JUVENILE DELINQUECY AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE; THE DYNAMIC DUO

Igbaekemen Goddy Osa,PhD
Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social & Management Sciences,
Nigeria Police Academy,Wudil,Kano State
Email;drigbaekemengoddyosa@yahoo.com
Phone Nos;08033380078,08059269778

ABSTRACT

This research article offers a critique to the issues raised by other scholars in the possession and use of alcohol and other drugs are illegal for all youth. Because substance abuse and delinquency are inextricably linked, arrest, adjudication, and intervention by the juvenile justice system are eventual consequences for many young people engaged in such behavior. Substance abuse and delinquency often share the common factors of school and family problems, negative peer groups, lack of neighborhood social controls, and a history of physical sexual abuse (Hawkins et al, 2007 Wilson and Howell, 2007). Substance abuse is also associated with violent and income-generating crime by youth, which increases community residents' level of fear and the demand for juvenile and criminal justice services, thereby further increasing the burden on these resources. Gangs, drug trafficking, prostitution, and youth homicides are other related social and criminal justice problems often linked to adolescent substance abuse.

Keywords; Youth,abuse,substance,crime and gangs

INTRODUCTION

When young people engage in alcohol and other drug use, they, their families, and their communities usually suffer. In some cases, because of the strong association between substance abuse and delinquency, an increased burden is also placed on the juvenile justice system. Since 1992, the high rate of illicit drug use among youth has been steadily increasing. The process of obtaining justice and enforcement is also a milestone in substance abuse and delinquency in the society.

According to the Monitoring the Future study (previously called the High School Senior Survey), which has measured the use of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs by the Nation's youth since 1975, drug use among 12th graders peaked in 1981, with slightly more than 65 percent of seniors having reported past use of an illicit drug. This figure dropped to a low of 40.7 percent by 1992. In 1993, however, this downward trend began to reverse. By 1996, 50.8 percent of high school seniors reported having used illicit drugs (Monitoring the Future Study, University of Michigan, 2006). These abuses tend to affect their behavior in the larger society.

Young people are using mood-altering substances at increasingly younger ages. The National Household Survey on Drug Abuse (Gfroerer, 2006) shows an overall decline in the average age of first use of alcohol, from 17.2 years in 1975 to 15.9 years in 1993; daily cigarette use, from 18.6 years in 1975 to 16.8 years in 1994; and, especially, marijuana use, from 18.9 years in 1975 to 16.3 years in 1994.

Studies of drug use among youth involved in the juvenile justice system indicate high levels of abuse. Since 1990, the Drug Use Forecasting (DUF) program conducted by the National Institute of Justice has measured substance abuse among male detainees/arrestees in 12 jurisdictions across the country. Like the data from the Monitoring the Future study, the DUF data show increases in illicit drug use by youth in nearly all sites between 1993 and 1995. In 1995, youth testing positive for at least one drug ranged from 19 percent in Portland, OR, to 58 percent in Washington, D.C. DUF data, which do not include information on alcohol use by juveniles, showed in 1995 that the illicit drug most frequently used by delinquent youth was marijuana (National Institute of Justice, 2004 and 2005).

Consequences of Adolescent Substance Abuse

Persistent substance abuse among youth is often accompanied by an array of problems, including academic difficulties, health-related consequences, poor peer relationships, mental health issues, and involvement with the juvenile justice system. There are also significant consequences for family members, the community, and society in general.

Declining grades, absenteeism from school and other activities, increased potential for dropping out, and other school-related problems are associated with adolescent substance abuse. Hawkins, Catalano, and Miller 2002 cite research that indicates both a low level of commitment to education and higher

truancy rates. Cognitive and behavioral problems experienced by alcohol- and drug-using youth may not only interfere with their academic performance but may also disrupt learning by their classmates (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2002).

