering' (P=0.0017), and 'taking drugs' (P=0.0295). These are, of course, precisely the

kinds of activities which render them more likely to be stopped, questioned, and (depending on their demeanour and answers) perhaps arrested by the police.

6.6.5 How much encouragement do young offenders get from their friends to commit crime?

We discussed earlier the results of a question in which offenders were asked to imagine how their parents would react were they to catch them committing problem or delinquent acts. In a related question (question B1) we also asked them to imagine how their friends would react if they caught them committing such acts. This question produced four factors which explained 59.04% of the variance in the sample. Factor MOB1#1 can be described as 'problematic' behaviour, as it includes the main status offences such as watching pornographic or violent films, drinking alcohol, smoking, swearing and staying out late. Many of the items in this factor are a normal part of male working class youth subculture and, as one might expect, the male offenders' peer group would offer no comment or implicitly accept this type of behaviour as a normal part of their lifestyle (Table 6.33).

Factor MOB1#4 includes the main minor delinquent activities such as vandalism and shoptheft. Truancy, lying, and running away from home also appear in this factor. Here the young offender would continue to receive considerable acceptance from his peer group, particularly in such items as shoptheft and playing truant. Nevertheless, an element of disapproval is beginning to appear. 'Throwing objects from a height' is certainly 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).[13]

One might expect that the type of behaviour encapsulated in factor MOB1#2 is a fairly normal part of the male offender's subculture; it includes such items as bullying and fighting. Triad association also appears in this factor. All three of these activities are likely to receive implicit approval from the young offender's peer group, albeit with less enthusiasm than displayed towards the behaviourial activities which appeared in Factor MOB1#1. However, as criminal intent becomes more serious, as in the robbery and blackmail items, the young offender can expect to face criticism even from within his peer group (Table 6.35). Nonetheless, factor MOB1#2 does show some significant differences (P=0.0016) between *newcomers* and *repeaters*. *Repeaters* are much more likely to obtain the approval of their friends for engaging in this type of behaviour, which is understandable given that the factor includes triad activities and they have a higher proportion of triad friends.

Factor MOB1#3 includes a number of what are generally regarded to be very serious crimes, such as drug-trafficking and robbery. Even within the male offender's subculture, these crimes

---

[13]. Despite this observation, our self-report data suggest that this offence is relatively common; see Chapter 2.

are likely to meet with considerable disapproval. 'Taking soft drugs' is a slightly ambiguous item, with some offenders categorizing it along with drug-trafficking, and others as a minor pleasure pursuit. Interestingly, this factor is not associated with triad involvement and there is no significant difference between *newcomers* and *repeaters* in their responses (Table 6.36).

6.7 What factors lead to repeat offending and why?

So far in this chapter we have only been able to identify a small number of variables which might help us to explain the differences between *newcomers* and *repeaters*. Since they typically started at a much earlier age than *newcomers*, *repeaters* have usually had more extensive criminal careers. Yet they do not appear to be any more prone to violence than *newcomers*. *Repeaters* spend slightly less time with their parents, although this does not imply that their parents are more tolerant towards criminal behaviour. *Newcomers* and *repeaters* are equally conscious that if their parents were aware of the full extent of their criminal activities, they would be severely reprimanded. While in general, school has not been an entirely positive experience for young offenders, it does not appear to be linked to *repeaters'* greater involvement in crime.

The most revealing differences between *repeaters* and *newcomers* appear in relation to 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'. Within this subculture, activities centre around commercialized entertainment spots, loitering, and hanging around public places. Popular pastimes are bullying, fighting, and minor property crimes, which are fairly acceptable forms of behaviour within the *repeaters'* peer group. This is undoubtedly linked to their heavier triad connections. *Repeaters* have mixed feelings about taking drugs, but are more likely to experiment in such activities than *newcomers*. Nevertheless, even within the confines of this highly delinquent subculture, certain types of crime such as robbery and drug trafficking are likely to be frowned upon.

In order to substantiate the above analysis and explore in greater detail the factors that lead to repeat offending, all of the potentially significant variables from the *newcomers/repeaters* analysis were pooled into a multivariate regression based on two different dependent self-report variables - 'delinquency ever count' and 'delinquency score'.[14] These regressions largely confirm the findings from the *repeaters/newcomers* analysis, but because the regression analysis permitted greater sensitivity to differences in the offending patterns between the two groups, it also opened up some

[14]. These were the same measures as used in the earlier discussion of the school-TI-YC sample (see chapters 3 and 4).

additional insights.

Seven variables (all significant at 1%) provided the minimal set which usefully explained the variability in young offenders' 'delinquency ever counts', and six the variability in their 'delinquency scores' (Tables 6.37 and 6.38). What proves to be particularly interesting about these findings is that except in the case of one variable (factor MOA3#2) both regression analyses produced exactly the same results.

Attitudes towards crime and problematic behaviour appear to be crucial in understanding why some young offenders become more committed to a career in crime. Factors MOB1#1, MOB1#2 and MOB1#3 all refer to the likely reaction of friends to the young offender's delinquent behaviour. Where friends display more tolerance and less disapproval towards 'problematic behaviour' (factor MOB1#1), instances of 'bullying/fighting' (MOB1#2) and 'robbery/drug trafficking' type crimes (MOB1#3), then the young offender is likely to become more deeply involved in a life of crime. Similarly those young offenders who view 'property/white collar crime' (factor MOC2#1) from a less serious standpoint and are more inclined to take the law into their own hands (MOC1#3) will in all probability be more likely to engage in criminal activities.

At first glance factor MOA3#2 seems to have little direct linkage with the other independent variables. Although it only appears in Table 6.37 and not Table 6.38 (that is, it is one of the best predictors of 'delinquency ever count' but not the 'delinquency score'), it is nonetheless associated with the delinquency score at the 5% level (P=0.0227). This factor did not prove to be significant at an earlier stage in the analysis, but here it seems to imply that those young offenders who have a more negative relationship with their classmates are more inclined to engage in crime. It may be - and this was also suggested in Chapter 5, in relation to the school-TI-YC sample - that negative interactions with classmates are likely to propel the young offender to associate with a delinquent peer group, while those who do take up such associations are then treated even more negatively by their classmates.

Bringing together the results of the *repeaters/newcomers* analysis and the multivariate regression, an interesting picture emerges of what factors lead to repeat offending. *Repeaters* are obviously more deeply involved in a subculture in which drug taking and triad connections appear to play a significant role. Yet within this subculture, it is not the delinquent behaviour itself which is significant, but the delinquent attitudes which reinforce it.

6.8 School experience, self-esteem, and problem behaviour: a note on the differences between the school sample and offenders

Thus far we have generally pursued the strategy of explaining the variance within samples rather than across them. This chapter has tried to identify the key differences between *newcomers* and *repeaters*, while previous chapters have investigated the factors that discriminate between low and high levels of involvement in delinquency among the school-TI-YC sample. The key differences that discriminate between *newcomers* and *repeaters* seem to replicate the differences between low and high levels of self-reported delinquency in the school-TI-YC sample. However there are two specific issues on which comparisons between these two samples produce interesting results. One is the experience of schooling; the other is self-esteem.

The issue in relation to self-esteem can be quickly explained. Table 6.39 shows the mean self-esteem scores for the whole male school-TI-YC group; the top 10% and top 5% in terms of their delinquency scores; and the offender group. In essence the mean score for all school males, the most delinquent 10%, and the most delinquent 5%, are rather similar and lie in the narrow range 3.0-3.12 (this uses the 7-point version of the scale). Male offenders, however, have a lower score of 2.7. The clear implication is that the self-esteem of offenders is not lower because of their offending or any socio-economic factors associated with it; the self-esteem of delinquents who are not in the criminal justice system is essentially similar to non-delinquents. The reason for the lower self-esteem among the offender group can only be explained by the simple fact that of their involvement in the criminal justice system. Whether self-esteem is affected by the experience of arrest, prosecution, custody, or supervision is open to debate. But the fact that some or all of these experiences attack self-esteem seems to be the explanation for the findings reported in the CSD 1992 study on low self-esteem among offenders.

So far as schooling is concerned, it was noted in Chapter 4 that involvement in delinquency in the school sample was associated, for males, primarily with a feeling of being rejected by school and secondarily with negative relationships with classmates. On the first issue, the key factor involved was A2#2 and on the second, A3#2. It is possible to calculate factor scores on both factors for the offenders and compare them with males in the school sample and also to revert to the original questionnaire items and compare answers to individual questions.[15] The picture that emerges is rather interesting.

---

[15]. It was not possible to make direct comparisons between A2#2 and A3#2 for the school sample, and MOA2#2 and MOA3#2 for the offenders. For one thing the factor analyses which produced the 'A' and 'MOA' factors analyzed the data into different numbers of factors; for another, while A3#2 and MOA3#2 are in fact identical in terms of which variables load onto them, the other factors produced out of these analyses were rather

Table 6.40 summarizes the means and standard deviations for all school males, the top 10% and top 5% of delinquents among the school males, and the male offenders. The mean for A2#2 for all school males is close to zero (by definition, the mean for the whole sample entered into the analysis - originally both males and females - will be zero). The most delinquent 10% of males in the school sample had a mean of -0.35, that is, they felt more strongly that they were rejected by school. And the effect was even stronger for the top 5%. The offenders, however, felt in general less rejected by schools than did the most delinquent 10% of those still in school. Moreover, the same effect appeared also with A3#2 (negative relations with classmates); the negative relationships were much less strong among the offender sample than it was among the delinquents who were still at school. Similar effects can be seen in every one of the individual items which loaded onto this factor.[16]

While there were small differences between the groups in the 'academic' score, which combined student ranking in the year at school with an assessment of the school's performance, it appears that most of the variation came from the first of these components. In terms of academic performance within their year, the average for all school males was 3.04 (the scale was from 1, 'much lower than most', to 5, 'much higher than most', with a mid-point of 3). This was the only item on which there was more agreement among the 10% most delinquent, 5% most delinquent, and offenders, with all three groups returning means of 2.7 or 2.8 (i.e. a larger proportion assessed themselves as lower or much lower than most in their year). It therefore appears that offenders are not coming disproportionately from the poorer schools; their mean in terms of their rating for the school is similar to that for all males and higher than those reported for the delinquents still in school. Whether the difference in their academic performance within their school formed part of the problem to which delinquency was a response, or whether it was the result of other factors such as negative labelling by classmates and school, remains open to debate but in the light of our previous discussions the latter remains a clear possibility.

Finally, the problem behaviour and delinquency scores for

---

different.

[16]. It should be borne in mind, when looking both at the factors and the individual items, that the means are based on responses to statements. The A2 items comprised statements about school and the responses were gradings of how often those statements were true (1=all the time, to 5=never). The A3 items asked how many of one's classmates a series of statements were true of (1=none, to 5=all). As a result, a mean of say 2.09 on item A3:14 ('There are students in my class I dislike') can in practice be interpreted as the primary response being 'one or two', with more responses of 'some', 'all except one or two', or 'all' than 'none'.

the different groups should give us pause for thought. The offenders had a mean delinquency score comparable to that of the 10% in the school sample with the highest delinquency scores, and significantly lower than that of the most delinquent 5% still in school.[17] Their problem behaviour score, however, was the highest among all four groups. It is true that the offenders were on average about a year older than the school sample and this necessarily has some effect on the problem behaviour score, which includes items (e.g. drinking alcohol) that become more normal among older adolescents. Nonetheless, the difference in scores was so marked that we may 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. Gray (1991), making this argument in the context of data on the sentencing of juveniles, described sentencing as proceeding on the basis of a 'disciplinary welfare' approach. Our own data underline the importance of her argument and it is discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.

6.9 Newcomers, repeaters, and the model of delinquency

The finding that *repeaters* are more involved than *newcomers* in a subculture which tolerates delinquency is consistent with Sutherland's (1924, 1949) arguments about the importance of 'differential association' in the transmission of delinquent attitudes and values. Nevertheless, an argument based on differential association does not explain why some young people *choose* to become involved in criminal subcultures, or what they actually gain from the experience in terms of status and excitement. Nor does it explain the differential involvement of the *newcomers* and *repeaters* in the subculture. Other things being equal we would expect all *newcomers*, once imbued with the subcultural norms, to become *repeaters* and quite clearly they do not. The primacy of the delinquent attitudes appears to suggest, in the terms coined by Sykes and Matza (1957), that both *newcomers* and *repeaters* live within a 'subculture of delinquency' rather than a 'delinquent subculture'. That is, involvement in the subculture is largely a matter of attitude and bravado in which offending is incidental, perhaps even sometimes accidental or a misjudgement of the situation.

In Hong Kong this subculture is not so strongly developed as in many other countries, but it does revolve around what we may loosely call 'triad-influenced values' and there are particular entertainment spots associated with it. While it does not *require newcomers* to offend, it certainly provides

---

[17]. Some of whom, admittedly, may also have experienced arrest and a few of whom may in fact be under some form of supervision.

opportunities for offending and may reward certain delinquent acts by according them a higher status in the subculture (equally, however, it may censure particularly serious offences!). On this view the *repeaters* would be those who have become the 'culture-carriers', whose reputation and status in the subcultural group will be damaged if they do not commit sufficiently daring acts to command respect from the *newcomers*. Some such acts will clearly be offences.

This, then, gives us the distinction between *newcomers* and *repeaters*, based on the 'depth' of their subcultural involvement and different positions within the marginal youth subculture. Such a view remains consistent with the argument presented at the end of the last chapter, based on a modification of Braithwaite's (1989) model. To recapitulate, our model suggested that while the actual occurrence of a first offence could be sparked by a variety of events, and perhaps even accidents or misjudgements of the situation, the motivation for committing it was supported by a number of broad factors such as those described in Hirschi's control theory, that is, a lack of (or the perception of being denied) a 'stake' in conventional society. These factors are then compounded by the mutual reinforcement of labelling and subcultural factors, and lead to further delinquency.

Braithwaite uses his explanatory model - which appears to fit the Hong Kong situation, albeit with some modifications - to argue for a crime reduction policy. He argues that alternative labelling strategies may break the cycle which leads into deeper and deeper subcultural involvement, and reintegrate young offenders into conventional social institutions. The next chapter, therefore, investigates the issue of whether, in the context of Hong Kong's 'disciplinary welfare' approach to young offenders, their experiences in the criminal justice system have any prospects of repairing social bonds and reintegrating offenders into conventional society.

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

	COUNT	MEAN AGE	STD DEV
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

	COUNT	MEAN NO. DIFFERENT OFFENCES EVER TRIED	STD DEV
Newcomers	159	6.30	3.55
Repeaters	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

	COUNT	MEAN NUMBER OF OFFENCES	STD DEV
Newcomers	159	21.18	15.72
Repeaters	174	33.6	17.48
Total	333	27.67	17.76

(P=0.0000)

Table 6.4 Problem behaviour (Factor MOB4#2)
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
24	Watching a pornographic film	-0.76	2.65	1.26
23	Watching a violent film	-0.73	2.98	1.17
25	Reading pornography	-0.72	2.57	1.29
27	Gambling	-0.67	3.45	0.96
19	Flirting with opposite sex	-0.64	3.14	1.15
18	Drinking alcohol	-0.60	3.52	0.98
20	Sexual intercourse	-0.59	2.72	1.37
26	Staying out after midnight	-0.54	3.61	0.81

Number of cases = 267

* 1=Never; 2=Once; 3=2-4 times; 4=5 or more times

Table 6.5 Delinquent behaviour (Factor MOB4#1)
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
2	Bullying outside school	0.69	2.43	1.27
1	Bullying at school	0.67	2.13	1.25
3	Bullying for money	0.66	2.09	1.24
5	Damaging property	0.60	1.91	1.10
9	Shoptheft	0.55	2.43	1.26
15	Throwing object from height	0.54	1.94	1.88
10	Stealing money from home	0.53	2.12	1.23
13	Blackmail	0.52	1.65	1.07
14	Running away from home	0.52	2.34	1.23
4	Destroying public property	0.51	2.02	1.22
11	Embezzlement	0.49	1.45	0.89
28	Riding on public transport without paying	0.45	1.87	1.61
21	Truancy	0.44	3.07	1.21
16	Triad association	0.43	1.93	0.76
6	Fist fighting	0.42	3.33	0.91

Number of cases = 267

* 1=Never; 2=Once; 3=2-4 times; 4=5 or more times

Table 6.6: Drugs and violence (Factor MOB4#3)
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
33	Selling drugs	0.75	1.77	1.26
34	Carrying drugs	0.75	1.60	1.16
22	Getting tattoos	0.54	1.38	0.80
20	Sexual intercourse	0.50	2.72	1.37
7	Fighting with weapons	0.50	2.25	1.20
12	Robbery and mugging	0.47	1.96	1.16
13	Blackmail	0.43	1.65	1.07
32	Taking soft drugs	0.43	2.55	1.43
30	Driving without a licence	0.42	1.74	1.17
16	Triad association	0.42	1.93	0.76

Number of cases = 267

* 1=Never; 2=Once; 3=2-4 times; 4=5 or more times

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

TYPE OF CRIME	1ST OFFENCE	MOST RECENT OFFENCE
Against property	63.9% (195)	28.5% (87)
Against the person	29.2% (89)	43.9% (134)
Other	6.9% (21)	27.5% (84)
TOTAL	(305)	(305)

(Chi-sq.=88; Deg. of Free.=4; P<0.001)

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

LEVEL OF VIOLENCE	NEWCOMERS	REPEATERS	ROW TOTAL
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

LEVEL OF INJURY	NEWCOMERS	REPEATERS	ROW TOTAL
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

	COUNT	MEAN*	STD DEV
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 6.11 Problems with home and health before first offence, 'newcomers' and 'repeaters'
Sample base: male offenders

	NEWCOMERS		REPEATERS	
	COUNT	PERCENT	COUNT	PERCENT
Move to Hong Kong from elsewhere	30	20%	28	17.6%
Move within Hong Kong	69	46%	73	45.9%
Bereavement in the family	42	28%	39	24.5%
Parents divorce/separation	32	21.3%	39	24.5%
Family health problem	19	12.7%	20	12.6%
Personal health problem	15	10%	8	5%
Family mental health problem	4	2.7%	2	1.3%
Personal mental health problem	1	0.7%	1	0.6%
Running away from home	46	30.7%	45	28.3%
Cohabiting with others	11	7.3%	11	6.9%
Suicide attempt	5	3.3%	1	0.6%
Total:	150		159	

Table 6.12 Problems with home and health at time of interview compared to before first offence
Sample base: male offenders

	NEWCOMERS				REPEATERS			
	COUNT	PERCENT	DIFF.%	RATIO PRIOR: SINCE	COUNT	PERCENT	DIFF.%	RATIO PRIOR: SINCE
Move to Hong Kong from elsewhere	30	18.9%	-1.1%	1:0.95	29	16.7%	-0.9%	1:0.95
Move within Hong Kong	94	59.1%	+13.1%	1:1.28	92	52.9%	+7%	1:1.15
Bereavement in family	66	41.5%	+13.5%	1:1.48	67	38.5%	+14%	1:1.57
Parents divorce/ separation	35	22%	+0.7%	1:1.03	45	25.9%	+1.4%	1:1.06
Family health problem	34	21.4%	+8.7%	1:1.69	33	19%	+6.4%	1:1.51
Personal health problem	17	10.7%	+0.7%	1:1.07	11	6.3%	+1.3%	1:1.26
Family mental health problem	4	2.5%	-0.2%	1:0.93	4	2.3%	+1%	1:1.77
Personal mental health problem	2	1.3%	+0.6%	1:1.86	4	2.3%	+1.7%	1:3.83
Running away from home	80	50.3%	+19.6%	1:1.64	87	50%	+21.7%	1:1.77
Cohabiting with others	41	25.8%	+18.5%	1:3.53	42	24.1%	+17.2%	1:3.49
Suicide attempt	10	6.3%	+3%	1:1.91	9	5.2%	+4.6%	1:8.67
Total:	159				174			

Table 6.13 Sexual experimentation (Factor MOB2#2)
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
24	Watching a sex-oriented movie	0.74	2.20	0.99
25	Reading pornography	0.74	2.26	0.96
23	Watching a violence oriented movie	0.72	1.81	0.96
19	Flirting with opposite sex	0.71	1.72	0.92
20	Sexual intercourse	0.68	2.11	1.08
18	Drinking alcohol	0.54	1.96	0.97
17	Smoking cigarettes	0.50	2.12	0.98
27	Gambling	0.48	2.24	0.92

Number of cases = 249

* 1=Ignore; 2=Remind me of the bad effects; 3=Scold me

Table 6.14 Misbehaviour at home and at school (Factor MOB2#4)
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
15	Throwing objects from a height	-0.64	2.58	0.95
21	Playing truant from school	-0.1	2.92	0.98
14	Running away from home	-0.56	2.92	1.11
31	Cheating in exams	-0.54	2.69	0.99
29	Swearing	-0.53	2.10	0.96
16	Triad association	-0.51	2.75	1.08
26	Staying out after midnight	-0.50	2.47	0.97
27	Gambling	-0.49	2.24	0.92
11	Embezzlement	-0.47	2.75	1.01
28	Riding on public transport without paying	-0.45	2.37	0.81
8	Lying	-0.42	2.46	0.89

Number of cases = 249

* 1=Ignore; 2=Remind me of the bad effects; 3=Scold me

Table 6.15 Minor delinquent activities (Factor MOB2#1)
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
1	Bullying at school	0.70	2.79	0.90
2	Bullying elsewhere	0.77	2.78	0.97
3	Bullying for money	0.66	2.94	1.09
5	Damaging other's property	0.66	2.74	0.92
6	Fist fighting	0.65	2.82	1.03
7	Fighting with weapons	0.61	3.06	1.11
9	Shoptheft	0.62	2.94	1.09
4	Destroying public property	0.60	2.52	0.86
10	Taking money from home	0.45	3.30	1.03

Number of cases = 249

* 1=Ignore; 2=Remind me of the bad effects; 3=Scold me; 4=Non-physical punishment

Table 6.16 Drugs and violence (Factor MOB2#3)
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
33	Selling drugs	0.87	3.24	1.26
34	Carrying drugs	0.87	3.28	1.28
32	Taking pills	0.75	3.10	1.20
13	Blackmail	0.61	3.21	1.25
12	Robbery	0.60	3.22	1.26
22	Getting tattoos	0.57	2.84	1.04
7	Fighting with weapons	0.45	3.06	1.11
16	Triad association	0.43	2.75	1.08
30	Driving without a licence	0.44	2.63	1.00

