Adolescent Reputations and Risk

Advancing Responsible Adolescent Development

Series Editor:
Roger J.R. Levesque, Indiana University, Bloomington, USA

EMERGING AND YOUNG ADULTHOOD
Multiple Perspectives, Diverse Narratives
by Varda Konstam

A Continuation Order Plan is available for this series. A continuation order will bring delivery of each new volume immediately upon publication. Volumes are billed only upon actual shipment. For further information please contact the publisher.

Annemaree Carroll · Stephen Houghton ·
Kevin Durkin · John A. Hattie

Adolescent Reputations and Risk

Developmental Trajectories to Delinquency

Springer

Annemaree Carroll
The University of Queensland
Brisbane, Australia
a.carroll@uq.edu.au

Kevin Durkin
University of Strathclyde
Glasgow
United Kingdom
kevin.durkin@strath.ac.uk

Stephen Houghton
University of Westem Australia
Perth, Australia
stephen.houghton@uwa.edu.au

John A. Hattie
University of Auckland
New Zealand
j.hattie@auckland.ac.nz

ISBN 978-0-387-79987-2 e-ISBN 978-0-387-79988-9
DOI 10.1007/978-0-387-79988-9

Library of Congress Control Number: 2008938906

Printed on acid-free paper

springer.com

To our parents for their support and wisdom throughout our academic adventures and especially to Gem, whose strength, resilience, and warmth were great inspirations to her children, family, and friends.

Preface

Every society experiences problems with youth crime. Indeed, most crime is committed by the young. Typically (though not invariably), offending behavior is time-limited: it occurs during adolescence and declines or disappears thereafter (Moffitt, 1993, Moffitt, Caspi, Dickson, Silva, & Stanton, 1996). The costs of this relatively brief but disturbingly frequent foray are enormous when calculated in terms of lost or damaged property, violated homes, despoiled environments, and physical injuries to victims. The costs are enormous also in terms of the enduring harm to the perpetrators themselves: their young lives can be devastated by dangerous levels of substance use, by engagement in mutually destructive violence, by reckless behavior in the streets or on the roads, by acquiring records that will severely compromise their prospects of ever gaining mainstream employment, and, in some cases, by commitment to institutions where they will be brutalized and recruited to lifelong criminal careers.

Concerns about juvenile delinquency have preoccupied parents, educators, police, youth workers, legal professionals, and policymakers for a long time. In the past 100 years or so, a great deal of research attention has been invested in describing and explaining the origins and courses of delinquency, identifying different types of delinquents, developing and testing preventative measures, and examining the effects of varied treatments or punishments. A range of carefully constructed theories aiming to account for the causes of juvenile offending has been put forward and tested. Considerable information has been amassed about the incidence of different types of crime and their relationship to age.

The theories, the descriptive data, and the research evidence remain controversial, but a lot of progress has been made. We consider some of the progress in this book. Our own work has, of course, been guided and informed by the insights and findings of earlier and contemporaneous researchers; we set our studies in context by beginning with a review of some of the most influential theoretical approaches to the study of delinquency. Our focus is on the motivations of youth at risk and the trajectories they pursue on their routes to delinquent behavior. Following Emler and Reicher (1995), we argue that, for some young people, involvement in delinquent activities is a deliberate choice. We consider why they make that choice, drawing on findings in the literature

and from our own research. We draw also on theoretical work in a different tradition and one hitherto more typically associated with societally endorsed outcomes, such as educational achievement and career development. This is Goal-Setting Theory (Locke & Latham, 1990). Goal-Setting Theory assumes that conscious goals regulate human actions and influence performance levels. We ask what goals delinquents have and how these goals relate to the behavior of these young people.