Health-related consequences of teenage substance abuse include accidental injuries, physical disabilities and diseases, and the effects of possible overdoses. Death through suicide, homicide, accidents, and illness may be the final outcome for youth involved with alcohol and other drugs. Information drawn from the preliminary 1994 estimates of the Drug Abuse Warning Network (DAWN) indicates that drug-related hospital emergency episodes for youth ages 12-17 increased by 17 percent in 1994 over the rates for 1993. Significantly, there was a 50-percent increase in hospital emergency episodes related to marijuana/hashish use in this age group between 1993 and 1994. DAWN is a national survey conducted annually by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration to estimate drug-related emergency department visits for various substances (McCaig, 2005).

The danger of contracting HIV or other sexually transmitted diseases is increased for substance-abusing youth if they engage in high-risk behaviors, including the use of psychoactive substances (particularly those that are injected) or activities resulting from poor judgment and impulse control while experiencing the effects of mood- altering substances. Rates of AIDS diagnoses currently are relatively low among teenagers when compared with most other age groups. Nevertheless, because the disease has a long latent period before symptoms appear, many young adults with AIDS may actually have been infected with HIV as adolescents.

Alcohol-related traffic fatalities for youth have declined, but young people are still overrepresented in this area. In 1995, more than 2,000 youth ages 15-20 were killed in alcohol-related car crashes (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2000).Substance-abusing youth may be alienated from and stigmatized by their peers. These young people also often disengage from school and community activities, thus depriving their peers and communities of positive contributions they might otherwise have made.

Depression, developmental lag, apathy, withdrawal, and other psychosocial disorders are frequently linked to substance abuse among adolescents. Users are at higher risk than nonusers for mental health problems, including suicidal thoughts, attempted suicide, completed suicide, depression, conduct problems, and personality disorders. Marijuana use, which is prevalent among youth, has been shown to interfere with short-term memory, learning, and psychomotor skills. Motivation and psychosexual /emotional development may also be influenced (Bureau of Justice Statistics,2002).

Many aspects of family life are jeopardized, sometimes resulting in family dysfunction. Siblings and parent are profoundly affected by alcohol- and drug- involved youth (Nowinski, 2000) who often drain family financial and emotional resources (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2002).High economic and social costs can result from monetary expenditures and emotional distress related to alcohol- and drug-related crimes, increased burdens for the support of

adolescents and young adults who are not able to become self-supporting, and greater demands for medical and other treatment services for these youth (Gropper, 2005).

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Quite often, however, the situation is far more serious, poverty, social exclusion and unemployment often cause marginalization, and young people who are marginalized are more susceptible to developing and maintaining delinquent behaviour. Furthermore, young people are more likely to become victims of crimes committed by juvenile delinquents. Delinquency is largely a group phenomenon. It is frequently engaged in by certain subcultures of young people who have jointly assumed a particular identity. It is also primarily a male phenomenon, with crime rates for male juvenile and young adult offenders more than double those of the female. Some criminal activities are associated with intolerance of members of other cultures or religions racial or ethnic groups. In the aforementioned situations, no research findings have established the facts of this research problem.

LITRATURE REVIEW

According to Holmes et' al (2001), minor commit sexual crimes refer to individuals adjudicated in a criminal court for a sexual crimes are defined as sexually abusive behavior committed by a person under the age of 18 that is perpetrated "against the victim's will, without consent, and in an aggressive, exploitative, manipulative, or threatening manner". Examining prevalence data and the characteristics of juvenile sex offenders is a fundamental component to obtain a precise understanding of this heterogeneous group. With mandatory reporting laws in place, it became a necessity for providers to report any incident of disclosed sexual abuse. But, the situation remains unresolved as increase in abuse among younger generation affect productive age.

Classical criminology stresses that causes of crime lie within the individual offender, rather than in their external environment. Classical theories state that "juveniles are rational, intelligent people who have free will - the ability to make choices." Crime is the result of people making choices, such as breaking the law. According to rational choice theory, "because behavior is a conscious decision children make, they may be held responsible for their choices and their consequence.

