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ABSTRACT

Crime is a major concern to every nation, more so, the involvement of minors in criminal activities. In Kenya there is a high rate of children involvement in criminal activities indicated by the high number of minors arrested or sentenced of criminal charges. Of specific concern is Taita-Taveta County where minors have joined terrorism activities and involved in robbery in inter-clan wars. Considering the effects of children involvement in criminal activities, there is need to identify the social and environmental factors that contribute to minors’ involvement in criminal activities and seek ways to address them. This study therefore sought to determine the factors that promote juveniles involvement in criminal activities in Taita-Taveta County to fill in the gap of knowledge and assist in developing strategies to curb the scourge. Specifically the study sought to: determine the factors that promote juveniles involvement in criminal behavior in Taita-Taveta County, find out the level of juvenile involvement in criminal behaviors in Taita-Taveta County, and investigate the impact of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors in Taita-Taveta County. A cross-sectional descriptive research design was used in this study to assess the determinants of juvenile involvement in criminal activities in Taita-Taveta County. Purposive sampling technique was employed to select the sample. The study targeted a sample size of 50 respondents including police officers, local administration members such as chiefs and members of local organizations supporting the rights of children. Twenty respondents were intervened including nine selected juvenile in the correction centers. Data collection instruments included questionnaires and interview guides. Both quantitative and qualitative data was analyzed and results were then presented in tables and graphs with emphasis on graph analysis. The results revealed that the main causes of juveniles involvement in criminal behaviors include; the quality of parenting; lack of adequate supervision; rejection by the mother/father, lack of parents involvement with the child, maltreatment of children including neglect and abuse and youth homelessness; rebellion against parental authority, income inequality and poverty. The findings of this study showed that there was increase in theft and robbery among the juveniles. Crime among the juveniles was reported as a social problem that affects the lives of people, lowers their dignity, and affects people psychologically, physically, emotionally, economically and socially, thus affecting community development. The proposed strategies to curb juveniles involvement in criminal behaviors included; constant presence of police in the neighborhoods and the establishment of more police stations in juveniles prone areas; preventing the free usage of small arms/weapons by members of the community and creation of training/job opportunities for idle youngsters to prevent them from engaging in crime and violence. Improve the image of the police and establishment of community policing forums. The parents must also take responsibility over their children up to the time when they would be in the position to stand on their own. Finally, Kenyan government deserves every support from local and international organizations as well as individuals to sustain the constitutional free basic education, and ensure its quality.
**OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS**

**Crime** - Crime occurs when a specific act that is proscribed in law is committed; an act may have harmful consequences and be regarded as morally reprehensible, but if it is not so proscribed then a criminal offence has not been committed.

**Criminal behavior** - Actions violating the established laws of a country (Belfrage, 1998).

**Doli incapax** – a legal term used to describe the presumption that children are not capable of knowing that a particular behavior is ‘seriously wrong’ as opposed to being merely ‘naughty’

**Juvenile** – in this study juveniles are individuals who are aged between 10 and 18 years.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

During the closing decades of the twentieth century, juvenile justice policy underwent major change. In less than a generation, a justice system that had viewed most young lawbreakers as youngsters whose crimes were the product of immaturity was transformed into one that stands ready to hold many youths to the same standard of criminal accountability it imposes on adults (Elizabet & Laurence, 2008).

Universally, until 1998, children aged ten to fourteen who were charged with a criminal offence were presumed, in any court hearing, to be doliincapax (‘incapable of evil’); that is, they were presumed not to be capable of knowing that a particular behavior was ‘seriously wrong’ as opposed to being merely ‘naughty’(Elizabet & Laurence, 2008). In England, for example, it was the responsibility of the prosecution to demonstrate, beyond reasonable doubt, that the child in question was capable of recognizing behavior that was seriously wrong. Children aged between ten and fourteen were thus afforded some procedural protection from the full weight of the criminal law (Newburn, 2002). However, the presumption of doliincapax was abolished in England by the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (Bandalli, 2000).

Although ‘crime’ is a fiercely contested concept (Muncie, 2001), in legal terms a crime occurs when a specific act that is proscribed in law is committed. An act may have harmful consequences and be regarded as morally reprehensible, but if it is not so proscribed then a criminal offence has not been committed. Therefore anti-social behaviors of the minors should not be considered as a crime. Mooney and Young (2006) argue that anti-social behaviors, as the name implies, should be perceived as infringements of social or moral norms, not criminal codes.
Justice system for minors has gradually developed to what it is today. In South Africa, for example, there are two main factors that promoted the development of justice system for the minors: the number of crimes committed by minors increased through the 1980s and early 1990s, peaking in 1995 (Jansson, 2007); and media coverage of high-profile cases and the frequent portrayal of hooded teenagers terrorizing communities suggested that young people are becoming increasingly criminalized. Indeed, one study found that 71 per cent of media stories about young people were negative and a third of articles concerned the issue of crime (Ipsos MORI, 2006).

Since the inception of a justice system that ensures young law breakers are dealt with in the same standard as adults reports indicate that the levels of crime have decreased and have been stable since 2005/06 (Jansson, 2007). However, although the introduction of the justice system for minors saw a reduction in crimes committed by the youth, it is well-recognized internationally, and in Kenya, that preventing crime is an essential and effective part of long-term crime reduction.