Working with young people at risk or already engaged in crime brings researchers into a variety of environments and highlights a range of behaviors. We hope that readers who stay with us will learn something about the choices, goals, and values of young people in schools and on the streets, in clinics and in detention centers. Among other issues, we will be considering the motivations and rewards of activities such as antisocial behavior (in and out of school), substance use, volatile inhalant consumption, body-modification practices, and car theft. Most of these are seen, by respectable mainstream adults, as self-evidently undesirable in young people: most are nonetheless very popular among some sectors of the young. This poses obvious challenges to those administering law and order but also to researchers interested in explaining delinquency. An understandable lay account might be that these activities are popular *because* they are condemned or, in some cases, *because* they are designated as the preserve of adults. As we will see, whereas adult disapproval can make a contribution (albeit the opposite to that intended), the truly potent forces are often to be found in the social worlds of young people.

Delinquency is complex and multidetermined. We are not offering to deliver *the* cause or *the* explanation. Other factors are relevant, including personality variables, family histories, adverse environmental circumstances, and the socio-economic climate. We address some of these factors in the research to be reported here. Although there are some typical trajectories of involvement and some recurrent patterns of influence, which will be our principal foci, there are also less frequent routes into crime, such as those of individuals who enter into antisocial behavior very early and continue or intensify the problems (life-course persistent offenders in Moffitt's terms [Moffitt, 1993]), and there are some who pursue enduring engagement in crime with indifference to the social audience. We consider these types of offenders, too. Nevertheless, we will argue that much adolescent risk-taking and offending needs to be understood in relation to the social purposes it serves and the goals that are met by undertaking it.

Virtually all observers of youth crime would like to see it reduced or eliminated. Huge amounts of public resources and the energies of many professionals have been devoted to these aims. The relative inefficacy of many attempts – often despite high quality and delivery by skilled and resourceful practitioners – could lead to pessimistic conclusions. To accept defeat would be to give up on the social and criminologic sciences, to abandon intervention services, to leave the young offenders and potential young offenders to their fates, and to serve the broader society with the distressing conclusion that

"nothing can be done." Certainly, a lot of careful research and systematic treatments, which we summarize in the penultimate chapter, tell us that doing something is not easy, but they also tell us a lot about which strategies are promising and which factors remain to be addressed. Knee-jerk remedies based in short-term political expediencies are rarely beneficial (Frick, 2001; Gendreau, 1996), but theoretically grounded, intensive systematic programs that are attuned to the contexts and motivations of the young people can and do make a difference. Investigating these contexts and motivations is the principal way in which researchers can contribute to these broader goals.

Acknowledgments

In 1991, the first author commenced postgraduate studies at the University of Western Australia. In the Christmas season prior to arrival in Perth, the capital city of Western Australia, a terrible tragedy occurred at a suburban intersection of Perth. A 14-year-old juvenile, driving a stolen vehicle at high speeds, smashed into a family car carrying a newborn baby, wife, and husband traveling home from a family gathering. The wife and child were killed instantly. In the United Kingdom, during 1992, two 9-year-old boys coerced a 2-year-old boy out of a shopping center and onto nearby railway tracks. They bludgeoned the defenseless toddler to death and left him on the railway tracks to die. Other tragedies of a similar nature are constantly reported beckoning the questions "Why do young people commit crime?" and "What motivates them to commit acts of delinquency?"

Much of the past 15 years of our collaborative research have been devoted to understanding the motivational determinants for involvement of young people in delinquency. Specifically, we have examined whether some young people are at greater risk than others of becoming involved in crime and whether it is possible to identify those "at risk" before they go on to become chronically involved in criminal activities. We have investigated whether involvement in delinquency is a deliberate choice for some individuals with the development of a nonconforming reputation being a specific goal or whether it may be inherent in the individual as a result of psychopathology (e.g., undiagnosed or diagnosed disorders), interpersonal and affective traits (e.g., callousness, sensation seeking, impulsivity), and/or personal circumstances (e.g., socioeconomic status, family issues, cultural factors) or a combination of all of these factors.

The proposal for this book emanated from a very fruitful and productive research partnership of the four authors and from a vision that placing 15 years of research into a chronological and developmental framework would provide a comprehensive understanding of youth at risk especially those who engage in antisocial and delinquent acts. We are grateful to Roger Levesque, Series Editor, *Advancing Responsible Adolescent Development* (Springer), for embracing our idea, encouraging us in our endeavors, and publishing the final product.