Number of cases = 249

* 1=Ignore; 2=Remind me of the bad effects; 3=Scold me; 4=Non-physical punishment

Table 6.17 Positive teacher-student relations (Factor MOA2#1)
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
8	My teachers are interested in me	0.75	2.82	0.98
9	My teachers are fair to me	0.75	2.90	1.04
7	My teachers help me when I'm having difficulty with my work	0.73	2.53	0.99
12	My teachers praise me when I do my work properly	0.68	2.85	0.90
13	My teachers praise me when I behave well in class	0.67	2.99	0.92
5	My teachers are friendly towards me	0.65	2.65	0.92
1	My lessons are interesting	0.54	3.21	0.79
4	My teachers have clear rules which they expect me to keep	0.42	2.77	0.98
2	My lessons are difficult for me	-0.40	2.94	0.86

Number of cases = 326

* 1=All of the time; 2=Most of the time; 3=Sometimes; 4=Seldom; 5=Never

Table 6.18 Negative teacher-student relations (Factor MOA2#2)
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
10	My teachers scold me when I do work poorly	0.84	2.79	0.84
11	My teachers scold me when I behave badly in class	0.81	2.59	0.84
6	My teachers expect alot of work from me	0.53	2.70	0.98

Number of cases = 326

* 1=All of the time; 2=Most of the time; 3=Sometimes; 4=Seldom; 5=Never

Table 6.19 Positive interaction with classmates (Factor MOA3#1)
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
11	There are students in my class whom I trust	0.73	2.63	0.82
9	There are students in my class whom I like	0.69	2.74	0.83
10	There are students in my class whom I help	0.65	3.04	0.90
3	There are students in my class who trust me	0.64	2.93	0.73
12	There are students in my class whom I telephone at home	0.64	2.52	0.75
4	There are students in my class who telephone me at home	0.62	2.60	0.77
2	There are students in my class who help me	0.60	3.04	0.77
1	There are students in my class who like me	0.55	3.33	0.72

Number of cases = 321

* 1=None; 2=One or two; 3=A few; 4=All but 1 or 2; 5=All

Table 6.20 Negative interaction with classmates (Factor MOA3#2)
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
13	There are students in my class whom I ignore	0.76	2.01	0.85
14	There are students in my class whom I dislike	0.69	2.08	0.71
5	There are students in my class who ignore me	0.66	2.06	0.86
6	There are students in my class who dislike me	0.60	2.18	0.80
7	There are students in my class who tease me	0.58	1.82	0.84
15	There are students in my class whom I tease	0.56	1.90	0.85
8	There are students in my class who bully me	0.53	1.27	0.68
16	There are students in my class whom I bully	0.50	1.51	0.88

Number of cases = 321

* 1=None; 2=One or two; 3=A few; 4=All but 1 or 2; 5=All

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

	NEWCOMERS				REPEATERS			
	COUNT	PERCENT	DIFF.%	RATIO PRIOR: SINCE	COUNT	PERCENT	DIFF.%	RATIO PRIOR: SINCE
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 6.22 Societal rules and obligations (Factor MOC1#1)
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
4	Parents should teach children to behave	-0.76	1.76	0.87
2	Young people should care for parents' health	-0.75	1.78	0.92
3	Young people should take care of elderly parents	-0.68	1.46	0.78
5	Parent should spend time caring for their children	-0.66	1.89	0.91
7	Students should obey school rules	-0.60	2.22	1.12
8	Students should play truant if unhappy at school	0.48	3.71	1.18

Number of cases = 314

* 1=All of the time; 2=Most of the time; 3=Sometimes; 4=Seldom; 5=Never

Table 6.23 The criminal justice system (Factor MOC1#2)
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
9	Hong Kong laws are fair	-0.92	3.08	1.19
10	Hong Kong magistrates and judges are fair	-0.91	3.13	1.14
11	The police are fair in dealing with offenders	-0.81	3.67	1.17

Number of cases = 314

* 1=All of the time; 2=Most of the time; 3=Sometimes; 4=Seldom; 5=Never

Table 6.24 Law and order (Factor MOC1#3)
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
14	To obey or disobey the law makes no difference provided one is happy	-0.78	3.22	1.12
15	I will break the law if it is unfair	-0.74	3.36	1.07
13	Law is at a distance, but the fist is near	-0.66	2.78	1.18

Number of cases = 314

* 1=All of the time; 2=Most of the time; 3=Sometimes; 4=Seldom; 5=Never

Table 6.25 Property and white collar crime (Factor MOC2#1)
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
9	Stealing 200$ in cash	0.88	3.39	2.87
15	Shoptheft	0.76	4.66	3.08
19	Credit card fraud	0.74	5.03	2.91
18	Burglary of home, stealing a karaoke set	0.73	5.70	2.79
5	Defraud employer of 1000$	0.71	4.05	2.93
7	Stealing 1000$ from parents	0.71	4.65	3.36
10	Burglary of home, stealing 200$ in cash	0.70	4.84	3.10
8	Theft of a car for joy riding	0.70	5.46	3.07
12	Selling marijuana or pills	0.53	6.52	2.99
20	Throwing object from high place	0.45	4.94	3.46
14	Accepting a bribe	0.44	6.67	2.87
16	Theft of car to smuggle to China	0.41	6.94	2.73

Number of cases = 300

* 0=Not at all serious; 10=Most serious

Table 6.26 Deception (Factor MOC2#3)
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
2	Making a false tax return	0.83	5.33	3.08
1	Practice law with forged qualifications	0.76	6.53	3.18
3	Selling stolen goods	0.61	6.21	2.90
16	Theft of car to smuggle to China	0.56	6.94	2.73
14	Accepting a bribe	0.52	6.67	2.87

Number of cases = 300

* 0=Not at all serious; 10=Most serious

Table 6.27 Violent crime (Factor MOC2#2)
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
17	Impulsive killing of parents	0.77	9.7	1.47
11	Rape	0.69	8.24	2.55
4	Murder	0.67	8.68	2.43
13	Assault with a knife or chopper	0.63	7.56	2.78
6	Armed robbery	0.50	7.8	2.57
12	Selling marijuana or pills	0.43	6.52	2.99

Number of cases = 300
* 0=Not at all serious; 10=Most serious

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

	NEWCOMERS	REPEATERS	ROW TOTAL
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 6.29: Meet friends at entertainment places, 'newcomers' and 'repeaters'
Sample base: male offenders

	NEWCOMERS	REPEATERS	ROW TOTAL
Yes	25.8% (41)	42% (73)	2% (114)
No	74.2% (118)	58% (101)	65.8% (219)
COLUMN TOTAL	(159)	(174)	(333)

(Chi-sq=9.6; Deg. of Free.=1; P=0.0019)

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

	COUNT	MEAN*	STD DEV
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 6.31 'Normative' youth (Factor MOG1#2)
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
15	Studying	-0.67	1.39	0.84
26	Going to church	-0.67	1.33	0.83
27	Participating in organised youth activities	-0.64	1.39	0.94
28	Attending evening class	-0.63	1.18	0.61
37	Out-door activities	-0.59	1.79	1.29
13	Hobbies e.g. stamp collecting	-0.58	1.39	0.97
4	Reading school books	-0.56	1.72	1.15
36	Camping	-0.56	1.60	1.16
35	Sports	-0.55	2.09	1.37
9	Playing musical instruments	-0.55	1.44	1.05
1	Reading newspapers	-0.51	2.13	1.19
14	Doing housework	-0.50	2.08	1.20
34	Ball games	-0.47	2.43	1.45
3	Reading magazines	-0.46	2.45	1.39
10	Playing with computer	-0.45	1.63	1.25
23	Chatting on the phone	-0.45	2.58	1.47
25	Gambling	-0.42	2.05	1.45
7	Listening to the radio	-0.41	2.83	1.62
31	Getting tattoos	-0.41	1.36	0.93
24	Playing mahjong	-0.41	2.14	1.47

Number of cases = 253

* 1=None of the time; 2=1/4 or less; 3=1/4 to 1/2; 4=1/2 of the time

Table 6.32 'Marginal youth subculture' (Factor MOG1#1)
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
17	Watching movies	0.72	3.11	1.48
19	Going to shopping malls	0.72	3.06	1.54
18	Going to TV games centres	0.69	3.30	1.67
6	Watching videos	0.68	3.33	1.61
30	Drinking	0.67	2.98	1.43
33	Smoking	0.64	3.81	1.87
29	Eating out	0.62	2.88	1.39
8	Listening to records	0.59	3.23	1.72
20	Loitering	0.59	2.54	1.53
11	Playing karaoke	0.58	2.69	1.68
2	Reading comics	0.55	2.87	1.63
7	Listening to the radio	0.53	2.83	1.62
23	Chatting on the phone	0.53	2.58	1.47
12	Playing cards	0.52	2.34	1.56
16	Sleeping	0.52	3.91	1.51
5	Watching TV	0.49	3.33	1.61
21	Group games	0.46	2.30	1.49
25	Gambling	0.46	2.05	1.45
24	Playing mahjong	0.43	2.14	1.47
32	Taking drugs	0.41	1.87	1.48

Number of cases = 253

* 1=None of the time; 2=1/4 or less; 3=1/4 to 1/2; 4=1/2 of the time

Table 6.33 Problem behaviour (Factor MOB1#1)
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
24	Watching a pornographic film	0.75	4.83	1.73
18	Drinking alcohol	0.74	4.91	1.78
23	Watching a violent film	0.73	5.14	1.78
29	Swearing	0.72	4.89	1.70
26	Staying out after midnight	0.71	5.23	1.88
17	Smoking	0.70	4.93	1.81
27	Gambling	0.69	5.06	1.84
25	Reading pornography	0.68	4.71	1.70
19	Flirting	0.56	4.44	1.37
16	Triad association	0.55	4.38	1.86
31	Cheating in an exam	0.52	4.38	1.74
20	Having sex	0.50	4.01	1.18
21	Playing truant	0.48	4.63	1.89
32	Taking soft drugs	0.43	4.19	2.05

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; 6=Teach me how to do it; 7=Do it with me

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

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
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	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD. DEV
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 6.36 Drug trafficking and robbery (Factor MOB1#3)
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	LOADING	ROTATED FACTOR MEAN*	STD DEV
34	Carrying drugs	-0.83	3.32	1.71
33	Selling drugs	-0.78	3.47	1.77
32	Taking soft drugs	-0.57	4.19	2.05
30	Driving without a licence	-0.55	3.94	1.80
22	Getting tattoos	-0.55	3.89	1.70
13	Blackmail	-0.51	3.81	1.93
12	Robbery and mugging	-0.45	3.76	2.02

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 6.37 Multivariate regression with 'delinquency ever count'as the dependant variable
Sample base: male offenders

INDEPENDENT VARIABLE	P VALUE
Reaction of friends to 'problematic behaviour' (Factor MOB1#1)	0.0078
Reaction of friends to 'bullying and fighting' (Factor MOB1#2)	0.0000
Reaction of friends to 'drug trafficking and robbery' (Factor MOB1#3)	0.0000
Attitude to 'law and order' (Factor MOC1#3)	0.0017
Seriousness of 'property and white collar crime' (Factor MOC2#1)	0.0005
'Negative interaction with classmates' (Factor MOA3#2)	0.0036
'Taking drugs' (Item G1:32)	0.0001

Number of cases = 207
Explained variance = 43.8% (adjusted)

Table 6.38 Multivariate regression with 'delinquency score' as the dependant variable
Sample base: male offenders

INDEPENDENT VARIABLE	P VALUE
Reaction of friends to 'problematic behaviour' (Factor MOB1#1)	0.0018
Reaction of friends to 'bullying and fighting' (Factor MOB1#2)	0.0000
Reaction of friends to 'drug trafficking and robbery' (Factor MOB1#3)	0.0000
Attitude to 'law and order' (Factor MOC1#3)	0.0001
Seriousness of 'property and white collar crime' (Factor MOC2#1)	0.0043
'Taking drugs' (Item G1:32)	0.0001

Number of cases = 207
Explained variance = 44.3% (adjusted)

Table 6.39 Comparisons of self-esteem score across school and offender samples (males)

Sample Base 1: School-TI-YC/Male (Count= 1099)
Sample Base 2: School-TI-YC/Male, Top 10% on delinquency score (Count= 130)
Sample Base 3: School-TI-YC/Male, Top 5% on delinquency score (Count= 58)
Sample Base 4: CSD-SWD-Prob/Male (Count= 335)

Means and standard deviations

Variable #466 Self-esteem score

	Count	Mean	Std. Devn.
School-TI-YC male, all	1078	3.116	1.334
School-TI-YC male, 10% most delinquent	128	3.039	1.232
School-TI-YC male, 5% most delinquent	57	3.070	1.163
CSD-SWD-Prob male	326	2.718	1.345

Table 6.40 Comparisons of selected school, problem behaviour, and delinquency measures between school and offender samples (males)

Sample Base 1: School-TI-YC/Male (Count= 1099)
Sample Base 2: School-TI-YC/Male, Top 10% on delinquency score (Count= 130)
Sample Base 3: School-TI-YC/Male, Top 5% on delinquency score (Count= 58)
Sample Base 4: CSD-SWD-Prob/Male (Count= 335)
Number of cases for each variable may differ slightly due to missing data

Means and standard deviations

	School-TI-YC		School-TI-YC top 10%		School-TI-YC top 5%		School-TI-YC CSD-SWD-Prob	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
A2 Factor #2	-0.03	1.01	-0.35	1.17	-0.68	1.39	-0.25	1.03
A3 Factor #2	0.07	1.05	0.65	1.32	1.18	1.55	0.23	1.07
A4:1 Rating within year	3.04	1.16	2.83	1.31	2.71	1.39	2.71	1.42
A4:2 School rating	3.45	1.43	3.13	1.51	2.83	1.45	3.41	1.58
Problem behaviour score	22.40	15.98	42.79	16.26	49.82	17.48	52.75	16.18
Delinquency score	6.74	8.64	24.92	11.45	33.70	12.53	27.60	17.74

7. YOUNG PEOPLE'S EXPERIENCES IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM[1]

Young offenders' perceptions and experiences of criminal justice change as they become more involved in the system. In order to understand the nature of these changes, a sub-sample of cases was extracted from the total male offenders sample (268 cases, approximately 80% all males in the offender sample) where information was known about both the first and most recent arrests. Changes in these young offenders' views of the criminal justice system were traced through these two events.[2]

7.1 How do young male offenders get caught?

The majority of young offenders are likely to get caught by the police either at the scene of the crime or in stop and search operations. However, 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. This may reflect that their crimes have become more serious, thus increasing the likelihood of being caught, or that they have become a more obvious target of police surveillance (Table 7.1).

7.2 How do young offenders react to being caught?

Young offenders react in a variety of different ways to being caught. However 'fear' and 'nothingness' are the two most common reactions to their first arrest. Any sense of 'fear' declines in subsequent arrests, to be replaced by a greater sense of 'nothingness'. It would appear that as young people gain more experience of the criminal justice system they are less frightened of it and more inclined to detach themselves from its impact. Feelings of guilt or shame appear to have little significance either at the time of the first arrest or in subsequent arrests (Table 7.2).

---

[1]. This chapter focuses exclusively on how young people perceive their experiences in the criminal justice system. While from an 'interactionist' perspective it would have been interesting to explore how other social actors e.g. the police, judiciary, probation officers, residential workers and correctional services officers, view the operation of the criminal justice system, this was not part of the research team's remit.

[2]. Where the analysis moves beyond this sub-group or compares them with others, this is signalled in the text. Because complete information relating to both arrests was not available for every item discussed in this chapter, the totals shown in the tables fluctuate considerably.

7.3 How is the decision to caution structured?

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. What, though, had happened following their *first* arrest? In general, first offenders who meet specific criteria as to age, for whom there is sufficient evidence for a prosecution, and who admit the offence, may be given a caution under the Superintendent's Discretionary Scheme.[3]

This degree of flexibility means that in a few cases, offenders have been cautioned for serious assaults, deception, and even arson (Ip 1990: 38-9). However, Ip indicates that in 1986-8, the crime for which cautions were most often issued was shoptheft. In 1988, shoptheft accounted for 53% of all juvenile crime, and 81% of all those who committed this offence were cautioned. However in recent years the proportion of young offenders cautioned has declined. In 1986 and 1987, 58% of all offenders under the age of 16 were discharged under the Superintendent's Discretionary Scheme, but by 1990 this had fallen to 33% (the figure has since risen slightly and stood at 42% for 1993).[4]

Despite the flexibility of the Superintendent's Discretionary Scheme, among our own sample, the majority of young

---

[3]. Ip (1990: 8-12) describes the decision-making criteria in more detail. The offender must be a juvenile (i.e. not reached his or her 17th birthday). There must be sufficient evidence for a prosecution, and in addition the admission of guilt must be voluntary and unequivocal. While the scheme is flexible, the Superindent should consider: the nature of the offence (harm or injury must not be serious) and any element of malicious planning; the offender's previous record (a second caution may only be given in exceptional circumstances); the attitude of the complainant/victim, if there is one and he or she can be found; the attitude of parents or guardians (only in exceptional circumstances should a caution be issued in the absence of a parent or guardian); and the availability of facilities from SWD or similar agencies (a cautioned offender may be referred by the police to the SWD Family Services Unit). There are certain other legal matters concerning the likelihood of cautioned offenders then being pursued for compensation or another civil remedy. A caution is formal in nature and the offender is informed that it can be cited in court in any subsequent prosecution. Arrangements for the supervision of cautioned offenders - they may be supervised by the police from the Juvenile Protection Section for up to two years - were recently changed following the introduction of the Hong Kong Bill of Rights. In essence any follow-up must now be with the consent of the parent or guardian. All these provisions are under review at the time of writing and it is likely that the age limit for cautioning, at least, will be revised.

[4]. Source: Royal Hong Kong Police.

offenders for whom we have data on both first and most recent arrests[5] had in fact been sent to court following their first arrest (64.7%); only 35.3% had received a caution. In the whole male offender sample the situation was even bleaker than this, with 70% sent to court following their first arrest and only 30% cautioned.[6] 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.[7]

The decreased use of cautioning as a young offender's career progresses is hardly surprising, particularly as they are no longer eligible for a caution once they reach the age of 17. However what is significant about the above figures is that those who now constitute the 'correctional and supervised population' of offenders had experienced only a limited use of cautioning at the beginning of their offending career, despite many being less than 16 years old at that time.

Several obvious explanations for this are plausible at first sight. Those who are now in custody or under supervision may be among those whose first offences were more serious (or at least, not shoptheft). They may have parents who were unwilling to become involved in the cautioning process, thus limiting their chances of being cautioned. They may not have been prepared to admit guilt, thus leaving the police with no choice but prosecution. Or, following the train of thought initiated in Chapter 6, their problem behaviour may have given rise to a belief that cautioning would serve no purpose. We know that the amount of problem behaviour exhibited within the offender sample was greater that that of the 'worst' 5% of the school sample even though their offending behaviour was comparable with only the 'worst' 10% of those still in school (see Table 6.40), and we have grounds for believing that sentencing processes are highly

---

[5]. These percentages control for age, that is, they are based on the number of young people who were aged 16 years or below at the time of their first arrest and so were eligible for a caution.

[6]. It appears from anecdotal sources that where a young person without a prior criminal record or caution is apprehended as one of a group of young people, others of whom do have such records, the most common outcome is that all the young people will be dealt with by way of prosecution. It has been suggested that the alternative - to caution those without a record while prosecuting those with a record - would appear unfair to the culprits. But if this is indeed a common phenomenon, the net effect would be that a large proportion of young delinquents would skip the cautioning stage not on account of their own behaviour but because of who they associate with.

[7]. Social Welfare Department (1992) *Recidivism Study on Young Offenders.* Unpublished Departmental Report.

sensitive to problem behaviour.[8] Why should this not also be the case at the earlier stage of determining whether a prosecution should take place?

While none of these possibilities can be wholly discounted, some are more plausible than others. Although we saw in the last chapter that almost 70% of the offenders on whom we had data committed a property crime for their first offence, 49% were first *arrested* for crimes against the person (as against about 25% of all juvenile arrests being for violent crimes against persons *or* property). Even though the level of injury in most such cases was minor, this suggests that the nature of the offence for which the offender was arrested (property versus the person) is likely to affect his chances of being cautioned.

While almost all young people preferred to spend time away from the family, we also saw that the majority saw their parents at least once every day. Data as to the relationship between young delinquents and their families prior to their first offence are not as complete as we might like, but again give us no reason to suppose that parents would be unwilling to participate in cautioning. We have no data on whether young offenders were in fact prepared to admit guilt on their first detected offence, but in any case this factor merges into the wider one of demeanour and problem behaviour.

The most plausible explanations of the low cautioning rate for those who have gone on to become offenders are, then, that decision-makers in the cautioning process use, first, the issue of whether the offence is against property or against the person, and second, their perceptions of problem behaviour as the bases for determining whether cautioning would be desirable.[9]

---

[8]. See Gray (1994a) for a discussion of sentencing practices inside the Hong Kong juvenile courts.

[9]. It has also been argued, in Hong Kong and elsewhere, that a 'net-widening' effect has occurred. The argument is that the creation of cautioning schemes has led to more minor offenders - those who prior to the scheme's introduction would probably have been ignored or dealt with informally - being brought into the criminal justice system. At the same time, many of those for whom the scheme was originally intended continued to be dealt with by way of prosecution, rather than diverted into cautions. Cohen (1985) originally made the argument using UK and American data, and Gray (1991) discusses it in the context of Hong Kong. The argument we present here is to some extent independent of the net-widening issue. The use of problem behaviour as the basis of decision-making about offending could have arisen as a consequence of net-widening, but need not have done.

7.4 How do the courts deal with young offenders?

The majority of the young offenders for whom we have data on both the first and the most recent sentence 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. Nevertheless 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).[10]

Following their most recent conviction, the majority of this group ended up in residential care (40.9%) or custody (47.8%). Undoubtedly many of these young people would have already been tried on 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 a large number of this group (as a later section will elaborate) have been placed in residential care or custody after very brief offending careers and for crimes which could hardly be described as posing a serious threat to the public.