The DUF program found that male juveniles arrested for drug offenses (e.g., sales, possession) had the highest rate of positive drug tests when compared with youth arrested for other types of crimes. However, a substantial rate of drug use was also found among youth who committed violent, property, and other crimes (National Institute of Justice, 2006).Survey of Youth in Custody, 1987 (Beck, Kline, and Greenfeld, 2008) found that more than 39 percent of youth under age 18 were under the influence of drugs at the time of their current offense. More than 57 percent reported having used a drug within the previous month. The use of drugs became a norm as an enhancement in productivities.

A study of 113 delinquent youth in a State detention facility found that 82 percent reported being heavy (daily) users of alcohol and other drugs just prior to admission to tie facility; 14 percent were regular users (more than two times weekly); and 4 percent reported occasional use (DeFrancesco, 2006).A Study conducted in 1988 in Washington, D.C., found that youth who both sold and used drugs were more likely to commit crimes than those who only sold drugs or only used drugs. Heavy drug users were more likely to commit property crimes than nonusers, and youth who trafficked in drugs reported higher rates of crimes against persons. Youth in this sample were most likely to commit burglary or sell drugs while using drugs or seeking to obtain drugs. About one-fourth of the youth also reported attacking another youth to obtain drugs. However, among the youth in this sample, the majority who committed crimes did not do so in connection with drugs (Altschuler and Brounstein, 2001). Not really, drugs or alcohol are influencers of behavior among the youths.

According to Holmes et' al (2001), minor commit sexual crimes refer to individuals adjudicated in a criminal court for a sexual crimes are defined as sexually abusive behavior committed by a person under the age of 18 that is perpetrated "against the victim's will, without consent, and in an aggressive, exploitative, manipulative, or threatening manner". Examining prevalence data and the characteristics of juvenile sex offenders is a fundamental component to obtain a precise understanding of this heterogeneous group. With mandatory reporting laws in place, it became a necessity for providers to report any incident of disclosed sexual abuse. The negative impact of exposing the victim and security agencies compromise limit the enforcement of the law.

Classical criminology stresses that causes of crime lie within the individual offender, rather than in their external environment. Classical theories state that "juveniles are rational, intelligent people who have free will - the ability to make choices." Crime is the result of people making choices, such as breaking the law. According to rational choice theory, "because behavior is a conscious decision children make, they may be held responsible for their choices and their consequences." However, crime could be influenced by the eternal environment as a result of culture shock.

Social Disorganization

Current positivist approaches generally focus on the culture. A type of criminological theory attributing variation in crime and delinquency over time and among territories to the absence or breakdown of communal institutions (e.g. family, school, church and social groups.) and communal relationships that traditionally encouraged cooperative relationships among people. Merton's suggests five adaptations to this dilemma:

I. **Innovation:** individuals who accept socially approved goals, but not necessarily the socially approved means.

2. **Retreatism:** those who reject socially approved goals and the means for acquiring them.

3. **Ritualism:** those who buy into a system of socially approved means, but lose sight of the goals. Merton believed that drug users are in this category.

4. **Conformity:** those who conform to the system's means and goals.

5. **Rebellion:** people who negate socially approved goals and means by creating a new system of acceptable goals and means.

A difficulty with strain theory is that it does not explore why children of low-income families would have poor educational attainment in the first place. More importantly is the fact that much youth crime does not have an economic motivation. Strain theory fails to explain violent crime, the type of youth crime which causes most anxiety to the public. The attributes of crime do not ascribe to status in most cases, youths or peer groups are too fundamental in crime formations.

Differential Association

The theory of Differential association also deals with young people in a group context, and looks at how peer pressure and the existence of gangs could lead them into crime. It suggests young people are motivated to commit crimes by delinquent peers, and learn criminal skills from them. The diminished influence of peers after men marry has also been cited as a factor in desisting from offending. There is strong evidence that young people with criminal friends are more likely to commit crimes themselves. However it may be the case that offenders prefer to associate with one another, rather than delinquent peers causing someone to start offending. Furthermore there is the question of how the delinquent peer group became delinquent initially. The Economic Status has redefined association in modern societies – the children of the poor and the rich are in diverse group formations.