Collaborative research projects of this nature rarely reach fruition without the hard work and dedication of others. This book is no exception. Therefore, we acknowledge and thank the Australian Research Council who provided funding for much of the research conducted and the thousands of adolescents, parents, teachers, and professionals who willingly participated in the various research studies reported throughout the book. We hope that this participation and the outcomes of the research will divert some young people from a life of crime and the development of negative social, educational, and economic outcomes.

The authors have many people to thank for their help in researching and writing this book. In particular, we acknowledge Carol Tan for her extraordinary efforts in proofreading and editing and for compiling more than 500 references in the References section. To Ms. Jenny Foo we express our gratitude for the administrative support provided.

We would also like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the contributions of a number of our students, research assistants, and colleagues whose collaborative efforts over the years underpin the research findings presented in this book. Specifically, we would like to acknowledge the contributions of Julie Bower, Robin Cordin, Francene Hemingway, Umneea Khan, Carol Tan, and Allan Walker who have completed or are currently completing doctoral studies on the broad topics underpinning this book and who have provided research literature and conducted numerous studies under our supervision. Their motivation, commitment, and dedication to the topic of at-risk young people have been extremely noteworthy. Our heartfelt thanks for their collaborative efforts.

We would also like to acknowledge other colleagues who have coauthored articles reported in this book, namely Stephen Allsop, Adrian Ashman, Tony Baglioni, Paul Bramston, Elaine Chapman, Graham Douglas, Shauna Green, Waisam Hoong, Sarah Hopkins, Peta Odgers, and Yasmin Turbett. Chapters 2–8 of the book were based on previously conducted research, with the full reference to the materials being located in the References section (Carroll, Baglioni, Houghton, & Bramston, 1999; Carroll, Durkin, Hattie, & Houghton, 1997; Carroll, Durkin, Houghton, & Hattie, 1996; Carroll et al., 2006; Carroll, Green, Houghton, & Wood, 2003; Carroll, Hattie, Durkin, & Houghton, 2001; Carroll, Houghton, & Baglioni, 2000; Carroll, Houghton, & Odgers, 1998; Carroll, Houghton, Durkin, & Hattie, 2001; Carroll, Houghton, Hattie, & Durkin, 1999; Carroll, Houghton, Khan, & Tan, 2007; Durkin & Houghton, 2000; Hoong, Houghton, & Chapman, 2005; Houghton & Carroll, 1996; Houghton, Carroll, & Odgers, 1998; Houghton, Carroll, Odgers, & Allsop, 1998; Houghton, Carroll, Tan, & Hopkins, 2008; Houghton, Durkin, & Carroll, 1995; Houghton, Durkin, & Turbett, 1995; Houghton, Odgers, & Carroll, 1998; Odgers, Houghton, & Douglas, 1996).

A special vote of thanks is due to the highly competent staff at Springer for their support and professionalism in bringing this book to fruition.

Finally, the authors are deeply appreciative of the understanding and encouragement provided by our families. Most importantly, to John Sowby, Margaret Houghton, Parvin Durkin, and Janet Clinton, and to our children William, Nicholas, Gareth, Richard, Joel, Kyle, and Kieran for the support they have provided throughout the past 15 years of our research endeavors.

Contents

Chapter 1
At-Risk Youth: Identifying, Charting, and Explaining the Course of Early Involvement with Crime

Some young people are at greater risk than others of becoming involved in crime. Why? Is it possible to identify those "at risk" before they go on to become chronically involved in criminal activities? If we can identify those at risk, can we explain how intrinsic and/or external factors have led to this status? Are there protective factors that, for some, mitigate risk? Once we know who is at risk and why, can we predict the subsequent course of their lives? In this book, we use the term *at-risk youth* in the context of children and adolescents who, as a consequence of their involvement in delinquent activities, place themselves in danger of future negative outcomes. For some of these individuals, such involvement is a deliberate choice, as is the escalation of their at-risk behaviors. For these young persons, involvement is usually in the presence of a peer audience and is a means to attaining a social identity of choice, generally in the form of a nonconforming reputation. Involvement in risky behaviors may be the result of psychopathology (e.g., undiagnosed or diagnosed psychological disorders), interpersonal and affective traits (e.g., callousness, sensation seeking, impulsivity), and/or personal circumstances (e.g., socioeconomic status, family issues, cultural factors) or a combination of all of these factors.