7.5 What reaction do young offenders have to their caution or sentence?

It has been argued (Gray 1991, 1994) that while the welfare of the child appears to be the main consideration in sentencing, the interests and needs of the child are largely conceived of as needs to modify problem behaviour. Hence Gray's use of the term 'disciplinary welfare' to describe the prevalent sentencing and correctional perspective in Hong Kong.

This perspective raises three issues. First, as argued in Chapters 3, 4, and 5, it seems likely that where one is dealing with young offenders, the problem behaviour is not in fact the cause of the offending but can in some respects be the consequence of it. Second, in so far as problem behaviour results from a breaking of social bonds, primarily with the family and school, it is far from clear that the breaking of those bonds was effected by the offender; in the case of schools, as Chapters 4 and 5 point out, it may be the school that rejects the offender and not the other way around. Third, therefore, one has to ask whether repairing those bonds can really be achieved either by

---

[10]. The comparable figures for all male offenders (aged 7-20) sentenced in 1993 appear in Table 7.11. This shows that 22.9% of male offenders were placed in residential care or custody following their first conviction, and 47.2% were placed on a probation or community service order. Following their most recent conviction, the majority of this group (46%) ended up in residential care or custody, with only 20% receiving a probation or community service order.

supervision or through training in a custodial setting. Supervision and custody may in practice, and despite extensive efforts at rehabilitation, produce most of their effects through the blunt instrument of deterrence.

On the basis of our data we can make a clear finding only on this third issue.

We can make two comparisons. The first is between the responses of those who have been caught once and sent straight to custody or residential care, and the responses of those who have been caught at least twice and who are now on probation or in residential care or custody. The second, focusing on those who have been caught twice and who are now on probation or in residential care or custody, is a comparison between their response to the current sentence and to their first caution or sentence (which may of course have been simply a fine). Table 7.4 sets out the situation.[11]

On the first comparison, there is relatively little difference between the two groups. Of those who had been caught once, 60% stated that their sentence had a 'deterrent' effect; of those who were on their second or subsequent sentence and were on probation, in residential care, or custody, 55% felt that the sentence was a deterrent. For those now undergoing their second sentence, a smaller proportion (34.5%) thought that their first sentence had been a deterrent than thought that their current sentence had a deterrent effect. The key issue is, however, that deterrence was the response cited most often in both comparisons, with offenders saying that it made them 'think about the consequences of offending', or decide 'not to commit another crime'.

We have to acknowledge that our definition of deterrence is fairly wide.[12] However, the key point is that while most young people enmeshed in the criminal justice system typically acknowledge that the experience may dissuade them from committing further offences, very few talk of any positive 'rehabilitative' effects. Only small percentages (from 1.5% to 10.6%) claimed that the caution or sentence helped in sorting out their personal or family problems. Thus it would appear unlikely that sentencing facilitates a reforging of social bonds. It is far more probable that as young people mature they become more conscious of the

---

[11]. Question 3.17 (Section I) was a multiple-response question in which offenders were asked to choose which statements best described the effect of the sentence/caution on them.

[12]. This is of course a fairly liberal definition of deterrence, since it subsumes the idea of offender's attitudes being challenged and changed. In the classical criminological literature, deterrence is often seen in terms of a more rational 'cost-benefit' model in which deterrence means that any gains from potential future offences are outweighed by the likely costs (i.e. punishments) they would incur.

consequences of their actions, particularly when faced with the reality of life in residential care or custody.

7.6 How do young offenders feel about being in residential care or custody?

This section explores the feelings of those young people placed in residential care/custody following their most recent conviction. Unlike earlier sections, it is based on data derived from the whole male offenders sample. 'Regret' and 'adjustment'[13] are the main issues for young offenders during their most recent stay in residential care or custody (Table 7.5); 25.7% felt the former and 29.2% the latter. Only a small percentage (17.2%) described institutionalization as an opportunity to acquire new skills.

7.7 Is the use of institutions and custody justified by the seriousness of the young offender's criminal career?

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).[14] 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.

Not unexpectedly, 41% of those 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 care (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).[15] 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

---

[13]. The 'just doing my time' and 'nothing to worry about' responses; there was no overlap between the responses to the two items.

[14]. Spearmans = 0.18, P=0.002. In this calculation, we have to assume that 'severity' can be ranked on a scale from open probation, through residential care, to custody.

[15]. The figures for all male offenders (aged 7-20) convicted in 1993 appear in Table 7.12. However this table uses the official classification of the offences for which they were convicted, while our table classifies by the self-reported type of crime.

7.8).[16]

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).[17] Of 241 young offenders admitted into residential care or custody, 111 had committed an offence against the person as their most recent offence. Out of these 111 cases, only 41 had used violence against their victim (a further 39 had threatened their victim with a weapon), and of these 41 cases only 13 victims required hospitalisation. This would mean that three quarters of those in residential care or custody for a crime against the person had committed offences which resulted in no, or only very slight physical injury to a victim.

These observations, when taken together, suggest that in Hong Kong the majority of young offenders who receive residential care 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 care or custody are in the majority of cases comparatively minor. These findings can be substantiated by Social Welfare and Correctional Services Department statistical data.[18] Our data shows that many young offenders who have not committed serious crimes are nonetheless placed in residential care or custody. In addition the data suggests that the problem behaviour that they

---

[16]. An analysis of the level of violence for the first caught offence by the main sentence for the first caught offence yields Spearmans 0.33, P=0.0007 (104 cases).

[17]. See also Tables 6.7, 6.8, and 6.9.

[18]. (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.

display may have influenced the sentencing decision. This interpretation of our data is backed up by previous research findings. Gray (1994a) found in her research that while sentencing in the juvenile court is based on the principle of being "in the child's best interests", this is usually interpreted to mean that juvenile justice decision-makers should take into account the total social situation of the young person before determining sentence. In this assessment process, delinquency is treated as a type of behavioural problem in need of varying levels of guidance, regulation and discipline. The degree of triad affiliation or association with undesirable peers is also viewed as a highly significant factor. However, the 'unintended consequence' of this practice is that young people often receive a higher tariff sentence not just because of the severity of their crimes, but also because their behaviour is seen to have 'wandered too far off the right track', beyond the control of family, school and other socialisation networks.

7.8 How do family, friends, and authority figures react to young people being caught and sentenced? Do these reactions change as young people get more involved in the criminal justice system?

A number of research studies (Farrington 1977, Rutter and Giller 1983) have attempted to show that negative labelling and stigmatization by family, friends, and authority figures are key factors in the young offender's acquisition of a criminal identity.

However, few young offenders in this sample appear to be conscious of any negative reactions from family. At the time of their first arrest/conviction, family members and friends remained supportive. By the time of the second offence, there was a slight tendency for parents to become if anything more sympathetic and friends, if anything, to become less sympathetic. 'Rehabilitative' criminal justice personnel such as probation officers, outreach workers, and social workers were generally perceived to be supportive figures in the young offender's life, with no significant change at the time of the young person's second arrest.

Nevertheless, young offenders were aware of negative labelling or stigmatization arising from the attitudes and behaviour of the police, magistrates, and judges. Both at the time of their first arrest/conviction, and more so at their most recent one, these key authority figures - but in particular the police - were generally perceived by young offenders to adopt a harsh, condemnatory stance to their criminal activities (Table 7.10).

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 7.2 Feeling about being caught, first vs. most recent arrest
Sample base: male offenders caught at least twice

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	FIRST ARREST	RECENT ARREST	P VALUE
3	Fearful	56.33% (138)	31.84% (78)	0.001
9	Nothing in particular	16.33% (40)	27.76% (68)	0.002
1	Guilty/ashamed	5.31% (13)	5.31% (13)	--
	Total	(245)	(245)	

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 7.4 Impact of caution/sentence, first arrest vs. most recent arrest
Sample base: male offenders

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	FIRST ARREST CAUGHT MORE THAN ONCE	RECENT ARREST CAUGHT MORE THAN ONCE	ONLY CAUGHT ONCE
	Deterrent:	34.5% (91)	55.3% (146)	60.0% (39)
1	Made me think about the consequences of offending			
2	I'll never commit another crime again			
8	Made me think about not committing crime again			
	Nothingness:	29.2% (77)	10.6% (28)	6.2% (4)
4	No effect/nothing			
	Rehabilitation:	3.8% (10)	6.4% (17)	10.8% (7)
5	Helped me sort out my problems at home/school/work			
6	It made me know what I should do			
	Manipulation:	10.6% (28)	4.6% (12)	1.5% (1)
7	Made me think about not getting caught again			
	Total	(264)	(264)	(65)

Table 7.5 Feelings while in residential care or custody, most recent experience
Sample base: male offenders in CSD/SWD residential care/custody

ITEM NO.	ITEM CONTENT	RECENT EXPERIENCE
2+7	Just doing my time/ Nothing to worry about	29.2% (76)
9	Regretful about offending	25.7% (67)
8	Lonely	3.8% (10)
5	Learning a new skill	17.2% (45)
	Total	(260)

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

(Spearmans 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.

LEVEL OF VIOLENCE	PROBATION/CSO		RES. CARE		CUSTODY		ROW TOTAL	
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 known	-	-	-	-	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.

LEVEL OF INJURY	PROBATION/CSO		RES. CARE		CUSTODY		ROW TOTAL	
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)

Table 7.10 Reaction of family, friends and authority figures, first vs. most recent arrest
Sample base: male offenders caught at least twice

SIGNIFICANT OTHERS	FIRST ARREST Positive reaction	Negative reaction		RECENT ARREST Positive reaction	Negative reaction		ROW TOTAL	P VALUE**
	Understanding	Fair	Harsh	Understanding	Fair	Harsh		
Parents	68 (114)	15 (25)	17 (28)	80 (133)	10 (16)	11 (18)	(167)	0.0148
Brothers/sisters	69 (90)	25 (32)	6 (8)	75 (98)	19 (24)	6 (8)	(130)	0.3806
Girlfriend	85 (62)	6 (4)	10 (7)	85 (62)	12 (9)	3 (2)	(73)	0.3507
Friends	78 (67)	19 (16)	4 (3)	70 (60)	20 (17)	11 (9)	(86)	0.0229
Employer	64 (9)	14 (2)	21 (3)	71 (10)	7 (1)	21 (3)	(14)	*
Teacher	64 (9)	14 (2)	21 (3)	71 (10)	14 (2)	14 (2)	(14)	*
Social workers	71 (24)	15 (5)	9 (3)	59 (20)	18 (6)	15 (5)	(34)	*
Outreach workers	77 (26)	15 (5)	3 (1)	74 (25)	12 (4)	6 (2)	(34)	*
Probation officer	44 (30)	35 (24)	18 (12)	32 (22)	48 (33)	18 (12)	(69)	0.1984
Residential/ custodial staff	41 (12)	35 (10)	21 (6)	41 (12)	48 (14)	10 (3)	(29)	*
Lawyer	53 (18)	32 (11)	15 (5)	35 (12)	47 (16)	18 (6)	(34)	0.1394
Police	15 (15)	29 (29)	56 (55)	6 (6)	26 (26)	68 (67)	(99)	0.0059
Magistrate	18 (17)	48 (46)	22 (21)	14 (13)	41 (39)	34 (33)	(96)	0.0087
Judge	22 (15)	48 (33)	22 (15)	17 (12)	41 (28)	29 (20)	(69)	0.0528

Percentages rounded to nearest percent; actual numbers shown in brackets.
** Wilcoxon signed-rank statistic
* Number of cases showing any change too small to compute p value

Table 7.11 The sentence of the court, first conviction vs. most recent conviction, for all males (aged 7-20) convicted in 1993 and having at least one previous conviction[1]

Type of Sentence	FIRST CONVICTION (%)	RECENT CONVICTION (%)
Imprisonment	4.8	12.6
Training Centre	3.3	11.8
Detention Centre	5.6	7.0
Drug Addiction Treatment Centre	2.5	11.7
Corporal Punishment	*	-
School Order	2.8	1.7
Institutional Probation	3.9	1.2
Open Probation	46.2	17.0
Community Service Order	1.0	3.0
Detention Order	0.7	0.2
Suspended Imprisonment	1.7	4.0
Bound Over/Conditional Discharge	5.1	2.2
Fine	21.4	27.1
Caution/Absolute Discharge	0.8	0.3
Hospital Order (CSD Custody)	-	0.2
Others	0.1	*
Total	100.0	100.0

* less than 0.05

Table 7.12 The most recent conviction of all males (aged 7-20) convicted in 1993 by type of sentence by type of offence[1]

Type of Sentence	Offence against lawful authority	Offence against public morality	Offence against person	Offence against property	Others	Total
Imprisonment	0.73	0.32	0.98	2.86	8.61	13.51
Training Centre	0.41	0.26	0.81	3.99	0.81	6.29
Detention Centre	0.81	0.19	0.41	2.79	0.36	4.56
Drug Addiction Treatment Centre	0.13	0.04	0.06	2.24	3.13	5.59
School Order	0.09	0.06	0.11	0.57	0.06	0.89
Institutional Probation	0.06	0.04	0.02	0.89	0.11	1.11
Open Probation	1.36	1.09	1.81	13.09	8.40	25.75
Community Service Order	0.11	0.09	0.45	1.49	0.40	2.54
Detention Order	0.02	-	-	0.32	0.41	0.75
Suspended Imprisonment	0.19	0.13	0.28	0.77	1.66	3.03
Bound Over/Conditional Discharge	0.45	0.66	0.53	1.70	1.04	4.37
Fine	1.98	0.81	2.30	7.87	17.39	30.34
Caution/Absolute Discharge	0.13	0.02	0.08	0.53	0.15	0.90
Hospital Order (CSD Custody)	-	0.02	0.02	0.04	-	0.08
Others	0.02	-	0.04	0.17	0.06	0.28
Total	6.50	3.73	7.89	39.31	42.57	100.00

[1]. Extracted from the Integrated Law and Order Statistical System (ILOSS) data base, and provided by Security Branch, Hong Kong Government.

8. MEDIA INFLUENCES

The previous chapters have dealt with the core issues of delinquency among the school sample, recidivism among offenders, and marginal youth. There remains one issue worth discussion because it has generated public and academic debate in the past, namely: is there any correlation between the type and level of mass media consumption and delinquency, and if so, why?

8.1 Mass media consumption and delinquency: general issues

The question of whether particular patterns of mass media consumption can cause delinquency has been hotly debated for many years. The issues are extremely complex. Separate arguments exist in relation to pornographic print materials, pornographic videos and films, comics, television-watching, horror films and a host of other genres and sub-genres; and in relation to aggression, sexual aggression, and more general attitudinal questions.[1]

There are major methodological problems with all such studies. For one thing it is considered unethical to expose minors to adult-oriented material in an experimental setting, so that most studies have concentrated on particular sub-populations of persons who have in fact been exposed to such materials in their course of their ordinary lives.[2] This and other considerations have led at least one of the original researchers in this field, Fredric Wertham (1968) to argue that valid results can only be obtained from clinical psychological studies which follow their subjects from childhood through to adulthood - and only a small handful of such studies have ever been done.

Moreover, as Winn (1977: 74) points out, in the American context (where most such studies have been done) it has proven extremely difficult to disentangle the interactive effects between television and other social variables such as poverty,

---

[1]. Even within these categories there are yet more specific arguments. For example in relation to pornography there are specific studies relating to pornography featuring consensual sex, rape, sadism, etc. Separate arguments also relate to the age of the young person; for example some studies of the effects of television have looked at age groups as young as 3-5.

[2]. Though in some studies it has been considered acceptable to create feelings of frustration, humiliation, etc. even in very young experimental subjects, and expose them to influences such as film of a researcher mutilating toy dolls, or acting aggressively towards the subjects. One study of adults (Rachman 1966, Rachman and Hodgson 1968) actually attempted to *create* a fetish in the experimental group for females wearing boots - and having successfully done so, had extreme difficulty in extinguishing the fetish. For a review of studies on these and related topics, see Eysenck and Nias (1978).

inadequate schools, family pathology, etc. Such social variables are likely to influence not only how much television young people watch, but what kinds of programmes they watch and how they interpret and are affected by such exposure.

The general tenor of research to date, however, is that in relation to television generally, preference for violent programmes in pre-teen children is mildly correlated with aggression in later life - though this may simply mean that patterns of aggression are established in childhood and affect both media consumption at that age as well as actual behaviour later on. Responses to pornography, meanwhile, seem to be too varied for any general conclusions to be safe.[3]

8.2 The implications of our own study

It is possible, drawing on the material presented in Chapters 3-7, to reach some conclusions about the broad social effects of mass media consumption on delinquency and recidivism. In essence, while there are some *associations* between mass media consumption of various kinds and overall levels of delinquency, we cannot infer that there are any *causal* connections.[4]

First, reading and viewing both pornographic and violent material was fairly widespread among all young people, but the factor analyses, both in the school and offender samples, placed it within the 'problem behaviour' dimension. Were problem behaviour to figure as a cause or precursor of delinquency, the implication would be that consumption of pornographic or violent

---

[3]. That pornography can produce a psychological response is beyond doubt, but studies of the nature of the response and the extent to which it is carried through into action typically show very low associations with psychological and social variables. Some studies have suggested that we need to distinguish between short-term and long-term effects, with exposure to pornography in the short-term enlarging the repertoire of sexual acts subjects are prepared to engage in, but in the longer term having an 'inoculation' effect, that is, making subjects *less* likely to engage in deviant sexual acts. In addition, several studies of sexual offenders have suggested that in so far as there is any correlation between pornography and sexual pathology, it is that rapists have typically had less exposure to pornography than the general population. For detailed discussion see Eysenck and Nias (1978).

[4]. For a fuller account of youth mass media consumption in Hong Kong, see So and Chan (1992). Although they did not ask their samples for information on delinquency, they were able to distinguish different mass media consumption habits which in some respects are similar to our G1 leisure factors. However, perpetuating what now appears to be a research tradition in Hong Kong, they analyse males and females together, making only a few subsidiary comments about the differences between the two.

materials could, at least potentially, lead to delinquency in general or to specific kinds of delinquency. Yet our study paints the reverse picture. Many of those who engage in problem behaviour never commit more than the 'normal' one or two offences committed by those who are not behaving problematically. Those who do become delinquent tend to engage in higher levels of problem behaviour after rather than before the onset of delinquency.

To put the matter crudely, becoming delinquent is likely to lead among other things to higher levels of consumption of pornographic and violent material, but not the other way round. In so far as there are any causal effects between mass media consumption and delinquency, they would be mediated by individual pathology and limited to a small handful of cases.

Second, it has been argued that watching television and viewing films (many locally-produced films and television films have implied or explicit triad themes) may lead to a greater likelihood of delinquency. Consumption of films and television generally figured on one of our 'lifestyle' factors, G1#1, which in the event did prove significant in some school sample multiple regressions (Chapter 5). But we would argue that watching more of such output (and reading comic books) is simply part of a wider subcultural array of behaviours, and not in and of itself a variable with a causal relationship to delinquency.

In so far as there is a link between delinquency and mass media therefore, it is most likely that persons who are delinquents tend to view or read such materials because they appeal to their already-held subcultural values; exposure to such materials is correspondingly unlikely to lead persons who do not hold such values to be 'converted' to them.

8.3 Some additional evidence

The views above can be tested, at least on the narrow front of magazine and comic consumption, and using both the school and offender samples.

First, we asked all our respondents several specific questions about whether and how often they read the following magazines or kinds of magazines (Table 8.1):

- 'Breakthrough' and 'Breakthrough for Youth': published by a Christian youth organization. Often recommended by school principals as 'good' magazines and subscribed to by school libraries, they are widely seen as promoting 'healthy' attitudes and values (or, according to other sources, as rather moralizing).

- 'China Hero': a typical martial arts comic which features a fair amount of violence, gang fighting, etc., but espouses 'patriotism' (that is, fighting 'foreigners'), helping the weak, and fighting evil. It is accepted by some

schools.

- 'Dragon Tiger Gate': a martial arts comic book which has frequent storylines concerning gangsters and triad societies. Schools tend to label it as a 'bad' comic.

- 'Yes': a gossip magazine with a wide youth readership.

- 'Big Brother': a comic which almost entirely comprises triad-related storylines and is widely perceived as sympathetic to triads. Schools typically consider it a 'bad' magazine.

- 'Dragon Tiger Leopard': this is a pornographic magazine which carries sexually crude articles and explicit 'pinup'-style photos. When it originally appeared, its publishers claimed that it had a sex-education value and most of its pictures could best be described as almost clinically explicit pictures of naked or semi-clothed female models with virtually no attempt at eroticism. Most schools would probably impose a disciplinary sanction on a student found in possession of a copy.

- Any TV magazine: a large number of TV-related magazines are on the market, all rather similar in style and content; television listings, television and film-related articles, interviews with TV personalities and film stars, etc. We asked whether respondents read any of them, without specifying titles.

- 'Young Girl': aimed at adolescent girls, this magazine carries items on gossip, fashion, love stories, and a personal problems page dealing with everything from pimples to menstruation. Some schools would consider it 'low-taste', though not 'bad'.

- 'Dragon Ball': a Japanese comic with fantastic storylines and occasional depictions of brutal fighting. Popular with junior secondary school pupils, it espouses heroism and bravery. It is generally accepted by schools.

Remarkably, none of these magazines had a lower readership among the offenders than among the school sample. Breakthrough and Breakthrough for Youth had similar levels of readership (a quarter to a third) among all groups. Yes, a gossip magazine, was read by about half the school sample, and three-quarters of both male and female offender samples. TV magazines were more often read by females than males, and by the offender sample rather than the school sample. The fashion magazine, Young Girl, was read by three times as many offenders as school sample members.

Dragonball, which may be seen as the mildest of the 'bad' magazines, was read by the same proportion (about two-thirds) of both offender and school samples. All the others were read by 5% or fewer of the school females, though larger proportions (14-

46%) of offender females. And they were read by 10-23% of the male school sample, but in each case, the proportion of readers among the male offenders was more than double that among the school males (35-61%).

Second, we asked about respondents' views concerning specific characters in different popular magazines:

- Lame Ho: a well-known drug tycoon from the 1950s and 1960s who has now been turned into a fictional character. His popularity may be linked to a film of his exploits. As a character he simply symbolizes gangsterism and crime.

- Super Police: a policeman whose storylines are always to do with fighting crime. He symbolizes official and legitimate, rather than private and retributive, justice.