Labeling

Labeling theory states that once young people have been labeled as criminal they are more likely to offend. (Eadie & Morley: 2003). The idea is that once labelled as deviant a young person may accept that role, aid be more likely to associate with others who have been similarly labelled. (Eadie & Morley: 2003 p.4) Labelling theorists say that male children from poor families are more likely to be labelled deviant, and that this may partially explain why there are more lower-class young male offenders. (Walkate: 2003 p 24). This assumption is been criticized by scholars overtime because most children from poor families are akin to loyalty to primary groups.

Male Phenomenon

Youth crime is disproportionately male: theorists and others have examined why this is the case. One suggestion is that ideas of masculinity may make young men more likely to offend. Being tough and reckless may be a way young men attempt to express their masculinity. Acting out these ideals may make young men more likely to engage in antisocial and criminal behaviour. Alternatively, rather than young men

acting as they do because of societal pressure to conform to masculine ideals; young men may actually be naturally more aggressive, daring etc. As well as biological or psychological factors, the way young men are treated by their parents may make them more susceptible to offending. According to a study, adolescent males who possess a certain type of variation in a specific gene are more likely to flock to delinquent peers. Crimes in any given society has no correlation of either male or female. It is a general phenomenon in modern society.

Risk factors; Individual Risk Factors

Individual psychological or behavioural risk factors that may make offending more likely include intelligence, impulsiveness or the inability to delay gratification, aggression, empathy, and restlessness. (Farrington: 2002) Children with low intelligence are likely to do worse in school. This may increase the chances of offending because low educational attainment, a low attachment to school, and low educational aspirations are all risk factors for offending in themselves. (Walkiate: 2003) Children who perform poorly at school are also more likely to truant, which is also linked to offending. (Farrington: 2002) If strain theory or subcultural theory are valid poor educational attainment could lead to crime as children were unable to attain wealth and status legally. However it must be born in mind that defining and measuring intelligence is troublesome. Young males are especially likely to be impulsive which could mean they disregard the long-term consequences of their actions, have a lack of self-control, and are unable to postpone immediate gratification. Current literatures on crimes do not state that academic performance is a prelude to crime. Rather, most brilliant students are usually engaged in all forms of abuses within and outside the school.

Mental Disorders

Conduct disorder usually develops during childhood and manifests itself during an adolescence life. Some juvenile behavior is attributed to the diagnosable disorder known as conduct disorder. Juvenile delinquents who have recurring encounters with the criminal justice system are sometimes diagnosed with conduct disorders because they show a continuous disregard for their own and others safety and property. Once the juvenile continues to exhibit the same behavioral patterns and turns eighteen he is then at risk of being diagnosed with antisocial personality disorder and much more prone to become a serious criminal offender. One of the main components used in diagnosing an adult with antisocial personality disorder consists of presenting documented history of conduct disorder before the age of 15. These two personality disorders are analogous in their erratic and aggressive behavior. This is why habitual juvenile offenders diagnosed with conduct disorder are likely to exhibit signs of antisocial personality disorder as they mature. Once the juveniles reach maturation their socially unacceptable behavior has grown into a life style and they develop into career criminals. “Career criminals begin committing antisocial behavior before entering grade school and are versatile in that they engage in an array of destructive behaviors, offend at exceedingly high rates, and are less likely to quit committing crime as they age. Substance

abuse among the youths easily led to psychiatric problems and school drop out.

Family Environment

Family factors which may have an influence on offending include; the level of parental supervision, the way parents discipline a child, parental conflict or separation, criminal parents or siblings, and the quality of the parent-child relationship Children brought up by lone parents are more likely to start offending than those who live with two natural parents, however once the attachment a child feels towards their parent(s) and the level of parental supervision are taken into account, children in single parent families are no more likely to offend than others. Conflict between a child's parents is also much more closely li:iked to offending than being raised by a lone parent. If a child has low parental supervision they are much more likely to offend. Many studies have found a strong correlation between a lack of supervision and offending, and it appears to be the most important family influence on offending. When parents commonly do not know where their children are, what their activities are, or who their friends are, children are more likely to truant from school and have delinquent friends, each of which are linked to offending. A lack of supervision is connected to poor relationships between children and parents, as children who are often in conflict with their parents may be less willing to discuss their activities with them. Children with a weak attachment to their parents are more likely to offend. Broken home children are likely to be involved in this abuse as a result of improper care but reverse could be the case as children from broken homes are observed to conduct themselves in an orderly manner.