This chapter presents an overview of factors that may place youth at risk or protect them from involvement in risky behaviors and, ultimately, delinquency. With others, we define juvenile delinquency as participation in illegal behavior by a minor who falls under a statutory age limit (Siegel, Welsh, & Senna, 2006). We discuss why young people at risk may become involved in delinquent behavior, and we outline the origins of delinquent behavior by briefly surveying the variety of theories in the area of juvenile delinquency and at-risk youth. The age of onset of delinquency is also examined in the context of developmental trajectories. We conclude with a discussion of self-regulation and delinquency involvement in youth at risk. This latter part of the chapter is inextricably linked with the central theme of our book and the subsequent chapters, which is that in their day-to-day lives, young people make choices in their pursuit of a particular kind of reputation. For some at-risk youth, the reputation is based on an admiration for social deviance and an affiliation with like-minded peers, the outcomes of which tend to be adverse. For others, the same adverse outcomes

A. Carroll et al., *Adolescent Reputations and Risk*, Advancing Responsible Adolescent Development, DOI 10.1007/978-0-387-79988-9_1,

apply, but for these young persons at risk, there appears to be no affiliation with a peer group. Finally, there are those individuals who are characterized by psychopathology that involves deficits in self-regulatory processes, which potentially predisposes them to even greater adversity.

Throughout this book, we present extensive research evidence gathered over the past 15 years pertaining to the importance of reputation in the lives of young people. In addition, we integrate this evidence with our research on the self-regulatory processes in goal setting to describe our *Reputation-Enhancing Goals Model*, which explains why the delinquent activities of young people are motivationally determined.

Children and Adolescents at Risk

The term *at risk* has appeared in various contexts even though there is a lack of consensus regarding its origins, meaning, and definition (McWhirter, McWhirter, McWhirter, & McWhirter, 2007). Educators and health professionals have often viewed *at risk* as a diagnostic and discrete category, and this has resulted in objections, criticisms, and argument (Swadener & Lubeck, 1995). According to McWhirter et al. (2007), being at risk occurs along a continuum from minimal risk through remote, high, to imminent risk. Intensity of risk along this continuum is defined in terms of the increasing number and severity of risk factors affecting the young person and the emergence of problem behaviors (Withers & Russell, 2001). These behaviors may range from being socially unacceptable to school authorities (e.g., disrupting the classroom, rejecting teacher support, poor motivation), through activities that are problematic by virtue of the age of the young person (e.g., status offenses such as truancy, running away, substance use), to those that are illegal independent of the offender's age (e.g., assault, vandalism, arson, robbery, rape). Involvement in these behaviors can lead to disciplinary consequences ranging from school suspension and expulsion to legal convictions and incarceration (Lorion, Tolan, & Wahler, 1987).

For some young people, involvement in activities that place them at risk is short-lived. For others, the activities continue over a period of time and may even continue throughout the life span. In many instances, the young person who participates in a specific at-risk activity also becomes involved in others. For example, a young person who is disruptive in the classroom may become truant and while avoiding school may join peers creating minor nuisances in shopping malls, which could result in challenges from security staff, leading in turn to migration to the less stringently policed suburbs where opportunities present for petty theft or vandalism. Academic failure, suspension and expulsion, and early school-leaving are well-known risk factors for juvenile delinquency (Christle, Jolivette, & Nelson, 2005).