- Wong Fei Hung: a Chinese Kung Fu master of the late Ching and early Republican era, popularized though a series of action films. He symbolizes heroism and patriotism (and is often depicted winning fights against the English and other 'foreign devils').

- City Hunter: a private individual who fights and beats crime single-handed, without the assistance of and sometimes in spite of the police. He can perhaps be thought of as an 'equalizer', dispensing 'real' justice in a world where official law enforcement is at best ineffective or unhelpful.

The results are shown in Table 8.2. Only a small minority of young people, of either sex, had *not* heard of these characters and the following percentages are based on the whole sample, that is, they are not adjusted to exclude those who had not heard of them.

While most young people had no strong feelings about Lame Ho (the gangster character), more males in the school sample, and of both sexes in the offender sample, admired rather than despised him. However, positive feelings about Lame Ho were twice as common among the offender samples than the school samples. Super Police, a figure symbolizing law and justice, and City Hunter, the figure who fights crime outside the law and despite the police, both evoked strong positive responses (the most muted response was among the school sample females). Wong Fei Hung, the Kung Fu master representing heroic and patriotic feelings, also called forth strong positive responses from all groups. In all three cases, there were no significant differences between the groups as to the level of positive reaction to the characters.

A third question dealt with what characteristics the respondents associated with each of these comic-book characters.

The two characteristics most often associated with Lame Ho were that he was brave (17% of the total sample, and 38% of male offenders) and 'does all kinds of dirty things' (18% of the total

sample, but 37% of female offenders). However, it is unclear whether 'doing dirty things' is regarded as a positive or negative attribute. Super Police was liked primarily because he was brave (37% of the total sample, no significant variation across groups). City Hunter evoked a wider variety of responses (handsome, brave, fights well, protects weak) but the main characteristic was being 'handsome' (27%, rising to 37% among female offenders). And as might be expected for a martial arts character, Wong Fei Hung was liked primarily because he 'fights well' (43%, rising to 57% among male offenders; there was limited support also for answers of 'brave' and 'protects the weak').

Our data suggest the kind of situation often observed among offenders elsewhere. Although feelings among the offender sample were more positive than among the school sample towards the gangster character, there were no differences with regard to the other three. The offenders admired even the 'good guy', Super Police, as much as the school sample did. The reasons for liking the characters were primarily because they were seen as brave (Super Police), handsome (City Hunter), or a good fighter (Wong Fei Hung). Feelings appeared to be most polarized in the case of Lame Ho, who was seen as brave but also as 'dirty'; this could have been a positive attribute in the view of some respondents and a negative one for others, and probably led to this character being the least admired and the one with the highest 'no feeling' response, even among the offender groups.

8.4 Conclusions

It is a fair comment to say that many of the comic books on sale in Hong Kong are, at the very least, prurient or in bad taste. Some contain fairly raw, one might say medically explicit, pornographic photographs, sometimes accompanied by the (in our view) spurious justification that they aid sex education. Others have titles and storylines which derive from, and appeal to, marginal youth values with triad overtones - to claim that such titles should be given a literal rather than culturally-specific interpretation is simply disingenuous. Despite being labelled as items for over-18s only, all these items are clearly widely available and in fact widely read by persons younger than this.

That said, the issue of whether such reading matter affects young people's behaviour is an empirical and not a moral question.

It is true that the readership of such magazines is at least twice as common among offenders than non-offenders. The most marked difference in readership habits occurs between the school female sample and the female offenders, who are up to ten times more likely than the former to read martial arts, triad, and pornographic magazines. Yet offenders also read gossip and television-linked magazines more frequently than the school sample. Part of the difference may come about because the offender sample prefers reading such material as an alternative to reading schoolbooks, spending time doing homework, etc. Part

of it may also be the result of 'bad' magazines circulating among the groups which frequent places such as electronic games centres.

When we come to specific comic-book characters, it seems that they have a similar appeal to both school and offender samples, and are liked for similar reasons. The major difference between the school and offender samples exists in relation to the gangster character, where only half as many of the school males as the male offenders profess admiration for him.

Despite the marked difference in readership patterns between the school and offender groups, there is no reason, on the basis of this evidence, to suppose that reading 'bad' magazines exercises a negative impact on young people that leads to their committing delinquent acts. It is far more plausible to suggest that a high level of readership, not just of these items but also of gossip and television-related magazines, is simply one part of involvement in the wider marginal youth subculture.

Table 8.1 Levels of readership of selected magazines, school and offender samples
Figures are percentage who read named item 'usually' or 'sometimes'

Name of item	School-TI-YC sample Female	Male	CSD-SWD-Probation ample Female	Male
Breakthrough (Christian)	27	25	25	25
Breakthrough for Youth	32	29	30	26
Yes (gossip)	54	50	78	72
(Any TV magazine)	79	59	89	79
Young Girl (fashion)	33	9	90	31
Dragonball (Japanese comic)	24	66	50	64
China Hero (martial arts)	5	20	14	50
Dragon Tiger Gate (martial/triad)	5	23	28	56
Big Brother (triad)	4	15	46	61
Dragon Tiger Leopard (porn)	2	10	19	35
Totals	(1175)	(1096)	(38)	(334)

Table 8.2 Attitudes towards sepcified characters in popular magazines
Figures are percentages

Character	School-TI-YC sample Female	Male	CSD-SWD-Probation sample Female	Male
E2:1 Lame Ho (gangster)				
Admire/admire very much	13	31	40	60
No feeling	65	44	45	28
Despise/despise very much	18	20	13	10
Never heard of	5	5	3	2
E2:2 Super Police (policeman)				
Admire/admire very much	44	63	47	60
No feeling	41	23	24	26
Despise/despise very much	5	5	8	8
Never heard of	9	8	21	7
E2:3 Wong Fei Hung (Kung Fu master)				
Admire/admire very much	59	77	47	80
No feeling	34	14	39	14
Despise/despise very much	5	6	8	5
Never heard of	2	2	5	1
E2:4 City Hunter (crimefighter)				
Admire/admire very much	47	64	63	68
No feeling	35	22	26	20
Despise/despise very much	16	12	5	9
Never heard of	1	2	5	3
Total	(1175)	(1096)	(38)	(334)

9. WORKING WITH 'AT RISK' AND MARGINAL YOUTH

9.1 Introduction

Outreaching social work was one of the youth services introduced in response to the increase in youth crime in the 1970s, and was aimed at dealing with youth 'at risk' of becoming delinquents.[1]

There are two major pieces of previous research on the service. Ng and Man (1985) did an elaborate evaluative study, found it effective, but recommended concentration on 'marginal' youth rather than 'hard core' cases. Gray (1987) focused on outreach client satisfaction with the service. This quantitative study reported that clients at large had positive relationships with workers and favoured more practical help.

Our own research on outreaching was a process evaluation of outreaching work, intended to provide a picture of the work process, including the perceptions and experiences of both clients and workers. It followed a broadly qualitative methodology in which cases were selected from different age groups and with a large spread of problems, enabling us therefore to review the range of services provided. The interviews ended by soliciting interviewees' opinions about the difficulties encountered in working with the cases and in outreaching social work at large. The clients' opinions about youth needs were explored and workers were also invited to make suggestions about how to improve the service.

The following sections describe the case profiles, the perceptions of the clients towards their service experience, the intervention approach as explained by the worker, and finally the problems of and prospects for the service.

9.2 Case profiles

Purposive sampling was used to tap a wide range of different cases, selected from three age groups and six problem types. The three age groups were 14 or below, 15 to 17, and 18 or over. They constituted 15.6%, 55.3% and 29.1% of the outreaching clients respectively (Hong Kong Council of Social Services 1991). The rationale for the age grouping was that clients aged 14 or below are expected to be in school, with the introduction of nine years' compulsory education in 1979; those aged 15 or above can legally engage in full-time work; while 18 is widely recognized as the age at which a youth becomes a young adult. The needs,

---

[1]. Pilot projects on detached work, school social work, youth counselling, youth guidance, etc. were introduced between 1967 and 1974. A programme plan for preventive social work among youth was implemented in 1979. Current arrangements for outreaching work are the result of the 1981 review of that programme plan.

life experiences, and responses to service of each group are thus likely to be quite different from each other. The six problem types were based on the clientele information face-sheet categorization. They comprised problems with: family, school, vocation, peers, self-functioning, and social norms. In addition, it was considered that males and females might have different needs and responses towards the service.

The combination of age groups, problem types, and sex yields 36 client types. Disregarding those which constituted less than 1% of the population, 24 client types were selected for interview.[2] Since there were 24 outreaching teams with more than one year's service experience, one case type was provided by each team.[3] The final case distribution is given in Tables 9.1 and 9.2.

Cases with a duration of service provision closest to the average period of that client group was selected, because it was intended to select more typical cases served by outreaching teams.[4] However exact matching was impossible as selection was limited to the cases actually available in that team. As a result, the case with shortest duration included in the study had a history of 6 months' service provision (the average duration of this client group in 1992 was 7.99 months), while the longest service history included in the study was 69 months (the average for clients in this category was 26.35 months). Two other cases had also been served for over five years, and all three of these cases with long histories had previously been closed and later reopened.

Of the 24 cases, four had been on probation, two were under the Police Superintendent's Discretionary Scheme, and two had experienced institutional care.

The comments above indicate that we were able to interview a wide range of age groups and case types. In fact, both the client and the responsible worker were interviewed, totalling 48 interviews.[5] All interviews were conducted between June and

---

[2]. Calculation based on the 1992 statistics of clients in outreaching social work, Hong Kong Council of Social Services, 1993.

[3]. This arrangement was preferred by the teams to one in which cases were selected at random, because each team could contribute equally. With the exception of two teams, which had to swap their case types with two other teams, all teams were able to provide cases that fit the assigned criteria.

[4]. The average period of duration of service for cases active in March 1992 was worked out with the help of the Hong Kong Council of Social Services.

[5]. Of the 24 workers, 6 had one year of outreaching service; 5 had two years; 5 had three years; 3 had four years;

November 1993.

In most of the following discussion, though interviews are quoted selectively, the points made in each quote were also made by other interviewees. However, since this is not a quantitative study with large sample, the variety of responses is often more significant than the fact that several interviewees made similar responses.

9.3 Marginal youth and their views

We asked clients to describe their experiences with outreaching workers, with the intention of identifying the intervention process from their perspective.[6] These experiences can broadly be broken down into experiences of the first contact with an outreaching worker, the changing response as a relationship was built up, descriptions of the services provided and the clients' response, attitudes towards the outreaching workers and their agencies, and youth needs.

9.3.1 Initial response to being approached

Outreaching social work, as implied by its name, refers to the service offered to youth through the workers' efforts to reach out to them. Hence the youths' natural gathering places were the most frequent contact points. These places included a fast food shop (case 13), a video game centre (case 09), a soccer pitch (case 07), a park (case 17), an open resting place in a housing estate (case 06), outside school (case 11), a shopping arcade (case 22), etc. If clients got to know the worker through their friends or siblings, the first contact place could be the outreaching service office (case 10), where they just came for fun, a court when they were in trouble (case 03), or the client's home (case 23).

Outreaching social workers used a variety of ways to contact potential clients. It could be just natural chatting, especially when some members of a group knew the worker (case 01), playing soccer with them (case 07), doing a questionnaire survey (case 09), service promotion (case 02), crisis intervention for a court hearing (case 03), or direct service when a request was made. Cases might ask for tuition (case 15), or help with legal matters (case 07).

These contacts elicited varying responses. Where introductions were made by a friend, which was very common,

---

2 had five years; and the remaining three had six, eight, and nine years service respectively.

[6]. This part of the interview was unstructured, so the client's views were not mediated through any of the categories or terms used by social work professionals.

initial contact was most natural (case 01). Joining in a soccer game (case 07) or offering activities was also easily accepted (case 02). However, more personal probing for individual understanding met with a rather different response. The initial exploration was sometimes resisted. Some clients felt uneasy, as though they were being 'questioned like a suspect' (case 04). Another felt 'shocked and also suspicious' (case 06). To these clients, the workers had asked too many questions, and the initial contact was too intrusive and 'odd' (case 21). The more cautious clients observed and listened to what the worker said first (case 10). On the other hands, case 09 felt 'special' doing a questionnaire and case 05 felt strange that a nice lady would approach 'bad guys' like them. Case 02 actually described it as 'interesting'.

In general, clients were more ready to connect with the workers when they had friends who knew the workers, or when the worker asked them to complete a questionnaire, or offered to participate in soccer games or activities. Asking too many questions at the initial stage led to suspicion. In addition, those who experienced a change of worker usually would not be ready to develop a new relationship right away (case 20). They might compare the new worker with the old one (case 11), and it would take time for them to form a more positive image of the new worker.

9.3.2 Changing responses as relationships are built

Activities and casual chatting are the key means through which clients, even if they initially resist approaches, lower their defence over time. The activities clients mentioned included: a camp, a barbecue (case 02), a picnic (case 19), Ocean Park (case 06), soccer (case 07), snooker (case 10), squash (case 12), table tennis (case 22), roller skating (case 18), and swimming (case 24). One was even engaged in volunteer service (case 19). Camping, which allowed a longer period of staying together in a relaxed environment, helped with sharing 'inner matters' (case 07). However, for most cases, the worker would simply chat with clients so as to 'tune into' their life and get more acquainted with them. Some clients were comfortable in relating with the worker personally, while others were more keen on the activities. Levels of trust in the individual worker varied.

A second key issue in building relationships with clients was the extent to which workers had an attitude of concern, reached out to clients, and were responsive to client needs. Reaching out to the clients meant, in essence, meeting them in their normal environment, and in some cases, even contacting them by phone (e.g. case 18). When clients expressed a need, the worker would respond and help. This was situational and 'just came naturally', as distinct from a purposeful request for help in other agency settings. It might be a simple accident which required medical consultation, a shopping request (case 09), or an indication of a need for tuition (case 11). Some cases who were more interested in activities might initiate contact with

the worker for programmes (case 19), or invite the worker to join their activities (case 05).

Clients generally appreciated the worker's efforts and good will. They felt that the 'worker just wants to show concern' and they 'like it' (case 01), or the programmes were 'interesting' (case 02). Some accepted service because the programme arranged for them was 'cheap' (case 13) or free. As case 15 said, 'It was free and I could spend my time [there].' However, young people absented themselves from programmes occasionally, probably due to their habit of unplanned activities.

While they accepted the worker, they might not like the term 'help'. When asked about worker's help, case 03 reacted: 'What's the meaning of help? He may be showing concern rather than help.' Some appreciated having 'someone to talk to' and could 'feel relieved' (case 05), though more responsive clients (e.g. case 17) would 'hasten forward to her and chat with her [the worker]'. Case 22 commented 'it is quite enjoyable to play with her [the worker]'. Such comments suggest a rather informal, friendly relationship with the worker. Only one comment gave a different tone: case 07 commented, 'I feel that he was full of 'reasoning' [*dou li*] that made you listen to him.'

9.3.3 Services provided

As worker and client gradually built up their relationship, workers could probe deeper into the client's personal matters and work on their problems. A range of intervention strategies were used, and clients could retrospectively identify them.

Advice giving was the most predominant. Clients could explicitly recall 'advice' or 'teaching' being given in different aspects of their lives, including: dating and courtship (case 01), peer relationships (case 02), triad connections (case 07), a court hearing (case 02), drinking (case 04), fighting (case 06), wandering out and going home (case 10), and going to consult a doctor (case 11). Advice-giving was straightforward and clients could well understand the intention of the worker. Of course how much they would take in varied.

Some workers might go as far as assuming a *parental role*. Case 06's experience is an example:

> She [the worker] mostly tried to exhort us, saying 'don't do this, and don't do that' etc.... Talking was the way of teaching, telling us not to take so much pills as a girl, be careful of car crash when we walk across the road... got to know what friends to make and what not to.[7]

---

[7]. This and all other quoted material in the chapter derive from taped interviews originally conducted in Cantonese. The tapes were transcribed and translated by the research

Some clients would describe the worker as *'lecturing'* (case 06), apparently feeling the advice was given at great length. However, some workers were said to adopt a more lively tone and cite the experience of other clients as examples to strengthen their persuasion. This occurred mainly in the area of triads (case 07) and drugs (case 17).

Many clients were aware of workers' efforts to *help them analyze different aspects of their lives*. A typical report was:

> She asked me why the situation became so bad. She analyzed with me what factors led to such a bad result.... She helps me to make a self-reflection (case 04).

Clients could identify the worker's *concern* expressed in different forms. It could be just through the worker listening and their 'feeling good after sharing' (case 24). It could be an explicit statement of verbal support and encouragement (case 17). Accompanying clients was also felt to be a form of support, whether to the court, to the probation officer (case 02), to the police station (case 07), to school (case 20), or back home after the client had run away (case 06).

Clients could detect the worker's attitude and appreciate genuine care from a worker. Many saw that asking about their affairs was a kind of concern. Taking the initiative to reach out to a client is still important at the intervention stage. As case 01 reported,

> If something, say a big event, has happened, she cares about us. She will look for us and keep asking what has happened. I find that she really cares for us very much.

Case 07 recalled, 'I joined the triad society and I told Mr. Wong; he did not look down upon me.' The words reveal appreciation of the worker's acceptance. Case 11 reported that the worker 'said that I'm the most diligent and conscientious person among my friends', and stated that this gave her great encouragement.

Cases 05 and 10 experienced something quite different. Case 10 reported that the worker would 'scold' him. But there was no tone of complaint. Case 05 actually felt she should do something. She reported, 'I think she was angry and she showed a different attitude to me....I want to talk to her.' Case 06's experience was milder. In her words, the worker 'said that if I quit smoking, she would be much happier'. Workers' concern was expressed in different forms, and clients could appreciate concern even where it was expressed negatively.

Some problems were associated with other people, and clients

---

assistants.

knew that the worker would *'talk' to others on their behalf*. It could be the parent, in cases of parent-child relationship problems (case 06), or a teacher, in relation to a client's study problem (case 09). It could even be talking to other gang members in the case of some mild inter-gang problems. Case 01 was most appreciative of this:

> The most impressive one was the time we were kidnapped... Miss was there and she protected us. She knew the other group.

Sometimes, *providing information and mobilizing resources* was helpful. The most common type of information required was related to school (case 12), job (case 11), and legal matters (case 06). Some clients were given information on abortion, parenting and child care (case 24). In certain cases, especially in a crisis situation, a lot might have to be done. Case 17 is one example, and she reported her worker's help as follows:

> She assisted my family in applying for public assistance and preparing my mother's funeral. Moreover, she informed both the centre I/C and my school social worker about my mother's death so that they could render adequate services to me... She helped me to make an appointment for physical check in the youth centre of Hong Kong Family Planning Association. She accompanied me to the centre twice and introduced other resources to me.

For some other cases, resources come directly from the worker. Case 20 reported that

> If I attended school everyday, he [the worker] would give me a present ... He organized activities in school in order to make me go to school every day.

Once a relationship with a client was built up, workers would usually increase their intervention through counselling and advice giving. Activities as a means of contact became less important. But for some cases, *activities to occupy time* might still be a relevant means of service. Case 14 knew that it helped stop him from going elsewhere. Case 10 felt happy to serve as volunteer in a game store, where he could learn some skills.

9.3.4 The clients' response

For most of the cases, by the stage of intervention, there would be much less resistance to the worker. But there were still problem areas that the clients had not disclosed to the worker and that the workers were not aware of. Some youths, like case 14, were reluctant to ask for help. If the worker was not aware of the problem and had not probed that particular area, they would just keep it to themselves (e.g. case 17). Of course, the same case may also accept or reject intervention to different problems differently. Some just wanted programme activities and

not personal problem-solving (e.g. case 12) while for others the reverse was true (e.g. case 08).

The majority of clients accepted outreach intervention positively, and expressed a positive feeling about relating with the worker. They might feel 'good' and found the intervention 'helpful'. Some of the specific comments were:

> What she said was quite true. (case 01)
>
> He could give me a lot of support and advice and I felt much better after talking to him. (case 02)
>
> I found myself more comfortable after talking with him. (case 03)
>
> I feel happy. (case 04)
>
> The outreaching worker can understand me. (case 05)

A number of factors affected their response. They made their own judgement as to what to accept and what not to. The worker's acceptance and concern might in turn have stimulated the client's acceptance. The usefulness of advice also affected clients' responsiveness. The comments below reflect their thinking:

> We usually would explain to her why we kept those group members away. Most likely, Miss accepted our reasons. (case 01)
>
> They [the worker's pieces of advice] were particularly useful in calming down my emotions. (case 02)
>
> The worker is like a friend, not so fierce, and helped me to think out solutions. (case 06)
>
> One more person is willing to listen to me. (case 09)
>
> I felt relieved and my burden shared by others. (case 19)

Some clients accepted service actively rather than simply responding to offers of help. Once they knew that workers were willing to help in different ways, they initiated requests of different kinds. These concerned: leisure craft work (case 06), getting attention (case 07), and getting help when the client was worried (case 15).

However, advice from workers was sometimes rejected. The clients themselves, in retrospect, sometimes felt they had been wrong to reject it but explained the refusal as the result of their earlier immaturity, ignorance of the significance of the issue, or their not being ready to accept help:

> Because we were so young at that time, we didn't

really listen to her [the worker's] advice and opinion. (case 06)

But I didn't consider his words since I didn't want to handle this problem again. I feel my father's concern for me, but he is very troublesome. (case 08)

Relying on worker's help is too dependent. You earn for your own use. So I think you should find your own job. (case 13)

Frankly speaking, I was disgusted with that as I could not accept the fact that an outsider cared more about me than my own family. (case 17)

I agreed to what she said but took no action, because I could escape from unpleasant realities into a fancy world whenever I took the drug. (case 17)

Sometimes, however, they felt the worker's suggestion was not feasible:

I am old enough to think, it is needless for her to talk about that. (case 22)

What she said was same as everybody else. I won't tell next time when I fight with others again. (case 10)

Those [worker's suggestions] were fallacy, only theory, no practical steps. I tried but failed. (case 15)

9.3.5 Clients' impressions of workers

Outreaching social work depends crucially on the worker's efforts to reach out to clients and establish a positive image. As indicated earlier, clients could feel interested, uneasy, or 'odd' when approached, though those who had friends receiving service might feel easier. Many could not articulate very clearly their exact impressions, but some recalled a friendly image. Some of the comments were:

Quite good. He talked politely. (case 09)

Quite good. She would talk and smile with us and buy us drinks. (case 18)

It's OK. She is easy going and she played with us... I just hurt my finger, she immediately gave me some tape. (case 24)

Quite friendly, and he was very patient. (case 15)

However, another commented that worker was 'troublesome' and asked too many questions (case 08), while one described a worker as being 'very stern, very quiet, with an air calling for respect' (case 07). This is a rather unique response.