Societal Consequences

Once the juvenile offender reaches maturation he or she is likely to continue exhibiting maladaptive behaviors and increases his risk of being cycled through the criminal justice system as an adult offender. Due to the small population of habitual adult and juvenile offenders attributing for the large percentage of violent crimes i.e. murder and aggravated assault) the criminal justice system should supervise the small population career criminals in an effort to prevent the spawning of serious violent offenders. If mental disorders such as conduct disorder go undiagnosed and untreated the juvenile offender has the increased potential to later develop antisocial personality disorder and continue his life as a career criminal. The majority of violent offenders exhibit characteristics of antisocial personality disorder and exhibit it no later than age 15. Antisocial personality disorder is a common diagnosis for a serial killer. Authors Alvarez and Bachman found that one similarity among serial killers was their prior criminal convictions. In this case conduct disorder can become a probable constituent to serial murder if not diagnosed and treated before it fully develops in adulthood as antisocial personality disorder. Both conduct disorder and antisocial personality disorder are categorized as personality disorders under the DSM-IV-TR and share extremely similar definitions as explained above in 'Mental Disorders'. Some of the common characteristics include consistent violation of societal

norms, aggressive behavior towards people and a disassociation to the emotion of empathy. These traits are also common amongst serial killers and if the maladaptive behaviors are not treated they have the potential to conceive a person that fantasizes about killing several victims and then fulfills their impulsivity when they are no longer capable of suppressing it. Maturity changes most of these ill behavior either by marriage, peer groups and working conditions.

PREDICTING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Through extant research, a framework for predicting juvenile delinquency has been developed and includes four categories of predictor variables: early antisocial behavior, individual-level attributes of the child, family attributes, and social characteristics of both the child and the family (Lipsey & Derzon, 1998). Focus on these predictor domains has greatly added to the literature, especially as they help to identify the developmental trajectories of youths. However, these four domains are limited in identifying the contribution of intervention to delinquency prediction.

Findings from the current study attempt to apply the structure of the existing prediction model and expand its scope to include both early intervention experiences and the early and later educational experiences that influence the social and behavioral development of youths. The inclusion of an intervention component in a large-scale longitudinal study is a unique contribution to the literature on the causes and correlates of juvenile delinquency. Evidence presented in this article uses an evaluation of a large-scale early educational intervention to examine the relation between program participation and lower rates of juvenile delinquency through age 18 in a high-risk low-income urban sample. This study also examined the contribution of child-developed abilities and social competence; family factors, including child maltreatment and parental involvement; and school-level risk and protective factors above and beyond preschool participation. Measures were compiled from multiple sources including teachers, parents, students, and administrative records. The exploration of an ecologically derived set of delinquency predictors that includes early educational intervention can highlight factors that are amenable to the efforts of both carefully planned intervention programs and other educational and social policies. It is difficult to predict the outcome of juvenile delinquency in a given society and there is no ideal yardstick to measure.

Preschool Education

Initiation of early intervention during the 1960s was sparked by the mandates of the war on poverty that called for the equalization of educational resources so that every child would enter school ready to learn (National Education Goals Panel, 2001, as cited in Meisels & Shonkoff, 2000). Preschool programs for disadvantaged children, such as Head Start, were initiated primarily to bolster school readiness for impoverished children (Zigler & Muenchow, 2002). This component of school adjustment and academic performance remains the focus of many intervention programs aimed at preschool

children and their families. The role of school intervention has not meet the desire needs of the society. More importantly, the falling standard of education.