During the past two decades, there has been increasing interest and research concerning the concepts of risk and protective factors and the vulnerability and

resilience of individuals. The early identification of these factors is emerging as extremely important for prevention. As we stated earlier, however, for some young people, involvement in at-risk activities is a choice, and the benefits obtained from the peer group are more salient and rewarding to the individual than are the possible punitive outcomes. Hence, some young people may not be amenable to change, thereby demonstrating the power of reputations in impeding many prevention and intervention programs. There is a clear need to understand the risk factors that increase the probability of onset, exacerbation, or maintenance of a problem condition.

Factors Placing Young People at Risk

Myriad factors have been proposed in the voluminous literature on delinquency as associated with or contributing to the development of negative outcomes for young people. Summation of these risk factors typically groups them in five categories; namely, individual, family, peers, school, and community/societal (McWhirter et al., 2007; Siegel et al., 2006; Withers & Russell, 2001). Table 1.1 summarizes the most commonly referenced factors for placing youth at risk, especially of engaging in delinquent behaviors.

Individual Risk Factors. Important individual factors that place young people at risk of offending may include physical issues such as premature birth, low birth weight, birth injury, chronic illness, and social competence issues such as insecure attachment, poor problem-solving, lack of empathy, learning difficulties, alienation, and low levels of self-regulation associated with hyperactivity, disruptive behavior, and impulsivity (National Crime Prevention, 1999). Of these individual factors, impulsivity has been demonstrated to be a major contributor to juvenile delinquency, and young persons with low self-control are more likely to react impulsively and engage in criminal behaviors than are those who do not display these characteristics. Vazsonyi, Cleveland, and Wiebe (2006) demonstrated that regardless of community economic status, individuals with low self-control are most likely to engage in criminal activities.

Being male is also an individual risk factor closely related to delinquency, and the relationship between adolescent males and offending has received considerable attention in the criminological literature (see Bottcher, 2001; Mazerolle, 1998; National Crime Prevention, 1999; Ogilvie, 1996; Ogilvie & Lynch, 2002; Ogilvie, Lynch, & Bell, 2000; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996; West & Zimmerman, 1987; Western, Lynch, & Ogilvie, 2003).

Family Risk Factors. Family risk factors, also identified in Table 1.1, include both parental characteristics and types of family environment (National Crime Prevention, 1999; Wasserman et al., 2003). Young people are considered to be at risk, for example, if they were born to teenage mothers, a single parent, a parent or guardian with a history of criminal activities, or parents with psychiatric disorders (especially depression). Family violence, marital discord,

Table 1.1 Summary of Risk Factors

The individual		
Psychosocial factors	Physical factors	Behavioral factors
• Low-self esteem • Low motivation • Poor cognitive development • Low intelligence • Poor social skills • Poor bonding to family • Early antisocial behavior • Psychopathology	• Poor health, illness and disability • Low birth weight • Low level of autonomic and central nervous system arousal • Being male	• Low behavioral inhibition • Hyperactivity • Passivity • Early pregnancy/motherhood • Offending behaviors • Substance use/abuse • Poor academic performance • Low academic aspirations • Early, chronic truancy • Expulsions or suspensions • Social isolation
The family		
Family structure	Family functioning	Family socioeconomic status
• Fragmented, reconstituted family structures • Large family size • Separation from family	• Poor family management practices (e.g., poor parental supervision and control) • Disturbed parent–child relationships • Childhood abuse, neglect, or family violence • Modeling on antisocial parents • High mobility • Family disorganization • Parental psychopathology	• Low parental income • Low parental education • Unemployment
Peers		
• Association with deviant peers • Peer rejection • Association with antisocial adults		
The school		
School organization	Curriculum	School climate
• Rigid organizational policies and practices • Repressive discipline • No help for early leavers and barriers to reentry • Large class size • Large school without substructures	• Unstimulating content • No participation in decision-making • Passive teaching–learning strategies • Competitive exam-dominated assessments	• Unsupportive school culture • Negative teacher–student relationships • Absence of school counsellors • Lack of student participation • Poor school–home relationships • Poor staff professional development

Table 1.1 (continued)