Given time and more contacts, clients could give more concrete descriptions of their impressions of their workers. There were a lot of positive comments: helpful, trustworthy, genuine, mature, friendly, understanding, accepting, logical and comforting, cheerful, motherly, caring etc.:

trustworthy:

> She usually will not disclose what I have told her... If something has happened, she is ready to help and is anxious about it. (case 01)

frank:

> She is frank and really treats you like a friend. (case 04)

mature and understanding:

> He is more mature than my friends and he would try to let me understand my family members' behaviours. (case 02)

concerned listener:

> She is a good listener... She gave you a feeling that she is so true that she would never cheat you. (case 06)

accepting:

> I didn't feel any barriers between us and I felt he understood me. He didn't criticise me too much. (case 08)

> The worker is very happy, likes to help people, not too strict and won't treat you bad... She won't mind what crime I committed in the past and what my family background is. (case 18)

logical and comforting:

> My friends said that what she said was very logical and comforting. (case 11)

> She is my elder sister. She can help me to analyze the situation. She is older than me and knows more things. (case 04)

caring:

> Like a mother. Care for us, always talk with us. (case 14)

good:

> I feel that she is a good person. (case 21)

Clients assigned certain roles to the workers, and some assigned the worker quite intimate roles such as 'sister' or 'mother'. Some demanded attention strongly, almost treating the worker as a girlfriend. In such cases, workers had to make great efforts to clarify the boundary and nature of the relationship. Others, however, did not think about whether the worker assumed any professional relationship or roles towards them, though a few treated the worker as their 'spokesman' when the need arose (case 06).

While many clients would take the worker as a friend, some sensitive clients explicitly denied a professional relationship with worker. Case 03 denied 'being helped' and insisted that the worker was only a friend. Case 12 also stated his boundary: 'I like to play with them [the workers], but I didn't like them to ask me questions.' Less resistant ones said that outreaching workers were 'friends as well as teachers' (case 15).

Of course there were also less favourable comments. Case 12 claimed that 'It's difficult for him to understand young people's romance. He's too old.' Sometimes feelings were mixed. Case 17 declared, 'I called her a meddler', but also considered that 'She is a devoted social worker who is committed to helping her clients.' There were also clients who would not disclose certain problems to workers as they did not think the latter could be of help, or the help expected was not what they wanted (case 19). But generally speaking, the outreaching workers were perceived as being friendly and helpful, though clients might or might not follow their advice.

Clients were asked about what they appreciated most in the workers. There was a range of response, including: teaching of 'knowledge of interpersonal relationships' (case 02), being patient, (case 03), being concerned (case 04), treating him as equal (case 05), trustworthy and understanding (case 07), analytical and helpful (case 08), ability to mix with teens (case 17), and provision of activities (case 21). Generally the worker could guess what the client appreciated most. When he or she could not identify it, the client also expressed uncertainty as to what he or she appreciated most (case 18). This might be explained by the stage that the worker/client relationship had reached at the time of the interviews. However, for most of the clients, genuine concern was felt and appreciated. As case 20 said, 'I just feel that they are very good people, and their attitude towards me is very good.' The attitude is most important, however it was demonstrated in particular situations.

9.3.6 Clients' impressions of outreaching service

The key roles of the workers were felt to be those of activity organizer and 'youth saviour'.

Many clients, especially those who had recently begun their relationship with an outreaching worker, had a vivid impression that the key role of an outreaching social worker was to *organize activities*, for whatever purpose. Case 11 said 'They organize more activities for us and chat with us.' Case 14 thought outreaching workers were 'to organize some activities so that I don't drift about.'

Some also felt they were *'youth saviours'* who would try to understand their problem and help them deal with it. Some of their comments were:

> They go to help those youngsters who are in need. They pull them out of the fire (case 07).
>
> They meet the bad guys in the street and try to change them. (case 06)
>
> They care for people, ask about people's current situation, help them to go back to school, and work with their family. (case 18).
> Save those youths, and make them continue to study if they can and play less outside. For those who can work, continue their work and do not ... Youths like us may think of some illegal things to do. If he can show them the consequence of doing bad things, analyze for them if it is worthy ... Outreaching worker should do these. (case 03)

The general feedback from clients was that outreaching social work is fine. Case 06 said, 'Generally speaking, they have done a good job.' Most of them started off with no expectations of the worker, and did not feel they had a right to obtain service. Consequently they felt fairly satisfied with whatever they got. A more demanding client made the complaint,'When I need her, I cannot always find her' (case 05); but he was aware of the worker's other duties and said that he would not blame the worker for not giving them enough time. The comments of more articulate clients help to refine this general evaluation in various ways:

> The activities organized suit our taste. It seems there is no subsidy ... At least when we feel bored, we could find Sir instead of going to fight. When we are with him, we won't be questioned by the police or the triad ... The centre facilities are OK now that there are table tennis table and karaoke. (case 12)
>
> They care for the young people. Talk to them if you are unhappy. (case 18)

> The parents are too busy with their work that they spare no time for their children. They've got no time to take care of them properly. It is common that the children are rotten, but their families are ignorant about it. That's the fact. I therefore consider that outreaching social work service is quite good. (case 04)

> If a youngster is on the wrong path, the outreaching social workers have the responsibility to give a helping hand ... They have the ability and method to contact different kinds of youngsters ... They can solve the problems of youngsters ... youngsters in my eyes still do not know how to face the family, interpersonal relationships, study and working environment. (case 15)

So it seems that while some clients are more concerned with benefits like programmes and activities (which could divert their attention from fighting), or protection from the police, others saw that outreaching workers could help with their developmental problems.

9.3.7 Youth needs identified

Clients were asked about youth needs and problems. Some answered these questions from their own experience, while others commented on youth in general, though their comments probably also reflected needs they could feel in themselves or in their peers. Felt needs, on the basis of these answers, can be categorized into three key areas, which closely match the definitions of adolescent needs proposed by developmental theories. They were: *fun and peer affiliation*, *guidance*, and *love and attention*. In addition, some clients expressed *material needs* (case 02), and a *need for recognition* (case 07). Some of their statements were:

fun and peers:

> It's boring to go and stay at the video-game centre. But we've nowhere to go ... If we do not make friends from other groups, we cannot play with them ... About the idea of not petting too much, it is difficult as we long for fun at our stage. (case 01)

guidance:

> My boyfriend gets another girl. I don't know what to do, I am so disturbed. (case 06)

> Different people have different opinions. I want to hear more opinions. (case 11)

family, love and attention:

> Those youth of my age may have poor relationship with their family. (case 03)
>
> I think the young people are in good material condition. They have enough clothes, food, pocket money and many other things. Yet they lack love. Their family cannot provide them with love. They do not like to stay at home because there is no love. They want to find substitutes. (case 05)
>
> I want someone to share with me if I have problems. (case 09)

Adolescents are at a very special stage of development. They may find their family boring and like to go out. They may like to be independent, and too much adult attention is felt to be 'troublesome'. Yet they also wish there were people around to care and help when they have problems. As case 01 described it:

> It creates a feeling of 'troublesomeness' if she [the worker] always finds us. But Miss gets us occasionally and this does not make us feel so. She always shows concern for us and we're touched. Then, we listen to what she said.

Somehow, some families are not providing support for the young people and they either rebel against supervision or are left to struggle on their own.

9.4 Intervention with marginal youth

9.4.1 Clients' problems

Though we created our client sample according to the six problem types generally categorized in outreaching social work (Table 9.1), the workers' analyses of these cases showed that most clients actually had several problems; the one which formed the basis for their inclusion in the sample was simply the most important of a range of problems. The most common problems reflected in the interviews were: study problems, peers, family, and the behaviourial problems of drug-taking and stealing. Others also mentioned were: problems of work (case 08), fighting and assault (case 01), staying out late (case 09), possession of a weapon for robbery (case 05), gambling (case 12), sex and abortion (case 04), self-destructive behaviour (case 04, case 19), and poor self-image (case 15).

In practice, clients' different problems were often inter-related. A boring family life might lead to attachment to peers, negative peer influence leading to undesirable behaviour, and undesirable behaviour leading to poor school adjustment. The 'flow' of problems could of course be the other way around, or the variables mutually reinforced each other.

The *family* problems reported were mainly about poor parent-child relationships. In one case there was a complicated family situation with a single parent, the father being unemployed and not very understanding (case 08). Another concerned a family with a second marriage, a father who only scolded the client, a mother who 'overexpected' the client's study achievement, and a poor sibling relationship (case 17). These cases suffered very much from missing a nurturing environment. Other less complex ones reported the father being too rigid and controlling (case 02), lack of concern (case 15) and not understanding (case 13), siblings being rough and aggressive (case 06) etc. Poor family relationships often created a 'pushing' effect and the youths went out more often or even moved out of the family (case 18). Case 04 kept looking for more intimate relationships and kept changing her sex partner. Case 24 got married young and stayed away from her family, with new problems arising in terms of relationships with the in-laws. In general, poor parent-child relationships were associated with poor family attachment and a lack of emotional well being.

Where clients had a problem with *study*, it was simply a matter of not being interested in it. This was sometimes associated with undesirable peer influences (case 19) or the client's poor academic standard (case 11). Case 22 went to school for fun rather than education. Many had made habits of truancy, violation of school rules, etc., and were either suspended or expelled from school (case 06) or made their own decision to quit (case 19). Some actually tried to stay on, but as their school performance was not good, they had problems getting a school placement (case 14). Even if they were accepted by a school, poor adjustment to a new environment could weaken their interest (case 21).

Peer problems were also significant. Adolescents have a great need for peer affiliation. If the family relationship is weak, the urge for satisfaction from peers is even greater and youths would easily follow peer norms. There were generally two kinds of problem: undesirable influence, and lack of peer attachment. 'Undesirable peer influence' was one of the analyses predominant in interviews with workers, and such influences contributed to disinterest in school (case 19), runaway behaviour (case 13), drug abuse (case 18), triad aggression (case 07), and other illegal activities (case 14). Some of the clients had no friends, and attached themselves to people who did not really treat them as friends but exploited them (case 15). Others were socially isolated because of their aggression (case 23), arrogance (case 08), or poor social skills in establishing relationships (case 04).

The other frequently mentioned problems were *drugs and stealing*. Many outreaching clients stole; this is one of the very common behaviour problems that appeared in their lives. Many such clients had not assimilated the moral value of the 'right of property', and were not fully conditioned to the idea of staying away from arbitrarily taking others' possessions.

Drug problems have been around for a long time, but seem to have increased greatly in the past few years. Some clients used hard drugs such as heroin (case 17), and a few were also engaged in trafficking (case 08). Three reasons were given for drug-taking: curiosity, especially in the initial stage (case 05), fun (case 24), and relief from emotional problems (case 17). It is a difficult problem to handle as drug taking gives immediate satisfaction and relief from problems, which the worker could not replace, and clients would become addicted to it.

Many of these problems are associated with the *social environment*: the family, school, the availability of drugs, and triad influence. Other parts of this report have provided more detailed discussions of the relationships between different social-environmental variables, and the following section thus simply reports on what outreaching workers did to help with the problems.

9.4.2 Intervention methods

We can broadly categorize the different stages of intervention into: an initial contact stage, a relationship-building stage, an intervention stage and a termination stage. While there is no clear demarkation between each stage, the nature of worker-client contact and its purpose would change gradually as worker got to know the client's problems and as clients become ready for help. The 24 cases studied included some from each stage, from relatively new clients (6 months) to those well into the termination stage.

The initial contact stage was discussed above and little more needs to be said here. In essence, most clients had no prior expectations about outreach workers, though some had the general impression that they provided activities. Many workers thus encouraged clients to use outreaching centre facilities and offer activities which were not sensitive or threatening. Sometimes workers just talked with the clients, showing concern and interest in them. This initial stage is not an easy one, because clients could feel awkward in relating with adults. Workers might thus be ignored or rejected. But as they had more clients familiar with them at each of the young people's gathering spots, they could build up contacts more easily. This process of 'snowballing' was one of the ways commonly used to reach new clients.

Regular contact is important for relationship-building, problem exploration, and intervention. One of the workers' considerations for taking up a case was whether the client could be reached regularly. The effects of intervention were easily weakened when contact was broken for whatever reason. As discussed earlier, clients often started to accept the worker as they felt the worker's genuine concern, patience, and acceptance of their behaviour. Frequent contact allowed the relationship to be tested, expanded, and strengthened. Hence workers showed a lot of personal care, such as accompanying clients in shopping,

applying for school, etc. Games and psychological tests were also used for exploration or relationship-building, depending on the skills and preferences of individual workers.

Sensitivity and timeliness in offering help was important. Outreaching workers work right at the activity area of the clients. Through observation of young people's behaviour and mood, and listening to their casual conversations, they could have some idea of their needs and problems. The peer group was a significant source of information because too much direct questioning would drive the client away. However, asking at the right moment would elicit a response. Case 17 disliked help from outside the family, but when she was really in trouble and worker noted and asked about it, she disclosed the problem. The worker then had to offer timely service, whether it was advice giving, counselling, support, or mobilization of resources. Crises such as staying out overnight and being scared to go home, being kicked out of school, unexpected pregnancy, being kidnapped by other gang members, loss of control after taking drugs, and prosecution by the police are all examples of situations where the timeliness of service is important. Yet spontaneity was also important. Service had to be offered naturally, so that clients could accept more readily. As case 01 observed, 'The worker taught and facilitated me to think about this naturally.' The outreaching situation is thus very different from working with adult clients in the office. Intervention methods in outreaching social work must be flexible, including group work, individual work, family work, and collaboration with other professionals.

Contacts that *started with the clients' natural group* had a number of advantages. As worker 13 explained,

> Firstly I could understand the relationship amongst group members and how others saw the client. Secondly, they could help me to know more people. When there was crisis or conflicts, I could start to work on the individual.

Intervention might continue in the group setting, especially when clients had a close group attachment. In case 06, the worker made use of the natural group and let clients 'share about some issues, different ideas, one counteracting others ... creating constructive group pressure in areas like drug abuse, casual sex etc.' Members could learn from others' mistakes and the worker could build up her helper image in a group. In case 07, the worker tried to 'transform' the group through manipulation of group dynamics and natural incidents of quarrels and fights in soccer matches. Worker 20 used similar ways to reduce clients' use of foul language etc. It could also be a means of building up a new peer group for the client, engaging him or her with constructive leisure activities. Ad hoc education programmes on sex, drug etc. were run. Other structured groups used included a soccer team (case 20), tuition class (case 24), volunteer service group (case 17), and parent training programme.

Most workers, however, used an *individual work approach*, especially when they wanted to do something 'in depth'. In practice this meant working in areas such as drug use (case 05) or the family (case 09). As one client said, 'With only myself, I could tell everything to the worker' (case 02). The worker might use micro-counselling skills (case 04), informal teaching, or simply express concern and encouragement (case 23) to induce change in the client. Such work requires sensitivity in showing concern without being too intrusive, and in being assertive without being over-dominating. Sometimes workers also tried to influence the client indirectly through their friends, parents, or siblings (case 17).

Mobilization of resources was done in relation to schooling, jobs, and finance. Workers often had to help clients with school placement, as many of the clients dropped out from or expelled from school due to their misbehaviour. For those who reached age 15 and indicated no interest in study, workers usually helped with career counselling and job seeking. Clients' friends sometimes could be of help (case 02). For other kinds of resources, such as spiritual, programme, or financial support, help from a church (case 04), the Social Welfare Department, or other agencies might also be solicited (case 17).

In terms of the application of particular models, a few workers were more conscious of theory application than most others. A variety of practice models exist, including rational emotive therapy, the client-centred approach, social skills training, reality therapy, behavioral modification, and problem-solving training. One worker commented that different workers in different teams were employing different interventions. However data is not available to reflect the extent of theory building or the application of theories in the field.

Use of a *family approach* is relatively limited. Though some workers helped to mediate between clients and their parents, most worked with the family only when there were special issues that required parental involvement, e.g. school placement (case 14), legal matters (case 10), or crises such as abortion or suicide (case 06). One agency initiated a seminar for parents on 'How to make your son stay at home' (case 22). Another worker explicitly stated his plan to train parents with ways to supervise the child (case 09). The majority of workers, however, had only limited contacts with the family. The reasons for this included client disapproval (case 04), lack of consent from the client (case 24), non-responsive parents (case 01), the family background appearing too complicated (case 13), or a feeling that things would change as the client himself/herself changed (case 05). For those parents who were keen and approached the worker to help their children, contacts were more frequent. Some further views about working with the family are reported below, in connection with in the workers' evaluations of the service.

9.4.3 What difference can an outreaching worker make?

As discussed earlier, each case usually has more than one problem, so that more problems were reflected in our interviews that were usually marked on the client file face-sheet. However, depending on client responsiveness and appropriate opportunities, workers would work more with one problem than others. In a few cases, the main problems were not touched on.

Because problems were intertwined, help with one kind of problem could also lead to improvement in the others though there was no general pattern as to which problems needed to be dealt with first. In one case a change in the client's behaviour led to more relaxed family control (case 10); in another, the reverse was the case (case 06). Of the 24 cases, some made very good progress in most of their problem areas and most had shown progress in some or all their problem areas.[8] Only three showed little progress. In one (which had received only six months of service), the worker observed that the case had deteriorated in that time due to the loosening of parental supervision. The other two had not developed a very good relationship with their workers, change was minimal, and the clients showed little appreciation of the help offered.

It was interesting to find that 11 of the 24 cases attributed their change to their own efforts. As they grew older, they were more thoughtful (case 11), had stronger will power to resist temptations (case 05), knew what was right or wrong (case 18), and so on. But when asked 'what difference would it make if they had not known the worker', they mostly felt that they would not have changed so much. The worker was seen as having stimulated them to think (case 18), given them support and encouragement (case 05), and given advice (case 07). Case 01 claimed that she and her friend went to look for school so as 'not to disappoint the worker'. In general, clients felt that while they had become more mature, the worker had speeded up the process of change (case 06).

This indicates that outreach work is rather successful: after all, the goal of social work is to help clients help themselves. *Probably because outreaching workers are not 'officials' and have no authority, clients are in a position to make their own decisions*. Given a nurturing experience, clients become more confident of their own abilities as they change their way of life.

---

[8]. In fact some of these cases had made such good progress that the outreaching workers closed their case files on these clients shortly after our interviews.

9.4.4 Other sources of change

Concern and support from sources other than the worker was also significant in inducing change in the client. Case 04 claimed that she changed because her boyfriend asked her to behave herself. Case 22 claimed that she went out less since she knew her mother was sad about her behaviour. Especially for the emotionally deprived, provision of concern and support gave them good motivation for change, and behaviour problems, such as going out or taking drugs could be improved. If they were only criticized and blamed, they might relapse even if they had made some progress (case 17).

The impetus for change might come from a different direction. A number of cases had gone through the crisis of being prosecuted for illegal acts. It made them think about the cost they had to pay for their behaviour. When they were let down by their triad friends, it helped to make up their mind to stay away from them (case 08). When families tried their best to help, maybe spending much money on the legal proceedings, it showed them that their families were actually very concerned and this motivated them to change their way of life (case 06).

To some clients, an environmental change was the significant factor. Finding an interesting job gave them satisfaction, helped them to start a new stable life, with income to support themselves or even their family (case 08). Good collegial relationships help them to detach from undesirable peers. Change of school might also bring about a change of peers. It gave case 18 the chance of starting a new image and forming new relationships.

While most clients only referred to the factor of concern in helping with their change, workers could see more objectively the parts played by other variables. Often a number of factors helped simultaneously and the result was consequently much better.

9.5 Outreaching social work: problems and solutions

9.5.1 Problems

The Hong Kong Council of Social Services (1992) notes that only about half of all outreaching cases were terminated with the objective reached. In one third of cases contact with clients was lost for various reasons. This study therefore tried to explore, through interviews with workers, some of the problems they encountered in working with their clients.

Some of the difficulties lay in the *characteristics of the clients*. They were playful, impatient, and often looked for immediate satisfaction (case 13). They did not worry about the long term. Some had poor self-control (case 02) and were bad-tempered (case 07). Some were prone to use violence to deal with daily problems, due to their triad subculture (case 09). Such

characteristics could explain their difficulty in adjusting to more structured and less enjoyable environments. Thus clients who were attending school often violated school rules and skipped classes as they found them boring and intolerable. Those who worked might also find the work setting routine and uninteresting, and they would easily quit the job. Case 13 declared that she wanted most to play, and case 20 felt freedom was more important. Often, even when clients asked for help with a problem, they wanted an immediate solution and would not make efforts to follow through. Case 11 is one example: she asked for tuition support just before the examination, and refused further service afterwards. Often the tuition helped and clients were happy that their marks went up, but they might still drop out later because their efforts were not persistent (case 14).

Because the clients were playful and unstable, even contacting them could be difficult. They might shift from one socializing place to another (case 10), or have no place where they would regularly socialize (case 19). They might 'disappear' following a change of school, or if they took up a part-time job. Service to clients was sometimes interrupted even if they had not disappeared totally (case 13).

Like their contemporaries, these youths looked for independence and tried to assert themselves. Yet they did not know what they wanted (case 12). They were not aware of the negative consequences of some of their behaviour, and even if they did, they might not want to change (case 14). Issues like triad association and drug abuse, which were considered highly undesirable by the workers, might be treated lightly by the clients. At their age, peer influence could be a great pulling force. Sometimes workers just had to wait until the clients experienced something undesirable, or witnessed it happening to their friends, which gave them a motivation to change. In this study, some cases only changed when they learned from such negative experiences.

Inadequate resources remained a big problem. School, job opportunities, and family support were the key resources required. School was the most problematic. The system created many failures. As worker 17 commented, 'I do not know why all our targets are not studying. I do not know how the situation could improve.' If the client was willing, the worker would try to look for school placement for them. But worker 12's experience was that 'If a client is expelled from school after Form 1, most likely you could not find another school for him.'

