

MID SWEDEN UNIVERSITY

Department of Social Work

SUBJECT: Social Work, Bachelor degree

SUPERVISOR: Docent Majen Espvall

ABSTRACT: The aim of this quantitative study was to identify risk factors that could cause or produce criminal behaviour among offenders under the age of 18 in East London, South Africa. This research looks into risk factors such as individual- home environment and neighbourhood factors. A non-probability sample of 80 young people within the age range of 12-18 answered a standardized self-administered questionnaire while attending a compulsory pre-trial assessment with probation officers at the Magistrate's court in East London. The individual factors behind delinquency were evidently gender based, a majority was males and between 16-18 years. Other risk factors were related to family structure or family functioning and the living standard of the household. The participants own explanations for committing the crime were connected to individual factors such as: influenced by friends, influenced by alcohol, bored and had nothing to do.

KEYWORDS: Youth, Criminality, Risk factors, South Africa

TITLE: Young people in trouble with the law. A risk factor study in East London, South Africa.

AUTHOR: Pernilla Johansson

DATE: May 2009

Acknowledgement

The author is grateful to SIDA (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency) and Mid Sweden University that sponsors the Minor Field Study scholarship. You made it practically possible to conduct the research in South Africa.

Secondly all the probation officers at Social Development in East London- Prudence Loggenberg, Sanet Nel, Pumeza Komani, Bulelwa Gobani, Thuli Makubalo and Bongani Cabanto- the number of questionnaires would not have been possible to collect without you, Hennie and Thuli makubalo, for translating the questionnaire to Afrikaans and Xhosa, Professor R.Bally, University planner at Fort Hare University, for help with construction of the questionnaire, Anna Dahl for friendship and advice, my supervisor Majen Espvall for guidance throughout the writing process.

Lastly, all the young people in East London that took time to fill in the questionnaires.

Thank You all!

Pernilla

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Object of the study.....	2
1.3 Research questions	2
1.4 Defining terms	2
1.5 Disposition.....	3
2. Research review and theoretical framework	4
2.1 Individual factors	6
2.2 Family /Home environment.....	7
2.3 Neighbourhood factors	10
3. Context of the research	12
3.1 Map: South Africa	12
3.2 South Africa.....	12
3.3 Eastern Cape- Amatole district municipality- East London.....	13
3.4 Social Development- probation Services	14
4. Material and method	15
4.1 Population and sample.....	15
4.2 Data collection and procedure.....	16
4.3 Research strategy and design of inquiry.....	17
4.4 Analysis methodology.....	17
4.5 Ethical consideration	18
5. Result and analysis	19
5.1 socio- demographics of the participants (Table 1).....	19

5.2 *Individual factors and categories of offence (Table 2)*..... 20

5.3 *Family and home environment factors and categories of offence (Table 3)* 22

5.4 *Problems in the neighbourhood (Table 4)* 26

5.5 *Neighbourhood factors and categories of offence (Table 5)* 27

5.6 *Reason for committing crime and categories of offence (Table 6)* 29

6. Discussion31

References3

1. Introduction

Young people under the age of 18 are a major sector of the world's population today, especially in developing countries (United Nations [UN], 2007; Shaw, 2001). They generally break the law more frequently than other groups in society, especially in urban areas in the southern part of the world (Shaw & Tschiwula, 2002; Sibusiso, 2004). The focus of this research is concentrated on South Africa where 53% of the population is under the age of 25 (Shaw, 2001).

South Africa faces many challenges in its transformation to a democracy; the high crime rate is one of the most urgent (Buffalo City Municipality [BCM], 2007a). In October 1998 there were 1 440 children under the age of 18 awaiting trial in South Africa, and 1 222 children serving a prison term. The number of children awaiting trial increased by 53% to 2 197 in December 2003, and the children in prison increased by 42 % to 1 734. There were 24 966 young people between the ages of 18 and 21 in South African prisons in January 2004 (Sibusiso, 2004). The official crime statistic for 2007/08 showed a general decrease in some areas of crime, but the government acknowledges that the crime rate is still high (Government of South Africa [GSA], 2008a; South African Police Service [SAPS], 2008; Strydom, Berg & Herbst, 2006). This is however not a certainty since many people never report crime to the police (Moore, 1991). The FIFA Soccer World Cup is coming up in 2010, and the government has set several goals to achieve by then, one is to decrease the crime rate (GSA, 2008b).

1.1 Background

Researchers within the juvenile field have during recent years approached delinquency, in a similar way that the health sector approaches diseases such as cancer and heart problems. They identify risk factors to be able to prevent them and put the best interventions into action (Butchart & Emmet, 2000; Shader, 2001; Farrington, 2000). Research shows that there is not just one single path towards delinquency. Many are the risk factors that have been identified, and research shows that the more risk factors present, the bigger the chance to offend. It is important to note that multiple risk factors only increase the chance to offend; it is not a certainty (Shader, 2001; U.S. Department of Justice, 2003; Case & Haines, 2007; Farrington, 2000).

Research within this field has been dominated by developed countries, while information about youth offending in Africa is lacking. Even though risk factors for young people to offend seem to be similar across both northern and southern parts of the world, research needs to be conducted locally to be able to implement suitable prevention programs (Shaw & Tschiwula, 2002; Sibusiso, 2003). Risk factors may vary for, different type of offenders or neighbourhoods (Farrington, 2000). Effective crime prevention should focus on eliminating risk factors and strengthen protective factors, both views are important for an effective reduction of delinquent behaviour (Farrington, 2000; Pollard, Hawkins & Arthur, 1999; Sibusiso, 2004).

This study briefly looks into selected sociological risk factors, since all risk factors are impossible to embrace within the scope of this study. The main areas looked into are: individual factors, home/family and neighbourhood, with sub- groups.

1.2 Object of the study

The aim of this minor field study is to identify the risk factors that could cause or produce criminal behaviour among offenders under the age of 18 in East London, South Africa.

1.3 Research questions

- To what extent are individual factors a risk factor for young people to commit a crime?
- To what extent is the family/home environment a risk factor for young people to commit a crime?
- To what extent is the neighbourhood a risk factor for young people to commit a crime?

1.4 Defining terms

The definition of *Risk factors* emerged from the health sector and has been broadly defined as “those characteristics, variables, or hazards that, if present for a given individual, make it more likely that this individual, rather than someone selected from the general population, will develop a disorder” (Mrazek & Haggerty, 1994, p.127). A risk factor also predicts an increased probability of later offending. Risk factors can derive from biological, psychological and sociological domains (Kazdin, Kraemer, Kessler, Kupfer & Offord, 1997).

In this study a *young person in conflict with the law* is defined as a person under the age of 18 that is known to the justice system but not prosecuted.

1.5 Disposition

Chapter 2 presents previous research made in the risk factor area and a theoretical framework to Individual, home environment and neighbourhood factors for delinquent behaviour.

Chapter 3 gives brief information about the context of the research: South Africa, Eastern Cape; Amathole Municipality and Social development; probation.

Material and method are presented in chapter 4. Result and analyse of the study follow in chapter 5, and the final discussion is covered in chapter 6.

2. Research review and theoretical framework

There is lots of research made on delinquency and risk factors, mostly in western countries. Farrington & Loeber (2001) explain that the pathway toward delinquency is well known, the first signs of problem behaviour are easy to detect. The root of the causes is often; child maltreatment, family dysfunction, school failure, negative peer influence and unstable and violent neighbourhoods. But there is still lot of research that has to be done.

A comparable risk factor study was made in London and Pittsburg by Farrington and Loeber in 1999. Risk factors were compared with court referrals later in the life of the young people. 21 risk factors were evident, 12 significantly predicted delinquency in London, while 9 were significant for Pittsburg. The following risk factors were evident: hyperactivity, poor concentration, low achievement, an antisocial father, large family size, low family income, a broken family, poor parental supervision and parental disharmony. The study showed that poor housing, physical punishment by the mother and low involvement in the family activities did not cause delinquency. Slum housing though could predict delinquency.