Community and societal factors
• Extreme poverty
• Antisocial community norms
• Neighborhood disorganization
• High crime rate
• Access to weapons
• High concentration of delinquent peer groups
• Minority ethnic status

Sources: McWhirter et al., 2007; Siegel et al., 2006; Withers & Russell, 2001.

a disorganized family environment, father absence, long-term parental unemployment, a harsh or inconsistent discipline style, rejection of the child, child abuse or neglect, and poverty or economic disadvantage have also been shown to act as risk factors (National Crime Prevention, 1999). Lack of parental supervision is a particularly strong predictor of antisocial behavior in adolescence (Connell, Dishion, Yasui, & Kavanagh 2007). Many young offenders also report having experienced physical, sexual, or emotional abuse (Kiriakidis, 2006; Ralph & Sanders, 2004) with young people who engage in regular violent or property offending crimes being more likely to present with a history of neglect and abuse (AIC, 2006b).

School Risk Factors. Negative school experiences can also be a major contributor to antisocial behavior for some young people. Poor student–teacher relationships and a lack of engagement, poor school organization, large class sizes, low student–teacher cooperation, poor rule reinforcement, inadequate behavior management, school failure, and bullying have all been shown to contribute (National Crime Prevention, 1999; Wasserman et al., 2003). A negative school climate is another major contributor to marginalizing and alienating at-risk students (McCrystal, Higgins, & Percy, 2006).

Peer Risk Factors. Peer risk factors appear developmentally later in young people's lives than do other established risk factors, and research in this area indicates that association with deviant peers is related to offending behavior and membership in adolescent gangs (Wasserman et al., 2003). As shown in Table 1.1, association with a deviant peer group can contribute to antisocial behaviors, promote reputation enhancement, and consolidate relationships within this group and hence act as a risk factor (Alvarez & Ollendick, 2003). Once young people are entrenched in an antisocial peer group, efforts to change their behavior can cause them to alienate themselves from their peers who provide support, acceptance, and companionship (McWhirter et al., 2007). On the other hand, of equal concern are those young people who display a lack of connectedness to peers and act out their deviant behavior in isolation (Demuth, 2004; Giordano, Cernkovich, & Pugh, 1986).

Community Risk Factors. Neighborhood characteristics of low socioeconomic status (LSES), high percentage of single-parent families, and high transience contribute to greater levels of crime, violence, and delinquent behaviors, as indicated in Table 1.1 (Barnes, Belskey, Broomfield, Melhuish, & National Evaluation of SURE START Research Team, 2006; Vazsonyi et al., 2006).

Although not all young people exposed to risk factors engage in antisocial behaviors, those exposed to a combination or an accumulation of risk factors (as shown in Table 1.1) across their families, schools, peers, and in their communities are at increased risk of becoming involved in offending behavior. Importantly, no single factor is a guarantee that a young person growing up in that context will embark upon a delinquent career. An accumulation of risk factors, and interactions among them, heighten the likelihood of a young person veering into risky or criminal lifestyles.

Factors That Protect Youth at Risk

Given the large list of risk factors, the characteristics of those young people who do not engage in antisocial or criminal behaviors become of particular interest. Researchers (Benard, 1991; Catalano & Hawkins, 1996; McWhirter et al., 2007; Resnick et al., 1997; Siegel et al., 2006; Withers & Russell, 2001) have identified those who do not engage in antisocial behaviors and determined which characteristics make them less vulnerable in the context of environmental hazards (Withers & Russell, 2001). Catalano and Hawkins (1996) described protective factors as those that "enhance the resilience of those exposed to high levels of risk and protect them from undesirable outcomes" (p. 153). Protective factors play a vital role in strengthening young people's resilience and providing them with the opportunity to withstand hazards that may precipitate involvement in crime. Protective factors are not simply the opposite of those variables identified as risk factors, but rather they form resilience within and external to an individual to withstand risks. Resilience is viewed as the outcome of the operation of protective factors, incorporating personal and external resources or capacities to cope effectively with and overcome adversity (McWhirter et al., 2007).