Since the introduction of compulsory education, children under 15 years of age should be provided with free school places and there should be no shortage of school places. However, many of the outreaching clients were school failures who had no interest in study and did poorly in class. They either dropped out or were expelled due to discipline problems. Workers often tried to help with school placement, but with their poor standard and behaviour pattern, it was very difficult to get them into decent schools. It was difficult to cultivate their interest in

study or reconnect them with the education system; and even if they could get the client back to school, he or she was not interested in it and went there just to kill time (case 22). Some band 5 schools also had a very noisy and chaotic learning environment (case 20). Students just skipped class and teachers could not control the classroom. Considering the clients' characteristics, workers felt that the school syllabus was too rigid and weak students were not taken care of. Tuition given by workers could only help to a limited extent.

There was an obvious need for more vocational training, but the number of places was insufficient and the courses outdated. Choices for female clients were extremely limited (worker 08). In general, then, quality of education was more of a problem than the overall provision of school places.

When youths decided not to go back to school, workers typically encouraged them to work so they could be constructively engaged. But finding the right job was not easy. As mentioned above, they were young and did not know what they wanted to be. They would not commit themselves to routine work and ended up just working in a succession of places for a day or two (case 13). For the 12-14 year old group, the situation was worse. As worker 20 said, 'There is no way out for them. They can't get a job or be a trainee.' In consequence, as worker 03 commented,

> They would idle away their time until they are old enough to join the work force or they might find other outlets to occupy themselves. They may expose themselves to danger during the period as they may be influenced by undesirable peers or even affiliate to triad society and commit illegal activities.

Other community resources mentioned included inadequate youth leisure programmes and difficulty in making referrals to social workers in other fields. Worker 21 felt there were too many children with leisure time problems in the district, and the drop-in centre service was inadequate. In addition, some of the clients could not afford the programme costs. Case 23 was actually so poor that he stole because he wanted a meal. Worker 13 commented that referral to Children and Youth Centres was not well received as centre workers felt they had no skill in dealing with outreaching clients. Even if some centre workers were less discriminating, there might not be the right programme for the clients as the programmes were not designed with them in mind. She felt that different social work fields seemed to be segregated. Family life education workers could not offer programmes that fit with their clients' needs, while outreaching workers could not adequately address family problems. Worker 17 looked for better cooperation with probation officers, yet she felt that probation officers did not trust them. So it was difficult to help a client more holistically.

There was a *lack of family support*. As reported earlier, besides fun and peer affiliation, the needs felt most strongly by the clients were guidance, love and attention. Such needs are

most appropriately satisfied in the family. The more attached were the clients to the family, the less attached they would be to peers. Since many of the clients stayed with 'undesirable peers', this was all the more important. But many of the clients did not get much guidance and support from their family. Case 09's father failed to supervise the child's behaviour. The parents of case 21 expressed their difficulty in caring for the client as they were busy making their living. A number of parents, like those of case 13, just did not show appreciation or support for their children. The family environment of case 11 was too noisy for study, and nobody cared. The mother of case 20 only used negative methods - scolding and criticism - in child discipline. So the clients tended to rebel and stay out. Some families just seemed so deprived that the workers felt community support for them was too limited.

Workers also identified some *internal constraints* within the outreaching service. Time was a key area. Because the clients needed to be reached in their own settings, were crisis-prone, and needed a personal approach in establishing relationships, serving them was time-consuming. A few workers suggested that their caseload was too heavy to allow more intensive and consistent work with the clients, and this was particularly detrimental for the emotionally deprived. It prevented the workers from doing much family work, from running more programmes, from establishing closer networks with schools, and from doing community work. Worker 19 felt the counting of caseloads discouraged community work which could be of help to the clients at large. Worker 19 also felt it unfair that joint projects with schools or talks for teachers were not recognized as part of the workload. Worker 15 suggested an increase in staffing would help, while worker 11 suggested they should have a computer to reduce the time taken in recording client information. Since computers were not a subvented item, not all teams had such technical support.

Facilities were also considered to be inadequate. Several workers felt that space was insufficient. Worker 13 commented that there were not enough interviewing room and activity room; and worker 17 that clients had to compete for the use of rooms. As clients belonging to different gang groups might turn up at the same time, more rooms for separate groups might help with management. Worker 15 felt that the facilities in the centre were too old; and in any case there was substantial wear and tear on facilities due to what worker 14 described as clients' 'bull-like' behaviour. Yet attractive facilities served as one of the contact means with the clients. One client commented that the facilities in the centre were alright 'now that there is table tennis and karaoke' (case 12). It is unknown if all centres had such facilities. Surely clients would be interested in getting more new games and better facilities, especially those that they could not afford themselves.

Relationships with clients were, as we have seen, built up gradually on a one-to-one basis. Staffing problems could, therefore, create problems of continuity. Worker 19 pointed out

that even study leave created this kind of problem. However, a greater problem was caused by staff turnover. Worker 15 commented that the staff turnover problem was due to the poor promotion prospect in comparison with other services, while worker 17 pointed out that a change of worker would slow down the intervention process as the client had to adjust to new worker. One other consequence of high turnover was that staff development had to focus more on orientating new workers. Knowledge consolidation and development by experienced workers was thus overlooked.

Some workers looked for more guidance with their work. In particular they wanted clearer guidance in defining 'potential client', and deciding on termination. Worker 24 suggested termination guidelines were particularly desirable for working with those marginal, poorly socialized youth who needed much adult support. Worker 11 felt outreaching social work still had no clear guidelines to evaluate the success with cases.

Workers also expressed a need for further training. Worker 08 stated that he did not have enough confidence in holding joint interviews as this had not be covered in his basic training. Working with drug problems was another difficult area (worker 16), and it was suggested that in view of the increasing number of drug-abusing youths, more training on this was required.

Worker 14 commented that different workers were trying different theories and not much professional sharing had been done. As described earlier, only a few workers had referred to specific models. Worker 15 commented that the clientele information collection forms were inadequate as they failed to reflect the specific work approach of the outreaching workers. The significance of theory-based intervention was not emphasized. Theory and practice were still thought by some workers not to be well integrated.

9.5.2 Solutions? Suggestions from workers

Besides checking on the problems encountered by the workers, the study also asked workers for their suggestions to improve the service.

Feedback from our outreaching clients shows their great dissatisfaction with their *schooling experience* and their low interest in studying.[9] The outreaching workers, based on their experiences of such problems among their clients, made the

---

[9]. See also Chapter 4, on the school-TI-YC sample. In that sample, delinquency was primarily associated with a feeling that the schools were not interested in the students. However, in looking at outreach clients, we are considering the views of young people who typically have more experience of problems in school, truancy, etc., and whose views are likely to be more extreme.

following suggestions:

1. *Broadening the curriculum.* As worker 08 commented 'The most stormy stage for the students is Form 1 to Form 3. The curriculum should be modified to allow more practical subjects.' As for the vocational training schools, some of the programmes were considered outdated and out of step with the current demands of society.

2. *Increase in choice of schools.* Worker 20 suggested that 'there should be more alternatives for them besides formal schools, like some training centres'. Others wanted to see 'alternate schools', along the lines now seen in the USA.

3. *Change of the compulsory education and child labour ordinances.* Since some of the clients refused to go back to school, it would be in their own interests if they could be allowed to work. The current ordinances give the 12-14 year old group 'no way out' (worker 20). So such ordinances might have to be relaxed and at the same time, it would be better if apprentice training could be arranged to improve their job opportunity and working capacity.

4. *Flexibility in time arrangements.* Since many of the clients were far below standard,, they found it hard to follow classroom teaching. Worker 15 suggested that it would help if secondary schools could break down the curriculum into a longer period than five years for students who fell behind. In addition, the fact that students were far below normal standards was partly created by the restriction on the number of repeaters in each year. It would be more meaningful if such quotas could be relaxed and students allowed to join the class that matched their level. They would learn more and teachers would find them easier to teach.

The second set of suggestions related to the *characteristics of the outreaching clients and the involvement of the family.* Workers wanted to improve their skills so as to do better in these areas. A basic model of practice has been developed already, as described earlier in this chapter. However, workers felt that there was still room for improvement and made the following suggestions:

5. Worker 03 felt that the *commitment of workers and support to new staff* were significant issues. He found that a good orientation programme for new staff was helpful. This view was supported, as it were inversely, by worker 09, who claimed that he had no outreaching training before and that working in this service demanded quite a different set of skills to other forms of social work. Worker 08 emphasized the fact that it takes time for the impact of service to be felt, and workers had to be patient. He felt that fresh graduates were not so suitable in doing outreaching social work, unless the fieldwork placement hours could be lengthened.

6. Related to the improvement in quality of service, worker 09 and other workers suggested a *more professional sharing in the application of different practice theories*. Most practice theories were written with reference to a clinical setting. Because of the unstructured setting and contacts in outreaching, application of the models demanded adjustment and extra effort. Worker 11 suggested that each team could try to study and apply one practice theory. Sharing among the outreaching workers would then help provide stimulation. Knowledge consolidation might take time, but worker 15 felt it could help the development of the service and growth especially of experienced workers. He also suggested that the statistics collected on the client information should have included items on the practice models used. It would help to alert workers to the need for purposeful intervention which is essential for this unstructured service. It would also encourage attempts to try out specific approaches. Some workers felt that there should be efforts to identify new approaches in dealing with the clients' problems (worker 02). These could include: other work approaches besides direct work with the client, projects in schools, talks to teachers, or advocacy for change in the education system as suggested by worker 20.

7. A number of workers considered that *working with family and drug problems should be significant areas for staff development*. In terms of the significance of families in the development of children and youth, and the fact that many of the clients had family relationship problems, it was obviously an area of training that would be of help to the workers. Drug problems had a lower prevalence, but were increasing. The different kinds of drugs, their effect on the body, the need for medical help etc. were areas of interest to workers.

Inter-service collaboration and resource building were also identified by workers as ways of enhancing their effectiveness and efficiency, and providing a better service to clients.

8. Worker 01 suggested that there should be *networking with the Education Department and the police*. Especially when clients were summoned for investigation or being prosecuted, workers should be allowed to accompany them to give support. This need was not yet recognized by the police for juvenile cases. There could also be other forms of cooperation. Some workers had tried approaching the police for referral of cases on the Police Superintendent's Discretion Scheme. These cases, who had committed minor offences, often had problems of supervision at home or of undesirable peer influence. They might need more help than the threat of meeting the police superintendent. Unfortunately such networks had not been established. School was another significant system to work with. For many of the clients who still studied in school, worker 09 suggested that close communication with the school would

help them to understand the client better. Some workers who had good relations with schools might also go into the school to offer programmes so as to identify potential cases; and this would help to supplement the work of school social workers. Other workers hoped for a referral system for school placement, but thought this probably would not be achieved until school authorities could remove their bias against outreaching clients. Labelling and rejection of the client by school due to the presence of outreaching worker had actually been reported.

9. Less ideal, but still useful, would be a *compilation of a school placement resources file* for the outreaching workers to facilitate their work with school placement. This might include relevant schools within the district as well as other training institutions or special schools outside the area. Worker 16 suggested other resource information, such as places for getting drug treatment, etc., would be also helpful for outreaching workers. Worker 03 felt that the services provided by the Employment Service of the Hong Kong Council of Social Services and the Labour Department were not comprehensive enough. He pointed to the need for job counselling for many of the outreaching clients and the need to improve the career manual.

There were also several suggestions concerning *improvement of the operation of the outreaching service*. Suggestions covered several aspects of the service, including case load and manpower, venue and facilities, team structure, staff turnover, etc.:

10. There was support on several grounds for the idea that *the workload should be cut to 20 to 25* (worker 13). Worker 15 commented that caseload of workers dealing with drug abuse clients (PS33) was only 27 and suggested the same for outreach workers, since some outreaching clients also had abuse problems. To give more time for direct practice, worker also suggested reduction of paperwork (worker 11) and computerization of record-keeping (worker 03).

11. Concerning the problem of insufficient space for activity and interviewing, worker 13 suggested that the *outreaching service should be allocated space equal to the size of a Children and Youth Centre*. More rooms would help with interviewing and meeting with different client groups. Case 17 was in favour of a large drop-in area so that they could come any time. Worker 06 suggested more branch offices so that more clients could be motivated to come for interview. Subvention for facilities would have to be more generous as facilities and programmes remained a means of contact with the clients and they helped to expand the choice of the clients' leisure time activities.

12 Relating to staff turnover, workers 15 and 16 both commented that *promotion prospects* in outreaching social work were not as good as in other services. So the staffing structure needed looking into.

13. *Selection of target* was probably an area that required constant review. Suggestions were to focus on younger children in P.5 or P.6, just when their problems started to emerge (worker 07). Worker 17 commented that more youngsters were dressed in 'ray' style, smoked, and had casual sex. The problem manifested might not appear severe. But as they worked with these marginal kids, often deeper problems were revealed.

14. There was a related emphasis on *community education on the nature of outreaching service*. Worker 08 wanted to emphasize that the outreaching clients were not problematic kids but normal children who needed service. Worker 11 suggested that the mass media should put less emphasis on the negative past history of the children or the mysterious image of outreaching worker. Rather, the children's change and growth should be the preferred focus.

Last but not the least is the issue of an *integrated team*, an idea which has been discussed for a long time in the field. Different workers had expressed dissatisfaction with the service system which categorized youth in such a way that each of their needs was considered separately, and the same person or family thus served by different workers. Worker 10 suggested that ideas of integration should be more than just pooling the youth workers of different services together. The idea of integration expressed by workers reflected several orientations :

15. *Holistic orientation*. Worker 05 suggested integrative service in terms of rendering more comprehensive service to the family as a whole. This might include working with peers, school, or family. It would help save time in coordination, but would mean integration of family service, school social work and outreaching social work.

16. *Non-labelling orientation*. Worker 10 suggested that youth should not be categorized into 'good' or 'bad guys'. Youth workers should just help any youth with his/her problems and unfulfilled needs, thus becoming more of an outreaching effort to serve the youth population in general. Thus school and outreaching social work might join together (worker 07), perhaps also with the Children and Youth Centre service too.

17. *Joint effort orientation*. There were also views on how best to integrate the service. Worker 08 expected to have family service workers in the team; that is, they would be 'colleagues' within the team, which would make referral easier. Worker 13 would like to have team-mates specializing in organizing programmes to give support to individual work. Worker 21's suggestion was also to have school social workers of the same agency working in the same district. But she would like to see staff specializing in legal matters, employment law, programme organization etc. This would represent more integration of expertise and specialization within the outreaching team.

These 17 proposals range from the specific to the general, and the theoretical to the practical. Some overlap with others, and a few are contradictory. What they do show, however, is that workers reflect on their own experiences and have a pool of suggestions, many of which would be relatively easy to implement, as to how to improve their service. Whether there is a 'best' way to provide an integrated service in the Hong Kong context is clearly an important question which deserves further and detailed investigation.

9.6 Prospects for the service

This study has tapped the views of both clients and workers. It has covered a wide range of client types and problems, including those at different stages in their relationships with outreaching workers. The workers interviewed came from the 24 teams which at the time of the study had offered service for one year or more, and included those who were new recruits, with fresh views, as well as experienced workers, both male and female. While we make no claims as to the prevalence of any particular problems, client reactions, of worker views, what we have done is to tap virtually the complete range of clients (and their problems, attitudes, etc.) and workers (and their experiences, views, etc.).

Outreaching workers encounter many problems in their work, not the least of which is that in a high proportion of cases service is interrupted. Assessments of their 'effectiveness' are fraught with difficulties. Their effectiveness sometimes lies in clients not doing things which, if not for service, they would have done; sometimes in clients being encouraged to do things which they might have done anyway; and sometimes in clients being given a way to solve their problems but also the opportunity to deny that they were helped. Moreover, and perhaps ironically, the main strength of the outreaching service appears to be that workers *have no authority over the young people*; their suggestions and offers of help are likely to be heeded because they do not come from an authority figure.

In such a situation we can reasonably conclude that even though many of the 'marginal youth' do commit delinquent acts, and outreaching social work often addresses such problems in a partial and limited way, it has value in dealing with other areas of its clients' lives in which the delinquent behaviour is rooted. And even if it does not prevent young people from choosing a 'marginal' lifestyle, or allowing themselves to drift into such a lifestyle, it does often provide young people with a sense of the consequences of their behaviour and with positive alternative options.

That said, there remain some prospects for further development, as outlined below.

9.6.1 Reaching out and filling in gaps of service.

Outreaching social work is a special service which fills an important gap in our service to the young people. Most of the subjects did not know any other social worker.

For those few who did have contact with a school social worker, Children and Youth Centre worker, probation officer, or family service worker, different workers gave them different impressions. Only one indicated that the school social worker was like the outreaching social worker (i.e. personal and caring). Under the current service system, school workers often do not continue with the case after he or she drops out from school. Even if they do, they do not have the advantage of outreaching workers in knowing the social environment of the client. Once the clients are out of school, they could be wandering anywhere and it would be very difficult for school social workers to reach them. Client experiences with outreaching workers are also rather different to their experiences of probation officers; the outreaching workers build up a much more natural, approachable relationship with the client in an informal way. There is no authority attached, and no obligation. Hence they tend to trust the outreaching workers more. Workers of other services, even without authority attached, are likely to have a special focus of intervention, such as dealing with family discord or offering programmes in the Children and Youth Centre. Clients may not feel concern for them as an individual. As case 18 commented, 'the family service worker is fierce. She is controlling, saying "If you don't go to school, I would put you in a boy's home."' He just did not feel any goodwill and would not ask for help. Outreaching workers, with their special work approach, are somehow reaching the 'unreachables'.

9.6.2 Evolution of a local indigenous model

Since the service was started in 1979, experience has accumulated. By now a basic practice model has evolved. It starts with active natural contacts with clients, then relationship-building through non-threatening media, exploration of problems through personal concern, spontaneous guidance and crisis intervention, to eclectic purposeful intervention of all kinds. Some of the strategies were actually strongly supported by the clients. They included the use of snowballing to reach more potential clients (case 07), the need of relationship with client (case 02), ability to play as well as communicate with each client according to his/her special personality (case 04), persistence to approach the client despite initial rejection (case 05), and sharing with client like a friend (case 19).

Workers had developed a more realistic expectation of the service and were more patient, accepting, and prepared for possible rejection or frustration. Training institutions have placement arrangements with the service. All agencies have their orientation programme for new workers, and the Social Welfare Department also helps with providing a staff development

programme. It is therefore an established and unique service.

9.6.3 Positive change in half of the clients

Statistics on client information in 1992 indicate that half of the cases were closed with their objectives achieved. This study has the limitation of not including clients who rejected service or who could not be reached. But since the subjects were at different stages of service, their experiences and perceptions were quite different. Our findings show that some problems were dealt with more thoroughly than others. Since the well-being of a person does not necessarily mean the removal of all problems, we should not look for perfection in each case. Nonetheless, efforts should continue to develop clearer guidelines to measure success. Most of the subjects in the study had reported positive changes due to their 'own growth and maturity', though this growth had been speeded up through the worker's intervention. It may be fair to comment that such maturity may have come about ultimately through a variety of processes, including learning from negative experiences and social-environmental changes. However, it remains a very favourable feedback, as clients had indicated growth of confidence in themselves, besides showing certain behaviour changes.

9.6.4 Awareness of inadequacies and need for improvement

For any service to grow, it is necessary that the workers are aware of its inadequacy and look for improvement. The urge for greater effort in applying different practice models, more professional sharing, and knowledge consolidation is thus very encouraging, and shows the motivation and the mission of the workers. The request for better guidelines for counting potential case, case evaluation and termination, the suggestion to examine the selection of priority target, and the request for revision of clientele information forms are all indicators that the workers are sensitive to their problems and ready to work for a better future. While some cases were better handled than others, there is only a delicate difference between spontaneity and lack of direction, purposeful eclecticism and laissez faire. The challenge of working in an unstructured setting with an unmotivated client is very great.

Accountability is necessary. There has to be monitoring through a good supervisory system, supported by professional input and a forum for workers to exchange ideas. Such processes should be supported and assisted by individual agencies or through the coordination efforts of the Hong Kong Council of Social Services. The move for concentrated experimentation of different practice models seems timely. Some agencies may have been doing it already in various ways, and others are interested to learn from their experience. More professional sharing within the field would help to provide stimulation for all. The next stage of development could be practice models for different kinds of clientele, and the application of different theories in

outreaching social work.

9.6.5 Chance for more collaborative efforts in youth service

The time is right for youth service integration, as centre service has been reviewed and the idea of an integrated team, encompassing outreaching social work, school social work, and centre service will be attempted. Outreaching workers who look for better service coordination may be more ready to tune in to the new mode of service. The integrated team also could provide the opportunity to review the calculation of workload, the clientele information system, the choice of target, operational guidelines, etc. As the Social Welfare Department and the Hong Kong Council of Social Service are also involved in the monitoring of this research, it is hoped that the suggestions of the workers reported in this study will be considered.

9.6.6 Limitations

Of course, there are also limitations as to how much the situation can be improved.

1. The complaints against the education system and the call for changes are not new. The Education Department is well aware of the drop out rate in the schools and of the inadequacy in vocational training programmes. Yet there is no indication of its intention to remove the repeaters quota or to offer the nine year free and compulsory education more flexibly. It is up to the effort of the educators and more public pressure to press for more quality education. Otherwise there would continue to be school drop outs joining the street.

2. Any change in the law on the minimum age of child labour would inevitably be a very controversial issue. It could open the way to the exploitation of child labour. And the provision of educational opportunity for the young is a well-accepted stand of the community. Our community is ready for better education and presumably better developmental opportunities for our next generation. One viable alternative would be the provision of more varied educational programmes, prevocational or vocational in nature, that would be of interest and practical use to the under-15s.

3. Better recognition of the role of the social worker by the police would be extremely helpful. Yet it is not easy for a disciplined force to modify its practice norms. Any change has to come from the top of the system. More advocacy from the social work profession and concerned Legislative Council members might be needed.