A table from a report by the Office of the Surgeon General (Shader, 2001) shows risk factors by key domains in the life of young people. Farrington and Loeber (2001) add single parenthood and large family size to the table below.

This research is based on three main categories of risk factor areas. They will be explained more in detail, firstly individual factors, such as: gender, substance abuse, schooling, peer group pressure and gang membership. Home environment, and neighbourhood are the last two main categories.

Domain	Risk factor
Individual	Being male General offences Crimes against persons Substance abuse
Family	Poor parent- child relationship Harsh or lax discipline Poor monitoring, supervision Low parental involvement Broken home Low socio- economic status/poverty Abusive parents Single parenthood Large family Family conflict (males only)
School	Poor school performance Academic failure
Peer group	Weak social ties Gang membership
Community	Neighbourhood crime, drugs Neighbourhood disorganization and poverty

Research made on risk factors is many. The ones most relevant for this study has been analysed and summarised in this chapter.

2.1 Individual factors

Gender

In all known countries males are more likely than females to commit crime, just being male are an individual risk factor for delinquent behaviour. Statistics from the United States show that 74 % of all arrests of people under the age of 18 were males (McCord, Widom & Crowell, 2001). In Canada 77% of all known young offenders are male and 23 % female (Butchart & Emmet, 2000; Shaw, 2001).

Substance abuse and schooling

A risk factor analyse in Wales made by Case & Haines (2007) shows that anti-social behaviour and impulsivity are the most common risk factors among the 3 088 young people that were analysed. Anti-social behaviour includes not having the ability to stay in school and substance abuse.

Substance abuse in early years is often a predictor for later offending. Many of the risk factors for adolescent drug abuse also predict other adolescent problem behaviours. There is evidence that adolescent drug abuse is correlated with delinquency, teenage pregnancy, and school misbehaviour and drop out (Hawkins, Catalano, & Miller, 1992; Jessor, 1976; Werner & Smith, 1992). A longitudinal study made by Holmberg (1985) of 15-year-olds, reported that truancy, placement in a special class, and early drop out from school were prognostic factors for drug abuse. Outstanding performance in school on the other hand, reduced the likelihood of frequent drug use among a ninth- grade sample studied by Hundleby and Mercer (1987).

Maguin & Loeber (1996) studied the relationship between academic performance and delinquency among young people in Chicago. The result of their study showed a strong connection between young people with low academic performance and delinquency. They offended more often, and committed more serious offences. This pattern was stronger for males than females. Interventions such as parent training and social skills showed a significant improvement in both academic performance and reduction of delinquency. The connection between academic failure and delinquency was independent of socio-economic status.

Peer group

Peer factors such as drug use and delinquency have been shown to predict adolescent problem behaviour (Loeber, 1990). The support of the family is important during early childhood, but in early adolescence the relationships with peers tends to take over. The importance of peers is at peak at about age 17, and declining after that period. In general the influence of peers depends on the influence of parents (McCord et al, 2001). Peer influence is of bigger importance among children who have little interaction with their parents (Kandel, Kessler & Margulies, 1978; Steinberg, 1987).

Youth gangs are a problem in many cities and countries, all of them are not dangerous to others, but research shows that they put their members at risk of law breaking and gang membership is connected to high rates of criminal activity (Shaw, 2001; Battin, Hill, Abbott, Catalano & Hawkins, 1998; Esbensen, 1993). To be part of a gang is proven to be connected to antisocial and violent behaviour (McCord et al, 2001).

Summary

Gender, school drop out, substance abuse, peer group pressure and gang involvement are important individual risk factors for delinquent behaviour in adolescent years. These will therefore be analysed in this study.

2.2 Family/Home environment factors

Family structure (who lives in a household), and family functioning (how people treat each other in the family), are two categories that often are being examined while studying family and delinquency (McCord et al, 2001).

Family structure and family functioning

Family structure might not be the main reason for delinquency in a young person's life. It might be other factors that are the reason for the structure to be present. A family structure could increase the risk of delinquency, but only in combination with other factors (McCord et al, 2001)

A family with only one parent is connected to increased delinquency, because single parents in particular are likely to live in poverty. Poverty has been shown to be a risk factor for delinquency. (McCord et al, 2001; Shaw, 2001). The socio-economic situation is shown to be more important than the number of parents (Austin 1978; Crockett, Eggebeen & Hawkins, 1993).

Absence of a father is many times discussed as an impact on young children, but in a two parent family the father is often minimally involved. The father mostly support the family financially, assumption of the paternal social role and social support for the mother (Crockett et al, 1993). Negative life events, such as death of a parent, produce negative behaviour in children (Loeber, 1990). Children growing up in single- parent families are more likely to be exposed to frequent changes of a father figure for example. It seems like the outcome of living with a single parent depends on the amount of supervision, and emotional and economic resources that the parent is able to bring to the child (McCord et al, 2001; Crockett et al, 1993).

Furstenberg, Brooks- Gunn & Morgan (referred to by McCord et al, 2001) made a long-term follow-up study of black teenage mothers and their children. They studied the impact of father absence in different age groups of the childhood. The father absence appeared to play a greater role in the adolescence than in the early years of the child. Father presence seems to be important for adjustment and well being of the child in the period of the adolescence.

Poverty and various socio-economic problems are factors that are strongly linked to crime (Shaw, 2002:151; Strydom, Berg & Herbst, 2006; Sibusiso, 2003), but many poor people also live an honest life without committing crime. Caregivers in 50 families located in disadvantaged communities in Northern Cape, South Africa were interviewed by Strydom, Berg & Herbst (2006) for a Thusano project. The result from the research showed that despite poverty, alcohol misuse and women abuse the community was not extremely vulnerable to crime. The citizens in the communities had strong social bonds.

A longitudinal study was made in Cambridge by West & Farrington (1973) upon 411 unselected boys from a normal population. The result from the study indicated that the boys who got involved in criminal activities differed from their peers in many ways, especially when it comes to their background and individual factors. The result showed that the number of children in a family is often a predictor for delinquency. This has been shown to be true for studies made in England, Scotland and the United States. Boys who had 4 or more siblings by the age of 10 had twice the risk to offend compared to those with fewer siblings. Large family

size is also characteristic for low parental occupational status and residence in a poor housing environment. The study result showed that low family income and large family size were closely related. It seemed like having to care for too many children were the result of poverty, and the over-burdened mother was not able to give the attention each child needed. The study also showed that boys that were poorly supervised were more likely to exhibit delinquent behaviour, but when other factors such as family income and parental criminality were included, poor supervision was of little significance. The study also showed that both a temporary and permanent separation from a parent was found to be associated with delinquency. Separations based on a parent leaving home were more closely connected than separation caused by illness or death.

Other studies also show that children with four or more siblings have an increased risk of delinquency (West & Farrington, 1973; McCord et al, 2001). It could be that large family size is connected with less adequate discipline and supervision of the children, and parenting difficulties are associated with delinquency (McCord et al, 2001; Farrington & Loeber, 1999). The quality of parenting is a major factor for protecting a child from crime, not the family structure itself (Shaw, 2001; McCord et al, 2001). Even two- parent families may not give the supervision and training the child needs to develop a positive life course (McCord et al, 2001).

Summary

The family and home environment factors that might predict later offending are in this study divided into family structure and family functioning. The factors related to the family structure are: the number of people living in the household and the number of parents. These factors are shown to be of importance for delinquent behaviour.

Family functioning, such as the parental role in the family are important for the well being of a child, therefore this will be looked at in this research

Poverty is according to some researchers connected to delinquency and therefore living standard will also be included in this research.

2.3 Neighbourhood factors

The community, where a family lives, affects the opportunities for criminal behaviour. Employment opportunities and options for entertainment impact the people living in an area. Gatherings in the neighbourhood and illegal activities, open up opportunities for further illegal activity. Frustration will be shown if there is nothing to do in the neighbourhood, and might be turned into alternative illegal entertainment. Communities with high levels of crime tend to make criminal behaviour acceptable (McCord et al, 2001).