Resnick et al. (1997) followed 12,118 adolescents recruited from 80 American high schools from Year 7 through to Year 12, in order to identify risk and protective factors associated with health-risk behaviors and the choices made. The investigators found that parent–family connectedness and perceived school connectedness were protective against all health-risk behaviors (e.g., violence, substance use) with the exception of pregnancy.

Benard (1991) identified four key domains associated with resilience: (1) social competence: responsiveness; flexibility; empathy/caring; communication skills; sense of humor; (2) problem-solving skills: critical thinking; ability to

generate alternatives; planning; making a change; (3) autonomy: self-esteem/self-efficacy; internal locus of control; independence; adaptive distancing; (4) sense of purpose and future: goal directedness; achievement; motivation; educational aspirations; healthy expectations; persistence; hopefulness; compelling future; and coherence/meaningfulness.

School-based policies and practices have the potential to mitigate the risks for involvement in juvenile crime. Christle et al. (2005) reported that school-level characteristics such as supportive leadership, dedicated staff, school-wide behavior management, and effective academic instruction can help minimize the risks for delinquency. School climate has also been found to be a critical determinant of delinquency within schools (Gottfredson, Gottfredson, Payne, & Gottfredson, 2005), whereby schools with clarity of rules have lower student delinquency.

Additional individual, family, school, peer, and community factors identified by Benard (1991), McWhirter et al. (2007), Siegel et al. (2006), and Withers and Russell (2001) are presented in Table 1.2.

Youth at Risk and Involvement in Delinquency

Juvenile delinquency theorists and researchers have reported that the most obvious differences in the frequency and severity of juvenile delinquency are with gender, age, and ethnicity (Australian Institute of Criminology, AIC, 2006a; Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, AIHW, 2006; Farrington, 1986; Moffitt, 1993; Siegel et al., 2006). Males are much more likely to commit crimes than are females. Siegel et al. (2006) reported that the male-to-female ratio for serious violent crime among juveniles in the United States is approximately 4 to 1. Interestingly, Siegel et al. reported that the numbers of female delinquents have been increasing faster than those for males: arrests of male delinquents having decreased by approximately 22% compared with females increasing by approximately 12%. The authors attribute some of this change to females self-reporting greater levels of delinquency and males underreporting their involvement. Similar statistics are evident in Australia with there being a slight increase in the percentage of juvenile offenders who are female, from 21% in 1995–1996 to 23% in 2003–2004, whereas the rates of male juvenile offending have been dropping by 27% since 1995, with a 19% drop in the past 3 years (AIC, 2006a). However, there were almost five times as many males as females under juvenile justice supervision in Australia, with males being supervised at a rate of 7.4 per 1000 compared with females at 1.6 per 1000 (AIHW, 2006).

In another Australian study, Hay (2000) investigated gender specific self-concept profiles of adolescents whose persistent behavior problems led to suspension from school. The resultant profiles suggested that boys' antisocial behaviors were associated with a striving for masculine self-image, whereas girls' antisocial behaviors resulted more because of rejection by female peers

Table 1.2 Summary of Protective Factors

Individual	Family	Peer	School	Community
High intelligence	Cohesion	Activity with prosocial peers	Involvement in school and belief in the school values	External social support
Abstract thinking	Prosocial family bonding	Belief in prosocial peer values	School connectedness	Social cohesion
Forethought	Values	Bonding to prosocial peers	Availability of counselling	Involvement with prosocial community members
High self-esteem	Connectedness to parents		Caring and supportive teachers	Availability of resources
Social competence	Emotional support from trusted others		High expectations	
Problem-solving skills	Affectionate		Clear rules	
Autonomy and sense of purpose	Prosocial family norms and rules		Student involvement in activities	
	High expectations		Opportunities to participate	

Sources: Benard, 1991; Catalano & Hawkins, 1996; McWhirter et al., 2007; Resnick et al., 1997; Siegel et al., 2006; Withers & Russell, 2001.