Several model preschool intervention programs have highlighted long-term effects on scholastic and behavioral outcomes. The most widely cited study that linked participation in early childhood intervention to reductions in delinquency is the High Scope Perry Preschool study (Schweinhart, Barnes, & Weikart, 2003) Intervention consisted of at least one year of high-quality preschool focused on cognitive advancement as well as weekly home visits. Other services included parent meetings designed to inform parents of their children's activities and inspire participation both at school and at home. The focus of the intervention was twofold, with both children and their parents receiving intervention services (Barnett, Young, & Schweinhart, 2000). Participation in the Perry Preschool program was associated with both academic and behavioral outcomes by age 27. Perry graduates had higher rates of high school completion, lower rates of grade retention and special education placement, and higher employment into young adulthood. Participants in treatment and control conditions displayed significant differences on behavior measures (including school infractions, criminal reports, and self- reports). Compared with the comparison group, Perry graduates had fewer overall arrests (31% versus 51%) and fewer costs associated with their involvement in the criminal justice system (Schweinhart, Barnes, & Weikart). The Perry study, as well as several other studies of model early intervention programs, have been reviewed more extensively elsewhere (Yoshikowa, 2004 Zigler, Taussig, & Black, 2002) and provide a foundation on which to view the unique contributions of large-scale preschool interventions.

Developed Abilities

Research on juvenile delinquency in adolescence clearly connects early educational experiences with later delinquency (Loeber & Farrington, 1998). The influences of academic functioning and IQ on later delinquency have been explored longitudinally (see Manguin & Loeber, 1996) and offer some support to the cognitive advantage hypothesis, which posits that the development of the outcome (delinquency, for example) is fostered through the positive or negative development of cognitive abilities, including reading abilities, early in the life span (Bennett, Brown, Boyle, Racine, & Oxford, 2003; Reynolds, Chang, &Temple, 1998; Reynolds, Ou, & Topitzes, 2004). In fact, in a study predicting the occurrence of delinquency, educational measures including low achievement, low vocabulary, and low verbal reasoning increased delinquency predictions by 27% (Loeber & Dishion, 1983). Results of a meta-analysis indicated that the odds of delinquency were more than two times as high for children who had low overall school performance (Manguin & Loeber, .2006).

Social Competence

Although the primary goal of early educational interventions is often school readiness, early interventions have also been cited

for their capacity to promote higher levels of social functioning (Lally, Mangione, & Honig, 2000): Youths with social, problem-solving, and communication skills are often more likely to motivate their own successes and avoid negative outcomes, such as drug use or delinquency (Garmezy & Masten, 2006). Social competence also extends to the dynamic relationships in the family, school, and community. Youths with high levels of social competence are thought to seek out and maintain social relationships and therefore have access to better social supports than youths who lack social competence (Werner & Smith, 2002). Positive peer relationships can also be considered as protective mechanisms associated with social competence. Some studies have identified a peer effect on delinquency, where the peer group influences individual participation in delinquent behavour, which influences the later onset of delinquency (Dishion, Eddy, Haas, Li, & Spracklen, 2007, Moffitt, 2003. Other research has found little support for a peer effect above and beyond prior individual involvement in delinquent acts (Tremblay, Masse, Viatro, & Dobkin, 2005).

Family Factor

The broader environment of the child, which includes the family, has been a key focus of early intervention and is also considered an independent predictor of juvenile delinquency. The importance of the family context was highlighted by Sameroff (1995), who, acknowledging the role of biology, also highlighted the interactional effect between child characteristics and the immediate care giving environment. Intervention, therefore, that looks beyond the child in isolation to the child's proximal environment, offers a family support dynamic (Reynolds, 2000). Family backgrounds in recent research shows that most risk factors are not predator of family backgrounds in ideal society.

Family factors have been shown to have an independent function as predictors of child outcomes. Family characteristics, such as parental involvement in criminal activities, have been identified as predictors of delinquency by age 10; the earliest predictors (by age six) tend to reflect general family functioning and parenting (Loeber & Dishion 2002). Family risk factors, such as domestic violence, drug and alcohol abuse, and involvement in the criminal justice system, have been identified as behaviors that influence disruptive parent-child relationships and contribute to negative developmental outcomes for youths (McLoyd,) The most significant family risk factors for the later onset of delinquency include poor parental supervision, family members with criminal involvement, low socioeconomic status, large family size, poor housing, and low educational attainment (Zigler et al. 2002).