It is only in the 1990`s that longitudinal researchers have started to pay attention to neighbourhood factors, and there is still a need for investigation of its influences on offending (Farrington, 2000). Existing research shows that the connection between offending and residing in an adverse environment is strong. The interaction between individual and environmental factors are widely discussed though, most agree that “living in a neighbourhood where there are high levels of poverty and crime increases the risk of involvement in serious crime for all children growing up there” (McCord et al, 2001, s.89).

A neighbourhood study in Philadelphia, USA, of 14-18 year-old boys (n=488) made by Chung (2006) found that weak neighbourhood social organization is indirectly related to delinquency, this through parental behaviour and peer deviance. To focus on just one of these factors would give a one sided picture why young people offend. A disorganized community and poverty is connected to a high risk of delinquent behaviour.

Poverty is widely spread across Africa, and research shows that inequality and social exclusion has been identified as significant factors for delinquency in this area (Shaw & Tschiwula, 2002). A qualitative study made by de Kock (2005) in Gauteng, South Africa with 58 young people awaiting trial showed a clear relationship between socio-economic circumstances and the crimes committed. Poverty was the main reason for delinquency. Lack of knowledge and understanding was also a factor, but mostly crimes such as rape and sodomy.

Breetzke (2008) made a socio-demographic profile of offenders residing in Tshwane, South Africa. The result of the study showed that the offenders resided in suburbs with 11-28% higher crime rate than the municipality as a whole. The study shows that location is an important factor for criminal activity in South Africa.

Young people in trouble with the law. A risk factor study in East London, South Africa.

Summary

This research will look at the participants own understanding of crime in their neighbourhood. If the participants live in areas with high levels of crime, research shows that they will easier get involved in crime. Since illegal activities open up opportunities for further illegal activity this is an important factor to look at.

3. Context of the research

Short information about South Africa and the context of the research will be presented in this chapter, this to give the reader a brief background to the country of the research.

3.1 Map: South Africa (UN, 2004).



3.2 South Africa

South Africa is located at the southern tip of the African continent. The area of the country is the triple of Sweden and is divided into 9 provinces. 47,6 million people live in the country, 79 % are of black ancestry, 9,6 % whites, 8,9 % coloured and 2,5 % Asian/Indian.. South Africa has 11 official languages; among these are English, Afrikaans and Xhosa (Utrikespolitiska Institutet [UI], 2007).

Young people in trouble with the law. A risk factor study in East London, South Africa.

The history of South Africa is filled with occupation and racial struggles. Part of the country was occupied by the Dutchmen in the 16th century, and that is when the white colonisation started. British people arrived as well, but in the late 17th century. South Africa was attractive for gold and diamond mining (Gibson, Steyn, Trail & Tyson, 1997).

From 1948, until the early 1990s the country was ruled by an apartheid regime. Apartheid was a system of racial segregation and white supremacy. The population was classified- and still is- as one of four groups: Black, White, Coloured (People of mixed black and white ancestry) or Asian. Laws were made by an all- white parliament, and they did not give any political or civil rights to the black people. The natives land Act restricted blacks to 13 % of the land, so called home lands. The remaining 87 % of the land was left for the whites. Mixed marriages were prohibited, and the people were separated as to all parts of society. A pass law forced black people to carry identity documents at all times (UI, 2007).

The country is affected by the AIDS epidemic more than any other African country. In 2005 the official government estimate was between 4.8 and 6.4 million cases of HIV infection.

South Africa is today a young democracy, and is today lead by the African National Congress, also known as ANC. This party was elected when the apartheid regime fell in the beginning of the 1990s. Nelson Mandela was the leader of the party at that time (Cronje, Diamant, Lebone, MacFlarlane & Tempest, 2007). Jacob Zuma is the president of South Africa at present.

3.3 Eastern Cape- Amatole district municipality- East London.

This study was carried out in East London, a town located in Eastern Cape; one of the nine provinces in South Africa. This province is constituted of two former home lands during the apartheid (the “republics” of the Ciskei and the Transkei) as well as of the eastern parts of the former Province of the Cape of Good Hope and is today the poorest province of South Africa (UI, 2007). Homelands were the areas where the black South Africans had to live and breed. East London itself has 200.000 residents and the metropolitan area about 500.000 (BCM, 2007b). East London is part of the Amatole District municipality, an area with both modern manufacturing economy in East London, and rural poverty. The population is divided into different race groups as follows: Black African 92 %, Coloured 3 %, Indian 0% and White 4 %.

Young people in trouble with the law. A risk factor study in East London, South Africa.

56% of the housing in the area is formal, and the rest is informal. An informal settlement is an area where the people have no legal right to the land they occupy. The areas are excluded from the community plan and there are no basic services. The houses are built by the people themselves and are very simple. Formal settlement is an area where the people have legal right the land, the areas are also included in the community plan. 66 % has access to water services in the formal settlements and only 34 % in the informal areas. Telephone services are available for 31% of the population, the rest have indirect access to telephone services.

40 % of the population lives in households with 1-2 people, a household size of 3-4 people are 34 percent. 16 percent has 5-6 people in the household and only 6 % has 7-8 people at home. A household number of 9 or more has 3 % of the population (Province of the Eastern Cape, 2008).

3.4 Social Development- Probation Services

Probation Services is part of the governmental Social Development and was developed as a result of the realisation that imprisonment has negative effects for offenders and their families. It was realised that certain offenders could be released conditionally without being a threat to the community.

Probation Services has to fulfil various obligations at national and provincial level, outlined in the Probation Services Act 1991, (nr 116). Prevention of crime, early interventions of crime such as: assessment and referral services, restorative justice and diversion programs are some of their obligations (Republic of South Africa [RSA], 2002a). However, in actual practice, probation work still consists mainly of conducting pre-sentence investigations.

According to Section 50 (1) of the Criminal procedure Act a young offender under the age of 18 has to attend a pre-trial assessment with a probation officer within the period of 24 to 48 hours after the youth has been arrested (RSA, 2002b). While attending the assessment they were asked to participate in this study.

4. Material and methods

This research came about when undersigned did her field work at probation services at Social Development in East London, South Africa, while studying the social work program. Lack of information about why young people committed crime was evident among the probation officers, and they saw a need for this information. Since an overall picture of why young people commit crime was asked for, a quantitative study was chosen.

Risk factors and why people commit crime was therefore studied, contact with Professor R. Bally at Fort Hare University, East London was made. The professor helped the undersigned to compile a relevant questionnaire in May and June 2008. The questions that are included in the probation officers assessment form was used as guidance. Since most of the questions were open questions these had to be reconstructed to closed questions. The questionnaire was tested in June 2008. The questions were constructed to include the relevant risk factor areas; individual factors, home and family environment and neighbourhood.

4.1 Population and sample

The population in this research was all young offenders between the ages 12-18. They were all in trouble with the law in East London, South Africa. The number of assessments made between 1 of July 2008 and 31 of December is the whole population in this research. There are no statistics available to find out how many assessments that were made at the specific time mentioned for this research. An estimated number can be calculated from old statistics.

April 2006 until March 2007 statistics shows that 306 assessments were made with young people who had committed an offence in East London. From April 2008, until October 2008 166 assessments were made (Social Development, 2008a; Social Development, 2008b). These statistics show that the average number of assessments per month is about 24, which means that the estimated number of the population in this research is 144. When the population is about 150, the sample should be about 54 according to Strydom and colleagues (2002). A number of 80 young people participated in this research, 56 % of the estimated population. For best result all young people in the population should be participating (Moore, 1991), this was not practically possibly to carry through. But nevertheless a high percentage of the population was involved. The sample in this study was chosen by opportunity sampling. Sampling means taking a portion of the population as representative of the whole population.

Young people in trouble with the law. A risk factor study in East London, South Africa.