4. The negative impact of the environment on the development of youths would remain. In the past attention has been

focused on 'fishball' stalls and massage parlours; now there is concern about karaoke nightclubs. Outreaching workers have tried to call public attention to the employment of underage girls in these establishments, and the police have taken some action. But the root problem remains, that prostitution and quasi-prostitution of underage girls continues in a variety of forms which mutate and follow the broader currents of the entertainment business. Similarly, whatever action is taken against triad societies, they have spawned a youth subculture which continues, recruits members, and influences marginal youth. The drug problem appears to have increased in recent years; more outreaching clients have been found with drug abuse problems, and some appear to be involved in trafficking drugs. While social workers can help at the level of the individual client, a collective solution rests on the shoulders of law enforcement action against those who sell drugs. While drug campaigns have probably made young people more aware of the harmful effects of drugs, they have clearly not reduced the number of young people prepared to take drugs.

Reality is always harsh. This study has reviewed the contribution and potential of outreaching social work, but its limitations must also be recognized. Action can be taken to make the service more effective, but it is also to be hoped that our youth will find more support in their social environment to prevent, or at least help them with, their problems.

Table 9.1 Profiles of 24 outreaching clients interviewed

Case Code	Case selection criteria		
	Age	Main problem type	Sex
01.	15-17	peers	F
02.	18 or over	vocation	M
03.	18 or over	peers	M
04.	18 or over	peers	F
05.	18 or over	self-functioning	M
06.	18 or over	self-functioning	F
07.	18 or over	social norms	M
08.	15-17	family	M
09.	14 or below	social norms	M
10.	15-17	school and education	M
11.	15-17	school and education	F
12.	15-17	vocation	M
13.	15-17	vocation	F
14.	15-17	vocation	M
15.	18 or over	school and education	M
16.	15-17	social norms	M
17.	15-17	self-functioning	F
18.	15-17	school and education	M
19.	14 or below	family	M
20.	14 or below	school and education	M
21.	14 or below	family	M
22.	14 or below	peers	F
23.	14 or below	self-functioning	M
24.	15-17	school and education	F

Table 9.2 Summary of 24 outreaching clients interviewed

Males: Age:	14 or under	15-17	18 or over	Total
Type of problem:				
peers			1	1
vocation		2	1	3
self-functioning	1	-	1	2
social norms	1	1	1	3
family	2	1		3
schooling	1	2	1	4
				16

Females: Age:	14 or under	15-17	18 or over	Total
Type of problem:				
peers	1	1	1	3
vocation		1		1
self-functioning		1	1	2
social norms				-
family				-
schooling		2		2
				8

Table 9.3 Problems identifed in each case from interviews with client and worker

PROBLEM	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	Frequency
fighting	x				x	x	x		*						x						x	x			7
staying out	x		x	x										x	x			x			x	x			8
runaway									x				x				x	x	x			x		x	7
substance abuse	x	x	x		x	x						x	x				x	x						x	10
drug trafficking		x						x																	2
stealing		x	x			x	*		x								x		x		x		x		9
robbery					x					x								x							3
self destructive				x													x		x						3
gambling					x							x		x			x								4
sex/abortion				x					x						x		x							x	5
heterosex relns.	x			x		x						x			x				x					x	7
undes. peer infl.	*	x	*	*		x		x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	*	x		20
triad	x				x		x	x	x	x		x			x	*	x		x						11
study	x					x		x	x	*	*	x	x	x	*		x	*	x	*	x	x	x	*	18
no/unstable job		*	x	x	x			x				*	*	*			x								9
family	x	x	x	x		x		*	x	x	x		x		x		x	x	*	x	*	x	x	x	19
self worth	x			x	*	*									x	x	*		x	x			*		10
No. problems	9	6	6	8	7	8	3	6	8	4	3	7	6	5	9	3	12	7	9	4	6	6	5	6	

* = problem recorded as basis for service
x = other problems client known to have

10. THE FINDINGS, THE MODEL, AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1 Summary of the findings

In Chapters 2, 3, and 4 we pointed out that most young people - three quarters of all males and about 40% of all females - commit one or two delinquent acts during their adolescence. We argued that this has to be treated as a normal and natural part of growing up. But we also observed that just over half of all delinquent acts are committed by only 11% of young people. This suggests that any explanation of 'why young people offend' cannot reasonably explain why the majority commit only a few offences. What we have to explain is the difference between the majority who commit only a few offences, and the few who are responsible for most delinquency. That is, we need to explain the variance within the population of young people.

Chapter 3 focused on the relationship between 'problem behaviour' and delinquency. It has often been argued in Hong Kong that young people become involved in problem behaviour - staying out late, going to electronic games centres, smoking, etc. - and then, through a process of differential association, are absorbed into a delinquent subculture and become delinquent. The evidence presented in Chapter 3 suggested that for many young people the situation was actually the reverse of this process. That is, they committed a first delinquent act and then at about the same time or shortly thereafter came to be absorbed in, or sought out, the delinquent subculture and hence presented problem behaviour. While not offering strong support for any particular theory of delinquency, this chapter suggested that theories which emphasize the mutually reinforcing effects of different variables, including the reactions of others to the early stages of delinquency and problem behaviour, have to be taken seriously.[1] These of course include labelling and subculture theories.

Chapters 4 and 5 reviewed a range of socio-economic, school, lifestyle, and attitudinal factors in relation to several measures of delinquency. The empirical findings suggest that delinquency is associated with:

- less frequent contact with parents, and more extensive contact with friends in the context of a 'marginal' subculture. Females were less likely than males to engage fully in all aspects of this subculture and thus some particular activities associated with it, such as spending time in electronic games centres, also appeared in the final multivariate regressions.

- perceptions of being treated negatively by school (for both sexes), anti-school attitudes (for females), and negative relationships with classmates (for males). In addition

---

[1]. See for example Thornberry, 1987; Thornberry *et al.*, 1994; Braithwaite (1989).

perceptions that the school, and classmates, treated the individual negatively were related to delinquency. However, delinquents were just as likely as others to assess their own class ranking and school as average, despite evaluating the school negatively.

Another important association was that those with the higher rates of delinquency appeared to be more firmly entrenched in the marginal youth subculture, and in street gangs.

However:

- despite the widely-held view that families in contemporary Hong Kong have difficulty in controlling their younger members, or take too little interest in them, delinquency as well as problem behaviour was very often detected by the family.

- there were differences between males and females in the patterns of association among delinquents. In essence delinquent males characterized their friends as 'playful', but did not appear to be close to their friends, despite the amount of time they spent together. Female delinquents, by contrast, appeared to have closer and more positive relations with friends.

Chapters 6 and 7 dealt with offenders undergoing supervision or in some form of custody, and sought to identify the factors affecting repeat offending and the effects of the sentence on the offender. In essence, the single factor which best differentiated 'newcomers' in the criminal justice system from 'repeaters' who had a longer track record of offending was the depth of their involvement in the marginal youth subculture. In line with findings from many other studies in the US and UK, repeaters had typically begun their delinquent career at an earlier age than the newcomers. However there were no other significant differences between the two groups.

10.2 Our model of 'becoming delinquent'

10.2.1 The first offence

As noted above, the majority of all young people commit one or two offences, for which they are usually not caught by the police (though they may well be caught by their families). Because offending at this level is so widespread, the causes are likely to be purely circumstantial - perhaps one could even say accidental. Any attempt to explain delinquency at this level would have to conclude, purely and simply, that testing the limits of acceptable behaviour is no more than part of growing up. What has to be explained is why some young people commit many more delinquent acts than others.

10.2.2 Further occurrences of delinquency

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 whereby 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. We are, after all, talking here of trends rather than absolute and clear-cut processes. However, our data give grounds for emphasizing other processes which are likely to result in young people becoming more delinquent. In essence three processes appear to be important:

- 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 as a 'bad element'. Certainly they feel that their school does not want to hold on to them. Males, in addition, tend to feel rejected by their (largely non-delinquent) classmates. The net result is that delinquents may have few options *except* to socialize with other delinquents, which in turn may mean spending more time in the marginal youth subculture.

- the argument that young delinquents are drawn into the subculture through being rejected by school and possibly family is underscored by the point that among the school-TI-YC sample, young people in the subculture often do not feel very close to their friends in the subculture. They are, we might say, not the kinds of friends they would like to have, but the only kinds of friends available to them.[2] Nonetheless, while the first offence(s) appear typically to predate involvement in the marginal youth subculture, heavier involvement in that subculture (as measured through problem behaviour, and initially brought about by negative labelling from school and possibly family) 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.

- although much of discussion talks about 'the' marginal street youth subculture it appears that the experience of that subculture and the kinds of activities involved are different for males and females and, it also appears, for

---

[2]. This was not the case with the male offenders, who typically saw their relationships with friends in terms of mutual support. This is most likely to be the result of their deeper involvement in the subculture, where they socialize with other young people who are likely to understand them.

those who are simply members as opposed to those who we have 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, coping with the consequences of negative labelling, and finding that the marginal youth subculture will tolerate their behaviour, thus have a less strong 'stake' in conventional society. The factors that lead most of us, as adults anyway, *not* to offend exert a much weaker effect on these young people. We do not want to deny that young people have free choice; they do. Nor do we wish to imply that they are somehow forced into crime; they are not. But 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.

- however, becoming a member of a 'street gang' appears to decrease the likelihood of such more of less aimless 'hanging around' and 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.

10.2.3 Detected offenders

At some point in this process, many of these delinquents will be caught. It appears from our data that:

- the initial police response to the offenders (caution or prosecution?) is largely geared to the amount of problem behaviour the individuals display. Thus 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 of course that they are within the age-limit for cautioning).

- most of those given custodial or non-custodial (supervision) sentences by the courts appear to see the sentence as having no positive effect on them, though it may have a deterrent effect. When they cease to offend, it is most probably because they feel they cannot face the prospect of another sentence.

- that said, those who have become 'repeaters', that is, who have committed and been sentenced for three or more offences, appear to be those who are 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.

10.3 Recommendations

Despite the intricacy and complexity of our study, the recommendations that it leads us to are broad and quite simple. They are as follows.

10.3.1 Schools should do more to retain their marginal students

One of the key findings in this research is the importance of negative labelling from schools in increasing the likelihood of (first or further) delinquency. There must, accordingly, be increased efforts made to retain students. Therefore, 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.

In this regard, we are informed that the Education Department has already introduced a range of support services and specialised teaching facilities for students experiencing difficulties at school (Education Department, 1994). However, in view of our research findings that delinquents continue to feel rejected by the school and outreaching social workers' comments about the inadequacy of school placement resources, it might be worthwhile exploring the extent to which these support services are achieving their target objectives.

Part of the problem may be that students and social workers are not well informed about these resources. Another factor may be that because the services have only recently been introduced, they have not yet had a chance to have an impact. Nevertheless, it could be the case that some of these new services are not tapping the real needs of the target population (Cheung, 1994). For example, the Education Department has set up a number of *Practical Schools* 'to cater for junior secondary school-aged children who have very low motivation towards the core curriculum of the ordinary schools and may become drop-outs' (Education Department, 1994: 4). However, the problem with this type of school is that it labels and excludes young people with low motivation towards an academic curriculum. This has the undesirable effect of further reinforcing their feelings of

rejection rather than integrating them into mainstream society.

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.

We understand that there will be moves in this direction shortly, with (a) the recruitment of more school social workers, and (b) the creation of integrated teams working from Children and Youth Centres but including work in schools within their remit. These are welcome steps.

However, principals and teachers should note that minor delinquency is a natural and common phenomenon amongst young people, that often responds better to persuasion, patience and concern, rather than force. This should alert school personnel to the need of being more accepting towards young offenders and of encouraging classmates to adopt a similar stance.

Lastly, then

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.

Currently, schools tend to expect commitment from their students. Yet they must work to generate that commitment, and should also demonstrate a deep commitment to their students who are experiencing problems.

10.3.2 Family support should be extended

In our study we found a strong association between contact with parents and delinquency. This is consistent with previous research findings (Ng et al., 1975; Chow *et al.*, 1987). This problem is likely to intensify with more and more parents working in China and the increase in single parent families.[3] We therefore 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.

---

[3]. In 1988, the number of single-parent families receiving public assistance was 3,714. By 1992, the figure had risen to 4,987 (Director of Social Welfare, 1990; 1994).

In addition, policy-makers should note that the type of care and control that families can provide is dependent on their socio-economic circumstances. Thus there may be a need to develop more effective policies and support services which ease the economic and social burden of parents in raising children, particularly if one parent is absent.

Finally, young offenders and their families may need another form of support. At the time of arrest and during the subsequent investigation, young offenders and their families may panic. The availability of social work assistance would be a valuable resource at this point in time. We further recommend:

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.

10.3.3 Work with marginal youth should be developed and expanded

Our data have shown the key importance of the marginal youth subculture in the maintenance of delinquency. It is the 'refuge' to which delinquents go when they suffer rejection elsewhere, and over time, it becomes a social space which is structured by delinquents and which reflects their values.

It is simplistic to suggest that any changes to that subculture can be effected through more stringent licensing of particular kinds of premises, etc. Subcultures tend to be very resilient to such tactics and moreover mutate relatively quickly. By the time any form of legislation can be in place to provide further control over electronic games centres and karaoke parlours, some new form of entertainment will have emerged and come to be absorbed into the subculture as a favoured leisure pursuit. A battle to reduce the extent and impact of a subculture must therefore be a battle for hearts and minds, often fought in the context of very adverse social circumstances.

Chapter 3 had pointed out that problem behaviours cannot be seen as 'predelinquent', which implies that outreaching work arguably is based on a misperception of the linkage between the marginal youth subculture and delinquency. Nonetheless, as Chapter 9 shows, it does not follow that outreaching social work is ineffective. It does a great deal to dilute, mitigate the effects of, and challenge the marginal youth subculture which gives rise to much of that problem behaviour.

We are aware that outreaching work, and other work with youth, takes a wide variety of forms and that these are now undergoing a variety of changes (Working Party on Review of Children and Youth Centre Services 1994). While our research dealt with outreaching workers, these workers will progressively become members of integrated teams based in Children and Youth Centres and serving a wide clientele. We do not make any recommendations as to the particular structures within which youth services are delivered. 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. It should be recalled that 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.

The significance of this recommendation is that *workers who have no formal authority over the young person* actually appear to be better able to work with such persons, and effect changes in their behaviour, than workers who have formal supervisory responsibilities. Within the subculture, any authority figure is suspect. The most effective strategies rely, not on the use of threats or even the perception that a worker is backed by legal authority, but on simple persuasion and concrete help.

The recommendation above would mean that outreaching work would need to expand, to operate across the whole spectrum from keeping young people from even entering the marginal youth subculture, through to challenging those who are its culture-carriers.

10.3.4 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, the fact that they were in the company of other delinquents, etc. In fact, if they were caught in the company of others who have already experienced a caution and are thus likely to be prosecuted, the decision *not* to prosecute may well drive a wedge between them and their associates.

We thus recommend that

k. all young offenders, unless their offences are extremely serious,[4] 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.[5]

The above recommendation does little more than reiterate existing cautioning guidelines (Ip, 1990). 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.[6]

m. in addition, it is clearly worth considering whether cautioning for a second offence should become normal rather than exceptional.[7]

At the cautioning stage it may actually be counter-productive to impose supervision on the young offender, due to the negative labelling effect and the young person's natural resistance.

---

[4]. 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.

[5]. 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 NACRO (1990: 2-3). These guidelines apply to all young people below the age of 18 years.

[6]. 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, 1989).

[7]. 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 1989).

However, 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. The 1990 Home Office Circular states:

> '... the effectiveness of cautions is likely to be enhanced if they are backed up by arrangements for referring offenders who have particular difficulties related to the offence to other agencies or to voluntary organisations for support, guidance and/or involvement in the community ... any agreement to be referred should not be made a condition of a caution'[8]

A number of youthwork agencies in Hong Kong have recently established or are about to establish such 'cautioning plus' schemes. The Phoenix project, which offers a number of social welfare services for young offenders and their families at the time of cautioning, has been positively evaluated (Cheng 1993; Lo et al., 1994). 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.[9]

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.

10.3.5 The impact of criminal justice policies

We now turn to the issue of the sentencing alternatives for young people. Our data are retrospective; that is, we interviewed young people in custody or residential care, or under supervision and attempted to recreate the 'delinquent career' which resulted in their latest disposal. The implication is of course that we have interviewed a large number of those who are considered to be among the most serious young offenders in Hong Kong. Two points stand out in relation to this group of offenders. First, even those who must be counted among the more serious offenders have only a small number of arrests. After each arrest and conviction they 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 care. Second, in most cases their offences appear to be fairly minor,

---

[8]. Home Office Circular 59/1990. HMSO: London.

[9]. See Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups (1993).

and only a small percentage are involved in violent crime. It must also be borne in mind that while those who end up under supervision or in custody are more likely to have been arrested for a crime against the person, the 'calibration of violence' in Hong Kong leads to heavy penalties in cases involving even the most minor victim injuries.

Our research has shown that young people who are most involved in delinquency are also those who are most heavily involved in marginal youth subculture. The response of the criminal justice system to such young offenders can be crudely characterized as one of plucking offenders out of that subculture and providing a period of discipline or training in a structured residential or custodial setting; when released, they return back into the same situation they came from, though they are usually supervised.

On the first occasion that young people undergo this process the main effect on them appears to be one of deterrence. Those who are not in fact deterred and who continue to offend are likely to receive further periods of custody, and in such cases the deterrent effect appears much more marked. Despite the mandate and activities of CSD and SWD, few young offenders are aware of the 'rehabilitative' value of residential care or custody.

Moreover, while parents may continue to be supportive of them, friends are likely to become less so; and those who have experienced a period of custody appear to experience many more problems after release than they did before their arrest.

There will of course always be a place for residential care 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 does suggest that alternative and more effective courses of action can be taken for many of those who currently end up in residential care 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 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 (similiar 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 sentencing programmes as an explicit alternative to residential care and custody. These differ from open probation or community service orders 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 kinds of skills, style, and qualities of social interaction that would be required to operate such a programme are very similar to those currently employed in less structured settings such as outreaching social work. Since we propose that this should be a sentence of the court, it follows that the intensity and duration of the programme should be court-ordered for each individual offender subject to maximum limits and the general intention that offenders should be able to continue to live with their family, attend school or work, etc., in the community. Non-compliance with the programme should result in the offender being returned to court for another non-custodial sentence to be substituted, though the nature and length of such a sentence should take into account the actual degree of attendance that has occurred. There should equally be a possibility for workers to recommend to the court that a programme is terminated early in view of good progress, and for offenders to continue to attend in a voluntary capacity if they feel this would be helpful to them.

Finally, the arguments about the net-widening effects of such programmes in other countries are well-known and were discussed in earlier chapters. They do not require elaboration here. Such arguments must be taken seriously, and 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.

10.3.6 Future research should take greater account of interactionist theories

Our data, while mainly quantitative, has shown the importance of labelling and subcultural effects alongside the other, one-directional, theoretical perspectives that have often been proposed for delinquency in the Hong Kong context. In addition it has shown the importance of making a clear separation between males and females, since their patterns and levels of offending appear to be rather different and in some important respects, the school, family, and subcultural factors which appear in the early stages of their delinquent careers may differ. And finally, we have argued that the marginal youth subculture, while not the 'cause' of delinquency, clearly provides a social refuge and a set of values which delinquents find supportive.

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

p. In particular 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.

At root, criminal justice is not only a matter of protecting the public, but of dealing justly and appropriately with offenders. Inadequate monitoring and evaluation thus carries a hidden cost, not only in terms of inappropriate or ineffective government spending, but more importantly, we believe, in terms of human misery for both offenders and their victims.

APPENDIX A: METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

A.1 Sampling

The sample is made up of 8 parts:

1. 30 schools resulting in 1898 valid questionnaires. The sampling mechanism involved selecting schools proportional to size, stratified by band and funding type (with help from Education Department). Within each school, we selected 2 classes randomly with equal chance from all secondary classes, giving sample sizes between 70 and 90 per school.

Some questionnaires were eliminated as it was clear that the respondents had answered questions in an arbitrary way. The answer spaces were constructed as rows of numbers, and respondents were asked to circle the appropriate number to each question. This format created 'grids' of numbers on many pages, and the discarded questionnaires were principally those in which the respondent had answered in such a way as to create a regular pattern on these grids.

2. 5 Technical Institutes resulting in 178 valid questionnaires. The TIs were chosen to cover Hong Kong geographically, subject to the consent of the TI director. We sampled 2 large classes (one dominated by each sex) of 15-20 students per TI, including both full-time and part-time students.

3. 7 Youth Centres selected following advice from the Federation of Youth Groups to give YCs with high throughput, resulting in 204 valid questionnaires. One YC only produced 2 respondents, but the others each provided 28 to 50 respondents.

4. 6 Outreach Centres resulting in 29 valid questionnaires. Each OC provided 3-7 respondents.

5. 5 CSD Institutions resulting in 203 valid questionnaires. The number of respondents per institution varied between 17 and 58. Sampling was done by CSD to be generally representative.

6. 6 SWD homes resulting in 86 valid questionnaires, with 10 to 20 respondents per home.

7. 5 SWD Probation Offices and 1 Community Service Office resulting in 84 valid questionnaires, with 12 to 20 respondents per PO and 5 from the CSO.

8. Superintendent's Discretionary Scheme resulting in 226 valid questionnaires returned from mail-outs to all 1,200 who were in the scheme within the last 6 months, giving a response rate of 19%.

These samples do not include the 48 interviews done with outreach staff and clients.

We were unable to include an ex-offender sample due to difficulty in arranging access for our research asistants. One of us (PG) has subsequently been able to arrange some interviews, but the results are not yet available.

All except part 8 answered the main self-report questionnaire covering attitudes, school, activities and family relations. Parts 4-7 answered questions about first and last offences and first offence caught, and also provided sequences of life-events (Parts G and H of the 'offender' questionnaire). Part 8 answered a shortened questionnaire reflecting that for this group alone, responses were mailed back, as opposed to being picked up by a research assistant.

In addition to the questionnaire, detailed interviews were done with 30 offenders as a pilot to provide a more detailed background.

A.2 Response rate

The institutional response rate was essentially perfect, and with the exception of a few respondents who did not answer seriously, non-response is only an issue for part 8 of the sample. For this group, the response rate was 19%. Thus the final sample is as follows:

Source	Sample size	Response Rate (%)
School	1898	76
TI	178	95
YC	204	100
Outreach	29	100
CSD	203	100
SWD	86	96
Probation	84	93
Supt Dis Scheme	226	19
Total	2908	

A.3 Language

While the research instruments were initially produced in English, the versions given to all samples were in Chinese (all interviewing was done in Cantonese with the exception of a handful of cases conducted in other dialects spoken by both interviewers and interviewees).