Child Maltreatment

Parenting characterized by low levels of participation or, at the extreme, child abuse and neglect has also been related to delinquency (Malmgren & Meisel, 2004; Patterson, Reid, & Dishion, 1992; Smith & Thornberry, series of studies explored the relation between child maltreatment and juvenile

delinquency (Smith & Thornberry, Widom, 2002. Studies have found significant differences between maltreated youths and matched samples of siblings or children in the community. One study found that maltreated youths had an official delinquency record of 16.0% as compared with 7.8% of controls (Bolton, Reich, & Gutierrez, 1997); another study found that 26% of maltreated youths had official court reports of delinquency, while the comparison group had a delinquency rate of 17% (Widom, 1991). But, predictor of behavior in most cases on children of good behavior are those that learn in hard ways from family background through socialization process.

School-Level Factors

School and community factors are often considered distal influences on child outcomes and are often beyond the scope of individual interventions. Although early educational programs do not often target changes in the broader educational or community structure, the role of these two domains has been linked to youth outcomes and therefore should be discussed in the context of other factors that are associated with resilient outcomes.

School-level contributors, such as positive school experiences, have been highlighted in longitudinal studies of resilience (Werner & Smith, 2009); These successes that are a result of either the child's natural academic abilities (for example, IQ) or the product of caring and capable teachers and support staff, provide youths with an initial success that can develop into additional successes. Schools, especially for high-risk youths, can serve as sources of protection from risk and a source for bolstering the individual- level social skills and self-esteem vital to the development of positive adaptation (Winfield, 2005). The role of positive school experiences as protection in and of themselves warrants their attention, but the role of the school as a moderator of other proximal risk factors, such as family disruption, highlights the considerable importance the school has on both academic and social outcomes (Masten, Best Garmezy, 2000; Rutter, 2000; Werner & Smith, 2002. The family is the bedrock through which children grows to the larger society, not the school.

Although positive school experiences may serve to jump-start success, several school-based factors can also lead to a disruption in learning or academic failure. Variables such as the child's reading ability, early behavioral problems in school, ineffective monitoring and management of students by teachers and school staff, grade retention, and special education placement all serve as potential indicators of school drop out and are related risk factors for delinquent behavior (Malmgren & Meisel, 2004; Reynolds, 2004).

The construction of a model that predicts juvenile crime requires the identification of protective factors that benefit the positive development of youths and diminish the risk factors that threaten positive youth outcomes (Fraser, Richman, & Galinsky, 1999). Consistent with the risk and resilience framework (Garmezy, 2001 Rutter, 2007) the prediction model presented in this study attempts to identify several risk factors in childhood an the protective mechanisms that alter the

escalation of negative developmental trajectories. The focus on delinquency prediction broadens the debate over how to continue to lower the crime rate and provide beneficial educational opportunities for positive development at the same time. The introduction of modern technologies like internet, Facebook, Whatsapp, email, etc and constant use by children increases their scope to crime

Although the relation between preschool participation and lower rates of delinquency has been previously examined Reynolds, Temple, Robertson, & Mann, (2001), the contribution of preschool participation on delinquency above and beyond other child, family, peer, and school predictors has yet to be investigated in this sample. This study included several factors proximal to the child's experience, along with preschool participation, s a means to better understand the role dearly intervention in context.

OFFENDERS AND VICTIMS

Criminal activity is strongly associated with a victim's behaviour. A victim's reaction can sometimes provoke an offender; however, "appropriate" behaviour may prevent a criminal act or at least minimize its impact. According to scientific literature, the likelihood of becoming a victim is related to the characteristics or qualities of a person. A social role or a social situation that provoke or facilitate criminal behaviour; personal characteristics such as individual or family status, financial prosperity, and safety, as well as logistical characteristics such as the time and place in which a confrontation occurs, can also determine the extent of victimization. The concept of relativity scientifically expose offenders and victims of crimes.