A sample is being studied to be able to understand the universal population from which it has been drawn (Strydom et al, 2002).

Since the circumstances at court made it difficult to assess young people that have committed serious offences, these people are under represented in this study.

The undersigned was not present while all the young offenders answered the questionnaires; the number who did not want to participate is therefore unknown.

All questions in the questionnaire were not answered by everyone.

4.2 Data collection and procedure

Data were gathered through a self- administered questionnaire, under the supervision of a probation officer or the undersigned at the Magistrate's court in East London. Data collection took place between July and December 2008. To make sure the questionnaires would be collected, and to secure a high respondent rate this was the most effective way to practically organize the delivery of the questionnaires. It was also the cheapest and least time consuming way.

In order to conduct the research authorization was requested from the area manager S.N. Ntonga, at the Buffalo City Area office.

The standardized questionnaire was translated into English, Xhosa and Afrikaans, the participants could therefore choose their preferred language. This was to make sure everybody would have the same opportunity to understand the questions. Trost (2007) emphasizes the importance of using a language that is easy to understand. Since many of the participants in this study might have problems with writing and understanding, this was considered as an important factor while constructing the questionnaire.

Trost (2007) also points out the importance of writing questions that are easy to answer. The answers to open questions are often technically difficult to compile. Sometimes the hand writing of the respondent is hard to interpret, or only fragments of the sentences are written down, that is IF the respondent even answers the question. The majority of the questions were therefore "closed", dichotomous or multiple- choice questions, to make it easy for the respondents to answer all the questions without too much writing. A few open-ended questions were also constructed where the participants themselves could write down the answer.

Young people in trouble with the law. A risk factor study in East London, South Africa.

The probation officers and the undersigned read the questions out loud and wrote down the answers for the young offenders who could not read or write. The participants got a small snack as a thank you, when returning the answered questionnaire.

4.3 Research strategy and design of inquiry

According to Strydom and colleagues (2002) a quantitative study needs to be conducted when a relationship between variables will be researched. The dependent variable in this research is criminality. The independent variables are individual factors, family/home environment and neighbourhood. Independent variables are independent of any intervention, they are used to explain or predict outcomes (the dependent variables) (Fink, 1998).

It is possible to look at the interrelationship between several variables. This is often a very complicated process (Jupp, Davies & Francis, 2000), was therefore not undertaken in the analysis of this research.

4.4 Analysis methodology

The data material was analysed using the statistic program SPSS 15.0 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). The questionnaires were numbered from 1-80, and the answers to the questions in the questionnaire were analyzed in cross tabulations.

Since the participants had committed various offences, there was a need to divide them into groups, this to be able to analyse the statistics. The five groups that were organised are: Property offences, Assault, Offences connected to drugs, Illegal circumcision and Murder. Since there were only one offender in each one of the last two groups these were not part of the analysis process.

A Chi-square test was made to analyse the significance of the individual factors (table 2) and home/family environment factors (table 3). It was also made on table 6, the offenders own explanation for committing the crime. The results were analysed against previous research made in the area relevant for this research.

4.5 Ethical consideration

When conducting a study it is important not to force anybody to participate in the study. Therefore participation was voluntarily. Everyone had the choice to withdraw from the participation in the research at any time. Care was also taken so that the questions in the questionnaire did not harm the participants. For this to be practically possible informed consent had to be obtained. The young people were informed about the aim of the study, because it is important not to deceive the participants and give them false information. The collected data was strictly anonymous and was treated with confidentiality. This is important since the participants must be assured that the private information they share will not be used for something it was not intended for (Jupp et al, 2000; Strydom, Fouché & Delpont, 2002).

5. Result and analysis

5.1 Socio- demographics of the participants (Table 1)

Table 1 shows basic socio-demographics of the 80 participants in this research. It gives an overall picture of the participants when it comes to age, gender, race and offence charge. Race is important to mention since South Africa still divides their population in four groups; Blacks, Coloured, Whites and Indian/Asian. During the apartheid years (1948-1990s) different race groups were separated in society. The majority of the population— the blacks (79% of the population), were forced to live in “homelands”, and were not allowed to mix with the rest of the population. A homeland was a geographical area where the people of black ancestry had to live (UI, 2007). The inequality during the apartheid was huge between the four groups, and still is. Today race is still recorded as the country tries to direct its development towards a normal society.

The offence charges for the young people participating in this study have been put together in 5 different categories. The first group includes offences such as theft, robbery and housebreaking. The second group involves offences that are connected to assault and violence. Group three is offences dealing with illegal drugs. Illegal circumcision and murder are the last two separate groups. Since the last two groups are small, they will be excluded from analyse and not be shown in table 2 and onwards.

TABLE 1.
SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY n=80

Age (years)	(n)	%
12–15	17	21
16–18	63	79
Gender		
Male	65	81
Female	15	19
Race		
Black	60	75
Coloured	15	19
White	5	6
Asian/ Indian	0	0
Offence charge		
Property	63	79
Assault	11	14
Drugs	4	5
Illegal circumcision	1	1
Murder	1	1

Table 1 shows that the majority of the young offenders are black males who are in their late adolescence, 79 percent are between 16-18 years as mentioned before. Studies from other parts of the world show the same pattern, males are more frequently breaking the law than females (Butchart et al, 2000; Shaw, 2001). 75 percent of the participants in the study are of black ancestry, they are underrepresented compared to the population statistics in the Amatole district municipality where 92 percent are of black ancestry. Coloured and whites are overrepresented in the study compared to the population in the municipality. Coloured are 3 percent of the population, and 19 percent is part of this study. The white people are 4 percent of the population and 6 percent is part of this study. It is interesting to see that the number of participants of black ancestry is underrepresented in this study. Since the black people during the apartheid era did not have any legal power, and had to live in the restricted areas, so called homelands, they had little or no power to develop and often lived in poverty. Therefore a higher number of participants from this group would have been expected. The Coloured group in the research is overrepresented with 16 %. Even the white young people are overrepresented with 2 percent. One of the reasons for this could be seen as reversed apartheid. Since South Africa became a democracy in the beginning of the 1990s the development in the country might have turned in the opposite direction, since the the black people now are a majority in the parliament.

The majority of the offences are connected to property offences (theft, robbery and housebreaking). The reason for this could be that many of the young people live in poverty. Another reason could be that young people, regardless of their social background want more material things.

5.2 Individual factors and categories of offence (Table 2)

Previous research shows that low performance in school, or dropping out are important factors for delinquency (Maguin & Loeber, 1996), just like drug and alcohol abuse (Hawkins, Catalano & Miller, 1992). Influences from delinquent peers are also an important factor for delinquency, membership in a gang makes the risk even higher since the main focus in a gang often is of law breaking character (Shaw, 2001).

Table 2 shows the participants of the study in three different categories of offences; Property, drugs and assault, and their relation to individual factors. The individual factors are alcohol and drug abuse, gang involvement and schooling.

The first column in table 2 shows the total percentage of the answer from the participants. The next three columns shows the total percentage of the answers within each group, this to make it possible to compare the answers between the three different groups. A Chi- square test was also made connected to each question.

TABLE. 2
INDIVIDUAL FACTORS AND CATEGORIES OF OFFENCE (%)
n=78
Chi- Square (*p<0,5 **p< 0,1 *p<0,01)**

	Total n=78	Property n=63	Drugs n=4	Assault n=11
Alcohol abuse *				
Yes	32	36	-	18
No	67	62	100	82
Missing	1	2	-	-
Drug abuse				
Yes, Cannabis	13	14	25	-
Yes, Cannabis/Man ¹	3	3	-	-
Yes, Cocaine	1	2	-	-
No	82	79	75	100
Missing	1	2	-	-
Part of a gang				
Yes	8	8	-	9
No	91	92	75	91
Missing	1	-	25	-
Schooling **				
Yes	72	76	100	36
No	24	21	-	55
Missing	4	3	-	9

¹Mandrax

Table 2 shows that a majority (67%) of the young offenders does not abuse alcohol. The same pattern shows for drug abuse, 82 % of the participants do not abuse illegal drugs. It also shows that a majority (91%) is not involved in any gang activity. Poor school performance is also associated with delinquent behaviour, but in this study 72 % attends school.