Most items were piloted on a small group of 30 individuals in mid-1992. The research schedules were then revised. Pressure of time meant that no systematic back-translation to English was conducted prior to the main fieldwork (though selected items

were). However the schedules were seen, in several drafts, by research assistants, team members, and Security Branch officials. Consequently there were repeated discussions between bilingual members of the research team and bilingual government officials as to the precise meaning and the purpose of including particular items. A few items (in particular section D of the instrument, dealing with self-esteem) were kindly provided by CSD in Chinese.

It will be seen that some of the items in Chinese were perhaps not so elegantly styled as they could have been, though consultation with Chinese colleagues and selected back-translation during the process of analysis makes us confident that their meaning was clear. In three cases (out of approximately 220 specific responses required for the school sample instrument and over 300 for the offenders) it did appear after the event that there were discrepancies between the English and Chinese versions of particular items or response choices within items (in addition, it will be seen that items G3.6 and G3.7 are transposed on the two versions of the research instrument). For all analytical purposes the Chinese version was treated as the authoritative one.

A.4 Statistical analysis

The major tools used in the analysis were Analysis of Variance, Principal Component Analysis and (Backwards Stepwise) Regression. Mann-Whitney and Wilcoxon rank-sum non-parametric tests and (Backwards Stepwise) Discriminant Analysis were used when appropriate. Analysis of Variance was used to identify whether groups were indeed different on a particular measurement scale. The significance levels of the individual T-tests are adjusted to take into account the multiple comparisons being done. Principal Component Analysis (i.e. Factor Analysis) was used to identify underlying scales and patterns for most areas of the self-report questionnaire. This is a more useful methodology than simply testing item reliability when it is not yet clear which items can be usefully clustered. Regression Analysis was used to try to summarize relationships of various items and scales with delinquency measures. It is important to realize that it does not test for causality and that the relationships may be in the reverse direction to that originally supposed, or even bi-directional. This means that, for example, the relationship between delinquency and delinquent associates or being caught may be strong and relevant without the direction of causality being established. More detailed analysis of the time sequence of life events should assist to some extent in identfiying causality, although associations with delinquent youth was not included in the set of life events. Stepwise regression allowed us to focus on the variables having major associations while minimizing the interference from intermediate variables. As a result, some of the variables having strong associations with delinquency do not appear in the regression models, as their effects are taken account of by the other variables in the model.

The school, TI and YC samples were grouped for the purpose of analysis, as were the CSD, SWD and Probation samples. In the case of the school samples, this is not exactly representative, but then it is not clear what the appropriate weights should be. Our major concern was to include youths from as wide a background as possible, which could not be done using the school sample alone for youths older than 15. Similarly, combining the three offender groups ensured coverage of a wide range of offenders.

A.5 Sex effects

Given the large difference in the number of delinquent acts between males and females, almost all the analysis was done separately for males and females (in addition to the school/offender separation). Indeed, we showed that attempting to predict delinquency for a combined male/female group degenerates primarily into predicting sex! In addition to the differences in global offending rates, there are also differences in the patterns of behaviour and offending between males and females, casting into doubt the meaning of any analysis that does not distinguish between the sexes.

A.6 Future analysis

There are at least four aspects of the data that have not as yet been fully explored. Firstly, the (relatively) small number of female offenders have not been fully investigated. One interesting question is the extent to which their behaviour is similar to the female school sample and to the male offender sample. Secondly, the time sequence of life-events for the offender sample has not been fully analysed. There is some difficulty with this analysis as many offenders could not remember exactly when events took place and the questionnaire only provided an ordering of events within types of event, meaning that the global ordering of events is not perfect. Thirdly, the Superintendents Discretionary Scheme sample has not yet been fully analysed, because of the more limited questionnaire. Lastly, the outreach sample within the main study has not yet been fully analyzed. Although they completed the offender questionnaire, they have not all ever been caught by the police for an offence. At this stage in the analysis it was felt that they could not be included in either the school-TI-YC sample or the offender sample, because they could have differed in crucial ways from both of these. However too few such interviews were conducted for them to constitute a statistically useful sample in their own right.

APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF FACTORS USED IN FACTOR ANALYSES

This study makes extensive use of principal component analysis to identify the major dimensions of respondents' attitudes and behaviour. The factors used in the study are listed below, with brief indications of the dimensions that each individual factor tapped.

A2 factors (3 factors)

Sample base: all school-TI-YC sample. Analysis of: question A2 (15 items dealing with attitudes to school lessons and teachers, and English language medium education.

A2#1: anti-school attitudes.

A2#2: feeling that school sees student negatively.

A2#3: students' confidence in his/her English abilities.

A2#4: feeling that school sees student negatively.

A3 factors (2 factors)

Sample base: all school-TI-YC sample. Analysis of: question A3 (16 items dealing with attitudes to schoolmates and perceptions of schoolmate's attitudes to respondent).

A3#1: student felt positively towards other students and vice versa.

A3#2: negative feelings towards others and perceptions of others' negative feelings towards the student.

A3 'MOA3' factors (2 factors)

Sample base: male offenders. Analysis of: question A3 (16 items dealing with attitudes to schoolmates and perceptions of schoolmate's attitudes to respondent).

MOA3#1: positive relationship with peers.

MOA3#2: negative relationship with peers.

B1 'MOB1' factors (4 factors)

Sample base: male offenders. Analysis of: question B1 (assessments of friends' reactions to discovering respondent involved in 34 specified items).

MOB1#1: friends' reactions to 'problematic' behaviour,

including the main status offences such as watching pornographic or violent films, drinking alcohol, smoking, swearing and staying out late.

MOB1#2: friends' reactions to items such as bullying, fighting, and triad association.

MOB1#3: friends' reactions to what are generally regarded to be very serious crimes, such as drug-trafficking and robbery.

MOB1#4: friends' reactions to the main minor delinquent activities such as vandalism and shoptheft, and probelm behaviour items including truancy, lying, and running away from home.

B2 'MOB2' factors (4 factors)

Sample base: male offenders. Analysis of: question B2 (assessments of parents' reactions to discovering respondent involved in 34 specified items).

MOB2#1: incorporates several of the less serious delinquent activities, including bullying, fighting, destroying public property, and shop theft.

MOB2#2: includes several of the main status type offences, particularly those relating to 'sexual experimentation' such as watching pornographic films, reading pornography and flirting. Smoking, drinking alcohol and gambling also appear in this factor.

MOB2#3: a number of fairly violent and drug-related crimes.

MOB2#4: brings together another group of status type offences, particularly those associated with young people's problematic behaviour at home and at school.

B4 'SFB4' factors (3 factors)

Sample base: school-TI-YC females. Analysis of: question B4, how often tried 34 specified delinquent/problem behaviour activities.

SFB4#1: Destroying property, fistfights, lying, taking money from home, throwing objects from a height, smoking, alcohol use, flirting, truancy, watching violent or pornographic films and reading pornographic magazines, staying out past midnight, gambling, swearing, and cheating in exams.

SFB4#2: Threats/bullying at school, elsewhere, and for money; shoptheft, robbery, blackmail, and drug use.

SFB4#3: Sex, drug sales.

B4 'SMB4' factors (3 factors)

Sample base: school-TI-YC males. Analysis of: question B4, how often tried 34 specified delinquent/problem behaviour activities.

SMB4#1: destroying property, lying, throwing objects from a height, smoking, alcohol use, flirting, truancy, watching violent and pornographic films, reading pornographic magazines, staying out past midnight, gambling, swearing, and cheating in exams.

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.

SMB4#3: robbery, sex, driving without a license, drug use, selling drugs, and drug trafficking.

B4 'MOB4' factors (3 factors)

Sample base: male offenders. Analysis of: question B4, how often tried 34 specified delinquent/problem behaviour activities.

MOB4#1: most of the minor delinquent type crimes such as bullying, fist fighting, vandalism and shop theft, plus triad association and truancy.

MOB4#2: 'problematic' behaviour, including such items as watching pornographic or violent films, reading pornography, gambling, and flirting.

MOB4#3: a range of more serious type crimes, including such items as drug trafficking, robbery, and fighting with weapons.

C1 factors (3 factors)

Sample base: all school-TI-YC sample. Analysis of: question C1 (16 items on parent-child relations, student-school relations, the police, magiatrates, judges, and law).

C1#1: views about whether the Hong Kong criminal justice system (laws, magistrates and judges, police) is fair.

C1#2: views about filial and parental obligations.

C1#3: feelings of how immediately relevant or distant individuals felt the law was to their lives.

C1 'MOC1' factors (3 factors)
Sample base: male offenders. Analysis of: question C1 (16 items on parent-child relations, student-school relations, the police, magiatrates, judges, and law).

MOC1#1: items which reflect the 'obligations' of parents to children, children to parents and finally children to school

MOC1#2: young offenders' beliefs about the fairness or otherwise of the Hong Kong criminal justice system.

MOC1#3: reflects young offenders' views on law and order issues.

C2 'SFC2' and SMC2' factors (3 female/3 male factors)

Sample bases: school-TI-YC females (SFC2) and school-TI-YC males (SMC2). Analyses of: question C2 (rating of seriousness of 20 specified offences). In essence the SFC2 and SMC2 factors were similar:

SFC2#1/SMC2#1: 'ordinary' property crime.

SFC2#2/SMC2#2: loaded mainly onto 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: 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.

C2 'MOC2' factors (3 factors)

Sample base: male offenders. Analysis of: question C2 (rating of seriousness of 20 specified offences).

MOC2#1: mainly relates to property and 'white collar' type crimes, but also includes selling soft drugs. The three most serious crimes identified by young people in this category are car theft, bribery and selling soft drugs, whilse the least serious are minor thefts and defrauding one's employer.

MOC2#2: reflects the type of crime which the general population tend to regard as being the most serious, such as murder, armed robbery, and rape.

MOC2#3: comprises a number of fraud-type crimes, some of which also appear in factor MOC2#1.

G1 factors (5 factors)

Sample base: all school-TI-YC sample. Analysis of: question G1 (frequency of engaging in 37 specified items; item 38, 'other' was excluded).

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.

G1 'MOG1' factors (2 factors)

Sample base: male offenders. Analysis of: question G1 (frequency of engaging in 37 specified items; item 38, 'other' was excluded).

MOG1#1: describes what would be defined in social work circles as 'marginal youth subculture'. It portrays a young person who spends his leisure time engaged in 'aimless' pleasure pursuits such as watching videos, listening to music, drinking alcohol and reading comics. Commercialized entertainment establishments such as TV games centres, karaoke lounges and shopping centres are also a strong attraction to the youthful members of this subculture.

MOG1#2: the 'studious', 'normalized' youth who spends his leisure studying, going to church and participating in organized youth activities.

APPENDIX C: TECHNICAL STATISTICAL TERMS

This is a very brief explanation of the statistical terms used in the report. We recommend reference to a statistical textbook or a statistician for further elaboration and explanation.

Statistical Significance: we say that something is statistically significant if it is unlikely to have occurred by chance. It is common to use 5% or 1% as measures of how unlikely we expect something to be before we reject chance as an explanation. For example, 5% significance means that there is at most a 1 in 20 chance that we would observe this result or a more extreme result by chance if we repeated the data collection on a similar sample.

Correlation: this is a way of assessing the strength and direction of a linear relationship between a pair of variables. It does not imply causation.

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA): this tests whether there are significant differences between subgroups on a dependent variable. It uses an F-statistic to test significance. It has been used in this study to see whether, for example, there are differences between different offender subgroups on their responses to variables that have a scale.

T-test: This is a special case of Analysis of Variance when there are only two subgroups. The square of the T-statistic is equal to the ANOVA F-statistic.

Principal Component Analysis: this is a way to find a small number of new variables that summarise the variation in a larger set of variables using linear combinations. It can be seen as a form of Factor Analysis and a plot of the amount of variation explained is usually used to decide how many new variables (factors) are created. We have used this strategy to summarise responses, for example, on the large number of variables indicating how often youths have done particular delinquent or problem behaviour acts.

Backwards Stepwise Regression: this is a way to select a reslatively simple model that explains as much as possible of the variation in a dependent variable. We have used this, for example, to try and find concise explanations of what factors affect the amount of delinquent activity. The regression coefficient tells us the multiplier of that variable in the best linear prediction formula. Beta is a standardised regression coefficient that gives some idea of that variable's relative importance. The T-statistic is a test of the importance of that variable in the relationship. Standard error is a measure of the accuracy of our estimate of the regression coefficient - i.e. small standard errors imply accurate estimates.

Mann Whitney U Test: this is similar to a 2 group t-test applied to the ranks, rather than the raw data. Thus it provides a robust method for testing whether 2 groups are different.

Wilcoxon Rank-Sum Test: this is similar to a paired t-test applied to the ranks. Thus it provides a robust way of testing whether there has been a change across 2 time points for measurements on the same individuals.

Backwards Stepwise Discriminant Analysis: this is a way to select variables that explain the division of individuals into groups. It is in some ways essentially the same as doing Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) except that the focus is on finding the best subset of the variables that predict group membership. We have used this in trying to understand what variables relate to classifications of the youths.

Spearman's rank correlation: this is a way of calculating correlation based on using the ranks of the data, rather than the original data. It is appropriate if the data are known to be ordered, but maybe ratios are not meaningful.

REFERENCES

Becker, H. (1963) *Outsiders*. New York: Free Press.

Blumstein, A., Farrington, D. and Moitra, S. (1985) 'Delinquency Careers: Innocents, Desisters and Persisters', in M. Tonry and N. Morris (eds) *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research, Vol 6*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Braithwaite, J. (1989) *Crime, Shame and Reintegration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cheng C.H. (1993) *Evaluation Report on the Phoenix Project*. Mimeograph.

Cheung, H.T. (1990) 'An Exploratory Study of the Participation in Juvenile Gang Activities in Hong Kong'. M.S.W. dissertation, University of Hong Kong.

Cheung, M.K. (1994) *Speech on Practical Schools to the Legislative Council on 27th April*. Reprinted in the Professional Teachers' Union News, Issue 284, 21 May, p.2.

Cheung, Y.W. and Ng, A.M.C. (1988) 'Social Factors in Adolescent Deviant Behvaiour in Hong Kong: An Integrated Theoretical Approach', *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, Vol. 12 No. 1, Spring, pp. 27-45.

Chow, N.W.S., Tang, A.Y.H. and Chan, T.F. (1985) *A Study of the Values, Leisure, Behaviour and Misbehaviour of the Youth in Tsuen Wan and Kwai Chung*. Hong Kong: Tsuen Wan District Board.

Chow, N.W.S., Tang, A.Y.H. and Chan, T.F. (1987) *A Comparison of Delinquent and Non-delinquent Youth on the Aspects of Parental Supervision and Schooling. A Follow-up Study of Unruly Youth in Tsuen Wan, Kwai Chung and Tsing Yi*. Hong Kong: Kwai Chung and Tsing Yi District Board/Tsuen Wan District Board.

Cohen, S. (1985) *Visions of Social Control*. Cambridge: Polity.

Correctional Services Department (1992) 'Recidivism Study on Young Offenders'. Unpublished manuscript. Hong Kong: Correctional Services Department.

Corrigan, P. (1979) *The Smash Street Kids*. London: Paladin.

Director of Social Welfare (1990) *Annual Report 1988-89*. Government Printer: Hong Kong.

Director of Social Welfare (1994) *Annual Report 1992-3*. Government Printer: Hong Kong.

Downes, D. (1966) *The Delinquent Solution*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Education Department (1994) *Support Services Provided for Secondary Students with Problems*. Unpublished Department Report, June.

Eysenck, H.J. and Nias, D.K.B. (1978) *Sex, Violence and the Media*. London: Maurice Temple Smith.

Farrington, D. (1977) 'The Effects of Public Labelling', *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 17, pp. 112-25.

Farrington, D. (1992) 'Criminal Career Research in the United Kingdom', *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol 32 No. 4, Autumn, pp. 521-36.

Farrington, D. (1994) 'Human Development and Criminal Careers', in Maguire, M., Morgan, R. and Reiner, R. *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gray, P. (1987) *A Consumer Study of Outreaching Social Work in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Baptist College Social Work Department.

Gelsthorpe, L. and Morris, A. (1994) 'Juvenile Justice 1945-1992', in Maguire, M., Morgan, R. and Reiner, R. *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gray, P. (1991) 'Juvenile Crime and Disciplinary Welfare', in H. Traver and J. Vagg (eds) *Crime and Justice in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Gray, P. (1994a) *Inside the Hong Kong Juvenile Court: The Decision-Making Process in Action*. Resource Paper Series No. 23, Department of Social Work and Social Administration, University of Hong Kong.

Gray, P. (1994) 'Juvenile Offenders, Community Treatment and the Family'. Paper to the International Conference on the Family, Hong Kong, April.

Hirshi, T. (1969) *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hong Kong Council of Social Services (1991) *Outreaching Social Work for Youth CIS Summary Report 1989-91*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Council of Social Services.

Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups (1993) *Decriminalising Juvenile Offences*. Youth Study Series No. 2. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups.

Hong Kong Government (1965) *Working Party on the Adequacy of the Law in Relation to Crimes of Violence Committed by Young Persons. Report to the Governor in Council*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Hong Kong Government (1981) *Working Group on Juvenile Crime: Report*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Ip, A.C.C. (1990) 'An Evaluation of Police Discretion: The Case of the Superintendent Discretionary Scheme for Juvenile Offenders in Hong Kong'. M.Soc.Sc. Dissertation, University of Hong Kong.

Laub, J.H. and Sampson, R.J. (1993) 'Turning Points in the life Course: Why Change Matters to the Study of Crime', *Criminology*, pp. 301-25.

Law, C.K. (1986) *A Study on the Behaviours and Attitudes of Youths in Kwun Tong. Report to the Working Group on Problem Youth, Kwun Tong District Board*. Mimeo. Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong Department of Social Work.

Lemert, E. (1951) *Social Pathology*. McGraw-Hill.

Lo, K.W., Lam Y.W., Hung, P.M. (1994) 'The Phoenix Counselling Project', in Hong Kong Council of Social Services (1994) *Casebook of Innovative Attempts*. Hong Kong: Cosmos Books Ltd. (In Chinese).

Lo, T.W. (1986) *Outreaching Social Work in Focus. Report of an Outreaching Social Work Project for Street Gangsters in Tung Tau*. Hong Kong: Outreaching Service, Caritas.

Merton, R. (1938) 'Social Structure and Anomie', *American Sociological Review*.

NACRO (1989) *Diverting Juvenile Offenders From Prosecution*. London: National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders.

NACRO (1990) *Briefing Report: The Home Office Circular on the Cautioning of Offenders*. London: National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders.

NACRO (1993) *Community Provision for Young People in the Youth Justice System*. London: National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders.

Ng, A.M.C. (1980) *Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior*. Columbia: Columbia University.

Ng, A.M.C. (1994) 'Delinquency Trends in Socio-economic Perspective', in Leung, B.K.P. and Wong, T.Y.C. (eds) *Twenty-five Years of Social and Economic Development in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong Centre of Asian Studies.

Ng, A.M.C., Lau, T.S., Lu, A., Tsoi, R. and Wong, K.H. (1975) *Social Causes of Violent Crimes Among Young Offenders in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Social Research Centre, Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Ng, A.M.C. and Man, P. (1985) *Report on the Evaluation of Outreaching Social Work*. Hong Kong: Centre for Hong Kong Studies, Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Matza, D. (1969) *Becoming Deviant*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Ng, P. (1987) 'The Family Material Possessions Index: An Alternative Measurement of Socioeconomic Status in Hong Kong'. Unpublished ms.

Parker, H. (1979) *View From the Boys: A Sociology of Down Town Adolescents*. Newton Abbott: David and Charles.

Rachman, S. (1966) 'Sexual Fetishism: An Experimental Analogue', *Psychological Record*, 16, 293-6.

Rachman, S. and Hodgson, R.J. (1968) 'Experimentally-induced "Sexual Fetishism": Replication and Development', *Psychological Record*, Vol. 18, pp. 25-7.

Robinson, J. and Shaver, P. (1973) *Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes*. New York: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research.

Rosenberg, M. (1965) *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Royal Hong Kong Police (1986) *Royal Hong Kong Police Review 1985*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Royal Hong Kong Police (1987) *Royal Hong Kong Police Review 1986*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Rutter, H. and Giller, H. (1983) *Juvenile Delinquency: Trends and Perspectives*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

So, C.Y.K. and Chan, J.M. (1992) *Mass Media and Youth in Hong Kong: A Study of Media Use, Youth Archetype and Media Influence*. Hong Kong: Commission on Youth.

Social Welfare Department (1992) 'Recidivism Study on Young Offenders: Part II of the Report on Subjects Under the Charge of the Social Welfare Department'. Unpublished Manuscript. Hong Kong: Social Welfare Department.

Sutherland, E. (1924) *Criminology*. Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Sutherland, E. (1949) *White Collar Crime*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Sykes, G. and Matza, D. (1957) 'Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency', *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 22, December, pp. 664-70.

Thornberry, T.P. (1987) 'Toward an Interactional Theory of Delinquency', *Criminology*, Vol. 25 No. 4, pp. 863-91.

Thornberry, T.P., Lizotte, A., Krohn, M., Farnworth, M., and Jang, S.J. (1994) *'Delinquent Peers, Beliefs, and Delinquent Behaviour: A Longitudinal Test of Interactional Theory'*. Criminology, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 47-83.

Wertham, F. (1968) 'School for Violence', in O. Larsen (ed) *Violence and the Mass Media*. New York: Harper and Row.

West, D.J. (1967) *The Young Offender*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Willis, P. (1977) *Learning to Labour*. London: Saxon House.

Winn, M. (1977) *The Plug-In Drug*. New York: Viking

Working Party on Review of Children and Youth Centre Services (1994) *Report on Review of Children and Youth Centre Services*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Young, J. (1971) 'The Role of the Police as Amplifiers of Deviancy, Negotiators of Reality and Translators of Fantasy: Some Consequences of our Present System of Drug Control as seen in Notting Hill', in S. Cohen (ed) *Images of Deviance*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Reprography by the Government Printer, Hong Kong
Printed on paper made from woodpulp derived from renewable forests