CONCLUSION

The critiques of this research scholarly work offers the opportunity in identifying the causes of criminal behaviour, it is important to determine which factors contribute to a delinquent identity and why some adolescents who adopt a delinquent, image do not discard that image in the process of becoming an adult. Delinquent identity is quite' complex and is, in fact, an overlay of several identities linked to delinquency itself and to a person's ethnicity, race, class and gender. Delinquent identity is always constructed as an alternative to the conventional identity of the larger society. Violence and conflict are necessary elements in the construction of group and delinquent identities. The foundations of group identity and activity are established and strengthened through the maintenance of conflict relations with other juvenile groups and society as a whole. Violence serves the function of integrating members into a group, reinforcing their sense of identity, and thereby hastening the process of group adaptation to the local environment. Other factors that may provide motivation for joining a gang are the possibilities of economic and social advancement. In many socio-cultural contexts the delinquent way of life has been romanticized to a certain degree, and joining a gang is one of the few channels of social mobility available for disadvantaged youth. According to one opinion, urban youth gangs have a stabilizing effect on

communities characterized by a lack of economic and social opportunities.

People may become accidental victims, as assault is often preceded by heated discussion. According to the classification of psychological types there are three typical adolescent victims of violence: accidental victims; people disposed to become victims; and "inborn" victims. Studies have shown that in the majority of cases that result in bodily harm, the offender and his victim are acquainted with one another and may be spouses, relatives or friends; this is true for 80 per cent of murders and 70 per cent of sexual crimes.

REFERENCES

Hawkins, R.J et' al (2007). The Effect Of Neighbourhood Dynamics On Gang Behaviour. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing.

Tremblay, A. et' Al (2005). Delinquency Careers: Innocents, Amateur and Persisters. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.

Nowinski, A.H. (2000). Drug Identification And Festing In The Juvenile Justice System. Washington, D.C: Office Of Juvenile Justice And Delinquency Prevention.

Benneth, T.C et' Al (2003). Reading In Juvenile Delinquency And Juvenile Justice. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Reynolds, R.A et' Al (1998). Delinquency And Opportunity: A Theory Of Delinquent Gangs. New York: Free Press.

Estein Law (2008) Juvenile Delinquency Prevention. U.S.A: Map Data.

Farrington, S.B (2002) Comprehensive Adolescent Health Care: St. Louis: Quality Medical Publishing.

Germezy, D. (2001) Manhood In The Making: Cultural Concepts Of Masculinity. London: Yale University Press.

Holmes, et' Al (2001) Juvenile Delinquency – Www.Wikipedia.Org/Wiki/Juvenile-Deliquency

Gfroerer, U. (2006) Gang Violence Prevention. Pleasantville, New York: Sunburst Communications.

McCaig, M. (2005) The American Street Gang: Its Nature, Prevalence And Control. New York: Oxford University Press.

Macmillan Dictionary For Students (2001) Nigeria: Pan Ltd.

Rutter, G.C (2007) The Dictionary Of Criminal Justice. New York: Dushkin/Mcgraw – Hill.

Loeber,M &Dishion R.G (2002) Controlling The Dangerous Classes. A Critical Introduction To The History Of Criminal Justice. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Winfeld, I. (2005) The Youth Gang Problem. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wilson,E & Howell, E.J. et' Al (2007) Comprehensive Handbook Of Psychology. New York: Wiley.

The Gale Group (2008) Early Intervention And Juvenile Delinquency Prevention: Evidence From The Chicago Longitudinal Study. Chicago: Gengage Learning.

U.N.O (1990) Guidelines For The Prevention Of Juvenile Delinquency (The Riyadh Guidelines) United Nations Publications.

Urban Management Programmer (2000) Street Children And Gangs In African Cities: Guidelines For Local Authorities. Working Paper Series No 18

Schweinhart,J.S. et' al (2000) Surviving The Breakup: How Children And Parents Cope With Divorce. New York: Basic Books.

Zigler,M.L. et' al (2002) From Boy To Man, From Delinquency To Crime. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.

Yoshikowa, J. (2004) Role Of The Police In Juvenile Justice. Japan Juvenile Division, Community Safety Bureau, National Police Agency.