The result indicates that there might be other factors present for the young people to deviant behaviour, since a majority attends school, does not abuse alcohol or drugs and are not part of a gang. The presence of the guardians while the participants were answering the questionnaire

could have impacted their answers though. They might not have been truthful while filling in the questionnaire.

The young offenders might not have been under the influence of drugs or alcohol while committing the offence. It is interesting to see though that 3 out of 4 that are charged for a drug offence do not abuse drugs themselves. The reason for this could be that they sell drugs for a living. A great need might force them to stay sober and alert, and that is why they do not abuse alcohol or drugs. They could also deny their abuse.

There are significant differences within the answers concerning alcohol abuse and schooling. The young people who committed drug offences do not abuse alcohol and all of them attend school. Only young people from the other two groups abuse alcohol and admit they are not schooling. The reason for this could be that the young people charged for drug offences only abuse drugs, and not alcohol. But since they do not admit they abuse drugs either it is difficult to know the truth.

5.3 Family and home environment factors and categories of offence (Table 3)

Table 3 shows the participants of the study in three different categories of offences (as shown in table 2), and their relation to family and home environment factors. It is divided into family structure and family functioning. The living standard is also taken into consideration.

Family structure, which lives in the household-, might not be the main reason for delinquency, but there might be other factors causing the structure.

Large family size is connected to delinquency (Farrington & Loeber, 1999; West & Farrington, 1973; McCord et al, 2001). The number of people that are living in the home is shown in table 3; this number is excluding the young offender.

Children growing up in a single-parent household has been shown to be associated with delinquency in previous studies. This is because single parents often have a lower living standard (Shaw, 2001; McCord et al, 2001). And that is shown to impact the children more than the number of parents itself (Austin, 1978, Crockett et al., 1993).

Furstenberg and colleagues (referred to by McCord et al, 2001) discusses the absence of a father, especially when the child is in the late adolescence. It seems like the father mostly gives emotional support to the mother and support the family financially (Crockett et al.,

1993). The data in table 3 shows therefore which one of the parent the young offenders are staying with.

Family functioning means how people treat each other in the family. Poor parental supervision is shown to be a predictor of delinquent behaviour (Shaw, 2001; McCord et al., 2001). Participants were asked whether someone reminds them to do their homework and also who is looking after them at home. The result of this is shown in table 3. These questions are connected to parental supervision.

The living standard is measured in three different categories. The participants answered questions about their home appliances, and sanitary services. Low living standard means therefore that the participant has a maximum of two out of three basic services at home. These are Piped water, electricity and an inside toilet. Medium living standard means that they have all the three basic services at home, and also 1-4 extra items of home equipment. Extra home equipment items are the following: radio, TV, DVD-player, Telephone, Refrigerator and a car. The high living standard category has all the three basic services at home and 5-6 extra items of home equipments.

Table 3 is constructed like table 2. The first column shows the total percentage of the participants answering the question. The next three columns show the total percentage of the answers within each group, this to make it possible to compare the answers between the three different groups. A Chi-square test was also made in connection to each question.

TABLE. 3
FAMILY/HOME ENVIRONMENT FACTORS AND CATEGORIES OF OFFENCE %
n=78 Chi- Square (*p<0,5 **p<0,1 *p<0,01)**

	Total n=78	Property n=63	Drugs n=4	Assault n=11
<u>Family structure</u>				
Nr of people at home*				
0-2	69	65	50	100
3-5	6	8	-	-
6-8	25	27	50	-
<u>Guardian living at home</u>				
Both mother and father	31	32	50	18
Single parent	44	44	25	45
Father	4	5	-	-
Mother	40	39	25	45
Extended family ¹	18	17	25	18
Nobody	5	5	-	9
Missing	2	2	-	9
<u>Family functioning</u>				
Looking after him/her				
Both mother and father	18	17	50	9
Father	4	5	-	-
Mother	46	46	25	55
Extended family ¹	24	25	-	27
Nobody	4	5	-	-
Missing	4	2	25	9
<u>Reminding about homework</u>				
Never	14	13	25	18
(1-2/week	23	25	-	18
3-4/week	13	13	50	-
Everyday	33	35	25	27
Missing	17	14	-	37
<u>Living standard *</u>				
Low ²	69	65	50	100
Medium ³	6	8	-	-
High ⁴	25	27	50	-

¹ Grandmother, grandfather, aunt or uncle, no parent is living at home

² Low= Maximum 2/3 basic services (Piped water, electricity, inside toilet)

³ Medium= All 3 basic services, and 1-4 home equipments (Radio, TV, DVD-player, telephone, Refridgerator and a car)

⁴ High= All 3 basic services, and 5-6 home equipments

Table 3 shows that a majority (69%) of the participants are living in a household with a maximum of 2 people, excluding themselves. 6 % lives in a family with 3-5 people, and 25 % lives with 6-8 people. The average numbers in the municipality that are living with 6 or more family members are 15 percent. The result differs from previous research which found that children growing up in a large family are more at risk for delinquent behaviour, since most of the participants actually lives in a family with only 2 family members. The numbers of participants in this study that are living in a 1-2 people family are overrepresented compared to the average in the municipality. The number is 40 percent in the municipality.

The reason for this could be very complex. Since South Africa is extensively affected by HIV and AIDS this could be a reason for many of the young offenders living in a household with only 1-2 people. The poor people might not afford the medication or do not have the knowledge of treatment or even information about the illness. Since a majority of the offenders comes from a household with a low living standard this could be an explanation.

Crime could also be a reason; family members could be in prison or have been killed. A further explanation could be that adult family members have moved to large cities such as Johannesburg or Cape Town to find work.

Research also makes it clear that children growing up in a single parent household are more at risk for delinquent behaviour, because of higher risk of poverty (McCord et al, 2001, Shaw, 2001). Table 3 shows that 44 percent of the participants of this study live with only one parent, 40 percent live with their mother and only 4 percent with the father. 31 percent live with their mother and father. This means that 71 percent of all participants live with their mothers and only 35 percent live with their fathers.

Research shows that the father figure might be important in late adolescence, and this could be a factor since most participants are in their late adolescence, and do not have a father at home. The presence of a father is very important for adjustment in the years of the adolescence according to Furstenberg and colleagues (referred to by McCord et al, 2001), as mentioned before. The reason for the family structure to appear like this could be that there are many teenage pregnancies in South Africa, and the father might not be part of the life of children that are growing up. The father might also have many wives; this is part of the culture in some areas in South Africa. The Xhosa tradition has its stronghold in the Eastern Cape, and groups within the tradition agree to polygamy.

One of the most evident individual risk factors for committing a crime is to be male. South Africa has one of the highest crime rates in the world; therefore many men might be in prison.

When it comes to family functioning, the participants answered questions of who looks after them at home, and how many times their guardian asks them about their homework.

18 percent said they were being looked after by both their parents. 46 percent were being looked after by their mother and only 4 percent by their father. This can be seen in previous research as well. Even if both parents stay together, the father is minimally involved in the parenting (Crockett et al, 1993).

The question about homework reminder by the guardian showed that 14 percent were never asked about the homework, 17 percent did not answer the question at all.

It seems like the guardians were very concerned about the homework according to the answers. These answers could be a result of the presence of the guardians while filling in the questionnaire.

According to previous research poverty should be a predictor for later offending (Austin, 1978; Crockett et al, 1993). This research shows that 69 percent lives on a low living standard, they do not have all basic services at home, like piped water, electricity and an inside toilet. 6 percent lives on a medium standard and 25 percent on a high living standard.

The result shows that a majority of the offenders come from a household with a low living standard. It is interesting though that the second biggest group comes from a household with a high living standard. The reason for this group must be other than poverty since they come from a financially independent home. The offence charge for this group is drugs and property offences.

There are significant differences within the answers when it comes to the number of people and the living standard at home. All the young people who have committed assault lives in a household with only 1-2 people and they have a low living standard.

5.4 Problems in the neighbourhood (Table 4)

People are being impacted by the community they are living in. Areas with lots of illegal activities and poverty open up for delinquency (McCord et al, 2001).

Table 4 below lists the number of participants who find different offences to be a problem in their neighbourhood. They were asked to mark any of the twelve listed options in the questionnaire, the selection number was unlimited. Table 4 shows nine of the most common problems in their neighbourhoods.

TABLE. 4
PROBLEMS IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD
n=78

Problems in the areas	(n)	%
Drunkenness	58	73
Gangs/groups of young people	31	39
Theft	27	34
Housebreaking	23	29
Illegal drugs	21	26
Dangerous/noisy driving	18	23
Neighbourhood probl/ Domestic probl.	14	18
Sexual assault	13	16
Car theft	13	16

Problems connected to alcohol abuse (73%) seemed to be the most common problem in the neighbourhoods. Gang activities (39%) were the second most common problem in the areas, but the gap between them was huge. Closely after gang activities comes theft (34%), housebreaking (29%), illegal drugs (26%) and dangerous/noisy driving. Obviously the participants think alcohol is a major problem in the Amathole district municipality.

5.5 Neighbourhood factors and categories of offence (Table 5)

Table 5 shows the participants of the study in three different categories of offences, and their relation to their residing area. The areas are ranked with the worst crime situation first, this according to the participants. The first column shows the number of participants living in the area of interest. Column two shows the estimated crime level in the area. The participants were asked what problems they could see in their area, out of 12 options. The estimated crime column in table 4 is the result of these answers, a mean that explains the crime situation in the area from 0-12. 12 is the highest crime rate.

The next three columns divide the participants into three different categories of offences, just like table 2 and 3. The first number in each column is the total percentage of the answers within each group, this to make it possible to compare the percentage of the answers between the three different groups. This table is interesting for probation officers and others working

on a local level with delinquency. It does not have the same relevance from an international perspective.

TABLE. 5
NEIGHBOURHOOD FACTORS AND CATEGORIES OF OFFENCE (%)
n=78

AREA¹	Total n=63	Crime- Est.	Property n=63 %	Drugs n=4 %	Assault n=11 %
Parkside area	11	4,55	18	-	-
Southernwood	3	4,33	5	-	-
Duncan village	12	4,25	13	-	36
Buffalo flats	7	4,13	11	-	-
Quigney	1	4,0	1	-	-
Scenery park	3	3,67	5	-	-
Beacon bay	8	3,63	10	25	9
Amalinda	5	3,20	8	-	-
Mdantsane	7	2,86	11	-	-
Gonubie	5	2,60	6	-	9
Rural area	9	2,56	8	25	27
Vincent	2	2,0	3	-	-
Cambridge	2	2,0	-	25	9
Greenfields	3	1,3	1	25	9

¹ The area with the worst crime situation, according to the participants, is placed first.

Table 5 shows that Parkside, Southernwood, Duncan Village, Buffalo flats and Quigney are the areas most affected by crime according to the participants. The highest number of participants comes from Duncan village and the Parkside area. These areas are two out of the three areas most affected by crime. Young people from these two areas have mostly committed property offences and in Duncan village a few assault offences. The six areas listed first in table 5 are mostly affected by property offences. This is an interesting reflection for the local probation officers working in the area; some areas might need the whole community working together against crime. The areas listed first are in great need for development, the government should focus on development planning for the community.

5.6 Reason for committing crime and categories of offence (Table 6)

The last table (6) is the result of a mixed open and closed question. The respondents had 6 options to choose between, or add their own reason for committing the crime.

The first column in table 2 shows the total percentage of the answer from the participants. The next three columns divide the participants into three different categories of offences, just like previous tables. The first number in each column is the total percentage of the answers within each group, this to make it possible to compare the answers from the three different groups.

TABLE. 6
REASON FOR COMMITTING CRIME AND CATEGORIES OF OFFENCE %
- The offenders own explanation.
n=78

Reason	Total n=78	Property n=63	Drugs n=4	Assault n=11
A need ¹	18	19	25	9
Influenced by alcohol	15	14	-	27
Influenced by drugs	4	3	25	-
Influenced by friends	18	22	-	-
Bored, nothing to do	12	14	-	-
Protect him/herself	3	-	-	18
Ignorance	5	5	-	9
Was not breaking the law	1	2	-	-
Was given firearm	1	2	-	-
Asked to hold drugs	1	-	25	-
Just got involved	4	3	25	-
Innocent	6	6	-	9
Missing	12	10	-	27

¹ Did not have money, Wanted food, cell phone, clothes or chocolate.

Table 6 gives a picture of the participants own reason for committing the crime. 18 percent say they were influenced by friends, or had a need for something. 15 percent admit they were under the influence of alcohol. 12 percent committed the crime because they were bored and had nothing to do. Peer pressure seems to be an important factor for committing the crime. Research conducted by McCord and colleagues (2001) shows that the influence of peers is at peak at the age of 17; a majority of the participants are in that age.

Young people in trouble with the law. A risk factor study in East London, South Africa.

32 % of the participants admitted that they abuse alcohol (table 2). Table 6 shows that 15 % of the offenders committed the offence under the influence.

A majority of the offenders come from a household with a low living standard (table 3). The young people explained in the questionnaire the need for food, school uniform and clothes for church. These needs might not be there if their living standard would have been higher.

6. Discussion

The primary purpose of this study was to identify risk factors that could cause or produce delinquency among young offenders in East London, South Africa. The areas looked at were individual factors, home/family environment and neighbourhood.

The questions to be answered were:

To what extent are individual factors a risk for young people to commit a crime?

To what extent are the family and home environment a risk factor for young people to commit a crime?

To what extent is the neighbourhood a risk factor for young people to commit a crime?

The findings from this study shows that there are certain risk factors more evident in the lives of the young people than others, especially if you compare the result to previous research made in the same areas.

This research shows that individual risk factors for delinquent behaviour are clearly gender based; being a male is a high risk factor. The same goes with age, a majority (79%) of the offenders are in the age between 16-18 years. This research shows that most of the young offenders are not abusing alcohol or drugs. They attend school and are not part of a gang. This is the opposite compared to previous studies. If the young people have been filling in the questionnaires truthfully there must be other reasons for committing the crime. According to the table from the Office of the Surgeon General (Shader, 2001) in chapter 2, race is not an individual risk factor. This research would like to add this aspect to the table.

Surprisingly the majority of the participants are living in a household of only 1-2 people. Previous research shows that living in a household with many family members increases the risk for delinquent behaviour, this study shows the opposite. The reason for this could be the impact of the HIV/AIDS epidemic. South Africa is one of the countries in the world most affected by the virus. The poor families might not afford the medication for the sickness or does not even have the knowledge about treatment or how the virus is spread. 44% lives with a single parent, 4 percent with a father and 40 percent with a mother. Staying in a single parent family increases the risk for living in poverty. 69 percent of the participants are living in a household with a low living standard and 25 percent in a household with a high living standard. The father is also said to be important in the lives of young people, especially in late

adolescence. A majority of the participants in this study are in their late adolescence and the father is absent at home. The parental responsibility in the home is taken 46 percent by the mothers and 4 percent by their fathers, according to the participants in the study. 18 percent answer that both parents are looking after them at home. This means 64 percent are being looked after by their mother and only 22 percent by their fathers.

These numbers makes it clear that it is the mothers that are carrying the burden of raising the children at home. The fathers are in the periphery even in the home where both parents are present.

The most common problem in the neighbourhoods according to the participants is drunkenness. 73 percent thinks it is a problem in their neighbourhood. The areas most affected by crime in East London where the participants' lives are: Parkside area, Southernwood, Duncan village, Buffalo flats and Quigney.

18 percent of the participants said they committed the crime because they had a need, or they were influenced by their friends. A need could be a school uniform, chocolate, a cell phone or clothes for church. 15 percent said they were influenced by alcohol and 12 percent had nothing to do and were bored.

Most research made in the risk factor area is done in the developed world. This makes it difficult to compare previous research results with this research since it is made in a developing country, with different requirements and living standards. In the same way it is interesting to see if there are differences between young people and delinquency in different parts of the world. It is difficult to compare the result to a small town such as Östersund in Sweden, but maybe there are reasons for committing the crime that are the same despite living conditions and welfare society. However the result is interesting especially from a local perspective. The result can be used as a guide for preventive work against delinquency. An international perspective can compare the results with the situation in other developing countries, and the countries can learn from each other.

To be able to generalize the findings in a study, the result has to be the same if any group of the population would be selected (Strydom et al, 2002). For best results the whole population should have been participating in the study. Since this was not practically possible non-probability sampling was used. This is not the best sampling method since non- probability

sampling does not give everybody the same chance to be part of a study, and therefore limits the representativeness and generalisability of the survey results with a hundred percent validity.

However the result is relevant in many ways. Reliability has been defined as the precision of an instrument, implying its ability to produce repeatable results. If someone else would conduct the study, they would get the same result under comparable conditions (Strydom et al, 2002; Moore, 1991). Since the study was made with the help of the governmental Social Development and their daily routines it would be practically possible to do the research again with exactly the same procedure.

The questionnaire was put together with people knowing the local area and culture and it was tested in the actual environment where the research later took place. The questionnaire was also translated to the languages spoken locally. This was to make sure all the participants had the same chance to understand the questions.

In this study important questions might be missing in the questionnaire, such as if they could read or write.

It is not possible to predict everything that could happen along the line when conducting a study, especially in a foreign country. Not all the offenders could participate in the study, although the majority did. The young people were all participating within the same short period after the crime had been committed.

Validity refers to the degree to which a measure assesses what it purports to measure (Fink, 1998). To avoid misunderstandings the questions in the questionnaire was made as easy as possible, both in the construction of the questions and the options for the respondents to answer. The questions were mostly connected to present time, about their family, home environment and individual factors.

For best results when it comes to research about risk factors, a longitudinal study should be conducted. Risk factors are being investigated because they predict future offending (Farrington, 2000:1:16). This was not possible to do in this research, which is why a questionnaire was made to see if any risk factors would be able to detect at the time of the offence.

Another problem is to know which one of the risk factors that are the cause of delinquency, and which are merely markers or correlated with causes (Farrington, 2000). That's the main problem with risk factor research, especially to see which factors is the reason for committing

Young people in trouble with the law. A risk factor study in East London, South Africa.

crime. A multivariate analysis would have been possible, but this was not chosen in this research, because of time limitation and analysis difficulties.

Response errors are something to take under consideration. The participants might lie about their home situation for example (Moore, 1991). Since the questionnaire did not have anything to do with their court procedure and was strictly anonymous the answers would be considered as solid and true. The understanding of the questions could be considered as a limitation though. They might not want to ask about the meaning of a question, and therefore make up an answer instead. The presence of the guardians could have been a limitation, since they might not have answered the questions truthfully at all times.

The study only includes those young offenders that got caught while committing the offence, the once that got away are not part of the study.

It would have been advisable to have a comparable group of young people that has not committed any crime. Two comparable groups would have made it clear whether the groups would differ when it comes to individual, home/family factors and neighbourhood.

Research in the risk factor area has mostly focused on the western part of the world. Research within developing countries needs to increase, especially within the risk factor paradigm to be able to prevent crime. The living standard, culture and welfare in South Africa and other developing countries differ a lot from the developed world. Young people are a major factor of the world today, especially in the developing world. New technology and communication instruments open up for interaction across borders, and this could be used in a creative way to help with effective prevention. Longitudinal studies should be done in developing countries; this takes time and can be difficult since statistics needs to be available to be able to carry through a study of such kind.

Future research in South Africa might need to focus on the family and home environment. Family structure, family functioning and living standard should be studied more thoroughly. Guardians could have been interviewed as well to give a wider and clearer picture of the background of the young offenders. Time and practical circumstances could not make this possible in this study though. The participants own understanding of why they committed the crime is mostly connected to individual factors such as peer pressure, alcohol abuse and boredom. This could also be focused in future research.

Young people in trouble with the law. A risk factor study in East London, South Africa.

References

Backman, J. (1998). *Rapporter och uppsatser*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

BCM (Buffalo City Municipality). (2007a). *Life in Buffalo city, Quality of life study 2007*. Fort Hare Institute of Social and Economic Research.

BCM (Buffalo City Municipality). (2007b). *Annual report 06/07*.

Breetzke, G. (2008). Spatial is special: A Socio-geographic profile of offenders in the city of Tswane, South Africa. *South African geographical Journal*, 90(1): 32-40.

Butchart, A., & Emmet, T. (2000). *Behind the mask, getting to grips with crime and violence in South Africa*. Pretoria: HSRC Publishers.

Case, S., & Haines, K., (2007). Offending by Young People: A Further Risk factor Analysis. *Security Journal*, 20(96-110).

Chung, H. L. (2006). Relations Between neighbourhood factors, parenting behaviours, peer deviance, and Delinquency among Serious Juvenile Offenders. *Developmental Psychology*, 42 (2): 319-331.

Crockett, L.J., Eggebeen, D.J., & Hawkins, A.J. 1993. Father's presence and young children's behavioural and cognitive adjustment. *Journal of Family Issues*, 14(3):355-377.

Cronje, F., Diamant, T., Lebone, K., Macflarlane, M., & Tempest, J. (2007). *South Africa Survey 2006/2007*. Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations.

De Kock, D. (2005). Youth in conflict with the law and socio-economic experiences in their childhood: A relationship. *Journal of child and youth care work*, 20: 56-71.

Edling, C., & Hedström, P. (2003). *Kvantitativa metoder. Grundläggande analysmetoder för samhälls- och beteendevetare*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Young people in trouble with the law. A risk factor study in East London, South Africa.

Farrington, D. P. (2000). Explaining and preventing crime: the globalization of knowledge- the American society of criminology 1999 presidential address*. *Criminology*, 38(1): 1-24.

Farrington, D.P., & Loeber, R. (2001). *Child delinquents, Development, intervention, and service needs*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Fink, A. (1998). *Conducting research literature reviews- from paper to the Internet*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Gibson, R., Steyn, R., Trail, G., & Tyson, H. (1997). *South Africa at a glance 96-97, History, Politics, Economy, Trade, Tourism, Statistics*. Johannesburg: Editors Inc.

GSA (Government of South Africa). (2008a). *Imbizo Junction 2008. Business Unusual: All hand on deck to speed up change*. Government's programme of Action 2008.

Hawkins, J.D., Catalano, R.F., & Miller, J.Y. (1992). Risk and protective factors for alcohol and other drug problems in adolescence and early adulthood: Implications for substance abuse prevention. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112: 64-105.

Holmberg, M.B. (1985). Longitudinal studies of drug abuse in a fifteen- year-old population. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavia*, 71:67-79

Hundleby, J.D., & Mercer, G.W. (1987). Family and friends as social environments and their relationship to young adolescents use of alcohol, tobacco and marijuana. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 44: 125-134.

Jessor, R. (1976). Predicting time of onset of marijuana use: A developmental study of high school youth. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 44:125–134.

Jupp, V., Davies, P., & Francis, P. (2000), *Doing Criminological Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Kandel, D.B., Kessler, R.C., & R.Z., Margulies. (2001). *Juvenile crime, Juvenile Justice*. National research Council. Institute of medicine. Washington: National Academy press

Young people in trouble with the law. A risk factor study in East London, South Africa.

Kazdin, A.E., Kraemer, H.C., Kessler, R.C., Kupfer, D.J., & Offord, D.R. (1997). Contributions of risk factor research to development psychopathology. *Clinical Psychology Review, 17*:375-406.

Körner, S., & Wahlgren, L. (2002). *Praktisk statistik*. (3rd ed.).
Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Loeber, R. (1990). Development and risk factors of juvenile antisocial behaviour and delinquency. *Clinical Psychology Review, 10*(1): 1-41.

Maguin, E., & Loeber, R. (1996). Academic performance and delinquency. In Tonry, M (Ed), *Crime and justice: A review of research*. 20:145-264. Chicago:University of Chicago press.

McCord, J., Widom, C.S., & Crowell, N.A., eds. 2001. *Juvenile Crime, Juvenile Justice. Panel on Juvenile Crime: Prevention, Treatment, and Control*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Moore, D. (1991). *Statistics Concepts and controversies*, (3rd ed.). New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Mrazek, P.J., & Haggerty, R.J., eds. 1994. *Reducing Risks for Mental Disorders: frontiers for Preventive Intervention Research*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Office of the surgeon general. 2001. Youth Violence: A Report of the Surgeon General. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, office of the Secretary, office of Public Health and Science, Office of the Surgeon General. [Online]. Available: <www.surgeongeneral.gov/library/youthviolence> [09/10/2008]

Pollard, J.A., Hawkins, D., & Arthur, M.W. 1999. Risk and protective factors: Are both necessary to understand diverse behavioural outcomes in adolescence? *Social work research, 23*(3):145-158.

RSA (Republic of South Africa), 2002a. Probations Services Amendment Act 2002. Government Gazette. Vol 449 Cape Town 7, Nov 2002, No 24027.

Young people in trouble with the law. A risk factor study in East London, South Africa.

RSA (Republic of South Africa), 2002b. Child Justice Bill. Section 75. Government gazette No 23728 of 8 aug 2002. Minister for Justice and Constitutional development.

Shader, M., (2001). *Risk Factors for Delinquency: An Overview*. U.S Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. [Online]. Available: <www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/frd030127.pdf>. [28/09/2008]

Shaw, M. (2001). Investing in Youth 12-18: International Approaches to Preventing Crime and Victimization, International Centre for the Prevention of Crime, Montreal/NVPC, Ottawa.

Shaw, M., & Tschiwula, L. (2002). Developing citizenship among urban youth in conflict with the law. *Environment and Urbanization*, 14:59-69.

Sibusiso, M. (2003). Finding local solutions: Crime prevention in the Nelson Mandela Metro. *SA Crime Quarterly*, 5:29.

Sibusiso, M. (2004). A world of crime. Youth views on crime in the Nelson Mandela Metro. *SA Crime Quarterly*, 9:21.

Steinberg, L. (1987). Single parents, stepparents, and the susceptibility of adolescents to antisocial peer pressure. *Child development*, 58(1):269-275.

Strydom, H., Berg, K., & Herbst, A. (2006). Perceptions of crime in disadvantaged communities: the Thusano project. *Acta criminologica*, 19 (2):74-87.

Strydom, H., Fouché, C.B., & Delport, C.S.L. (2002). *Research at grass roots, For the social sciences and human service professions* (2nd ed.). Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Trost, J (2007). *Enkätboken*. (3rd ed.). Pozkal: Studentlitteratur AB.

UI (Utrikespolitiska Institutet). (2007). *Länder i fickformat*, 201 Sydafrika.

West, D.J., & Farrington, D.P. (1973). *Who becomes Delinquent?* London: Heinemann.

Young people in trouble with the law. A risk factor study in East London, South Africa.

Unpublished materials

Social Development, Buffalo City (2008a). *Business plan: Developmental Foster Care 2009/2010*. Unpublished manuscript.

Social Development, Buffalo city (2008b). *Business plan: Reception, assessment and referral program 2008/2009*. Unpublished manuscript.

Internet

GSA (Government of South Africa). (2008b) [Online]. Available:

<www.sa2010.gov.za/safety-and-security> [10/10/2008]

Province of the Eastern Cape Social development (2008). Amathole DM demographics.

[Online]. Available:

<<http://www.socdev.ecprov.gov.za/documentscentre/populationdemographics/Pages/AmatholeDistrictMunicipality.aspx>> [10/10/2008]

SAPS (South African Police Service). Annual Report 2007/2008. [Online]. Available:

<http://www.saps.gov.za/saps_profile/strategic_framework/annual_report/2007-2008/2_crime_situation_sa.pdf> [01/11/2008]

UN (United Nations). (2007). Department of Public Information. Press release POP/952

[Online]. Available:

<http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/wpp2006/FS_ageing.pdf> [10/10/2008]

United Nations [Online]. Available:

<<http://www.ohchr.org/english/countries/maps/southafr.pdf>>. [25/3/2009]

U.S. Department of Justice. 2003. Child delinquency Bulletin Series. Risk and Protective Factors of Child Delinquency. [Online]. Available:

<www.helpingamericasyouth.gov/exhibithall/child%20delinquency_Risk%20protective%20factors.pdf> [14/10/2008]

Attachment: Questionnaire

The young offenders own understanding and description of their criminality- Questionnaire

1. What is your gender? (Cross one)

- Boy
- Girl

2. What is your Age? _____ years.

3. What race are you?

- Black Coloured White Indian

4. In which Area of East London do you live?

- Amalinda Parkridge Parkside Pefferville Duncan Village
 Buffalo Flats Southernwood Cambridge Nahoon Vincent
 Beacon Bay Gonubie West bank Greenfields Quigney

Other: _____

5. For how many years have you been living in this area? _____ years.

6. What problems do you see in YOUR area? This can be things you have seen or heard about. Please select from the following issues (You can select more than one).

- Car theft
- Groups of young people/Gangs
- Drunkenness
- Dangerous/Noisy driving

- Sexual assault
- Problems with neighbours/ Domestic problems
- Housebreakings/Burglaries/Theft from home
- Theft
- Armed robbery
- Prowlers/Loiterers
- Vandalism/Graffiti/Damage to property
- Illegal Drugs
- Other _____
- No problems

7. Are you part of a gang?

- Yes No

8. Do you use drugs?

- Yes No If Yes, Which ones? _____

9. Do you drink alcohol?

- Yes No

10. What do you do after school?

- Watching TV at home
 - Hanging out with friends in the neighbourhood
 - Sports
 - Other: _____
-

11. What is there to do for young people in your neighbourhood?

12. Who is living with you in your home?

- Father Mother Grandmother Grandfather Sister Brother
 Other: _____

13. Who is looking after you at home?

- Father Mother Grandmother Grandfather Sister Brother
 Nobody

14. Is your home a peaceful place? Is it free from violence and fights?

- Yes No

15. Do you feel safe at home?

- Yes No

16. Do you get regular meals at home?

- Yes No

17. Which of the following can be found in your home?

- Radio TV DVD player Telephone Refrigerator
 Car Piped water Electricity

18. What kind of home do you live in?

- House Flat Shack

19. How many bedrooms does your home have?

- 1 2 3 4 More

20. Does your home have an inside toilet? Yes No

21. Is the refuse collected every week from your area? Yes No

22. Do you attend school? Yes No

23. Are you able to keep up with the work? Yes No

24. How often does your guardian ask you about your homework?

- Never
 1-2 times a week
 3-4 times a week
 Nearly every day

25. Do you know someone who is involved in crime?

- Yes No

26. For what type of offence are you charged?

- Shoplifting
 Housebreaking
 Assault
 Theft
 Robbery
 Other: _____

27. Why did you commit the crime?

Young people in trouble with the law. A risk factor study in East London, South Africa.

- Money for food
- My friends do it
- Bored, had nothing to do
- Had used drugs
- Had been drinking alcohol
- To get respect from my friends
- Other: _____

28. Are the Police patrolling in your area? Yes No

You can now collect a small gift from the probation officer!!

Thanks for your help!!