In USA and Britain National household surveys have been carried out to measure the level of juvenile involvement in crime. Such studies have generally found that offending is widespread amongst youth, but that most offending is relatively minor and transient in nature (Visher & Roth 2010). Large scale self-report studies on representative juvenile samples conducted in Australia, such as adolescents in particular schools or in particular suburbs of major cities indicate that juvenile offending is widespread (Mak, 2011).

It is not only developed countries that are facing this situation; in developing countries as well there are new pressures on young people undergoing the transition from childhood to independence. In Africa, rapid population growth, the unavailability of housing and support services, poverty, unemployment and underemployment among youth, the decline in the
authority of local communities, overcrowding in poor urban areas, the disintegration of the family, and ineffective educational systems are some of the pressures young people must deal with (Ojo, 2012).

In Kenya, according to study carried out in Kamiti Youth Corrective Training centre (KYTC) the increase in the number of minors who drop out of school, the escalating poverty and unemployment level, poor parenting strategies and drug abuse among the young people, have seen steep increase of minors involved in crime (Omboto et al. 2013). The study further found out that most of the criminals in the major towns in Kenya are aged between 15 and 25 years. When these young stars take drugs, they cease to be normal people. They turn to crime to get money for drugs (Makhoha, 2008). Taita-Taveta County is one of the counties in Kenya that is exposed to the pressures of crime. Several clashes in the county that is led by the youth indicate the delinquency of the youth into criminal activities (Falcetto, 2012).

Strict law enforcement combined with tough criminal justice and sentencing systems, has failed to reduce crime effectively and has led to soaring rates of imprisonment at great cost to governments (Elizabeth & Laurence, 2008). In addition, researchers argue that International evidence indicates that young people, particularly those who are committing first crimes, tend to get involved in a range of crimes rather than specializing in a certain type of crime. In addition, international research shows that young people who commit crime are likely to experience other problems such as bullying, attempted suicide, drug use, lying, hostility and, unprotected sex (Omboto et al., 2013; Akers & Sellers 2008). These are important indicators for identifying at risk youth who may be targeted for early crime prevention programmes.

For many juveniles today, traditional patterns guiding the relationships and transitions between family, school and work are being challenged (Akers & Sellers, 2008). Social relations that ensure a smooth process of socialization are collapsing; lifestyle trajectories are
becoming more varied and less predictable. The restructuring of the labour market, the extension of the maturity gap (the period of dependence of young adults on the family) and, arguably, the more limited opportunities to become an independent adult are all changes influencing relationships with family and friends, educational opportunities and choices, labour market participation, leisure activities and lifestyles (Prior & Paris, 2005).

Juveniles nowadays, regardless of gender, social origin or country of residence, are subject to individual risks but are also being presented with new individual opportunities; some beneficial and some potentially harmful. Quite often, advantage is being taken of illegal opportunities as young people commit various offences, become addicted to drugs, and use violence against their peers. According to Omboto et al. (2013) the minors are not able to distinguish which factors will perpetuate their indulgence into criminal activities. They therefore get involved in criminal activities without their knowledge (Omboto et al. 2013). According to Mooney and Young (2006), studies need to be carried out to identify the context specific factors that promote juvenile involvement in crime. It is in line with this background that this study sought to distinguish the opportunities presented to youths that contribute to involvement of minors into criminal activities.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Crime is a major concern to every nation. More so is the involvement of minors in criminal activities. In Kenya there is increasing cases of children involved in criminal activities indicated by the high number of minors arrested or sentenced due to criminal acts (Omboto et al. 2013). However, although the justice system ensures that the minors are subject to law for any criminal activity, the tough laws have failed to reduce crime effectively. Instead the laws have only led to soaring rates of imprisonment which is at great cost to governments (Ojo, 2012).
The problem of juvenile delinquency is still becoming more complicated and universal, and crime prevention programmes are either unequipped to deal with the present realities or do not exist. Moreover, researchers have neglected this area of study (Mooney & Young, 2006). While Omboto et al. (2013) carried out a study in Kenya to assess the factors influencing youth crime and juvenile delinquency, the study did not focus on juveniles but rather convicted youths in prisons. Another study by Makokha (2008) focused on the male capital offenders in Kamiti Prison. Additionally, Mooney & Young (2006) argues that it is difficult to construct an accurate picture of crime among minors, due to a lack of long-term, self-report studies and changes to legislation on minors involved in crime. There is therefore a knowledge gap on the determinants of juvenile involvement in crime.

Research however revealed that generally, a person's decision to commit crime is based on a range of complex and intersecting social, personal, and environmental factors (Omboto et al. 2013; Jansson, 2007; Visher & Roth, 2010; Ojo, 2012). Becoming familiar with these social and environmental causes, and seeking ways to address them, are at the heart of youth crime prevention and are also the key areas for local government intervention. This study therefore sought to examine the determinants of juvenile involvement in criminal behavior in Taita-Taveta County.

1.3 Research questions

1. What are the factors that promote juveniles involvement in criminal behavior in Taita-Taveta County?
2. What is the level of juvenile involvement in criminal behaviors in TaitaTaveta County?
3. How has juvenile involvement in criminal behaviors impacted on Taita-Taveta County?
1.4 Objectives of the study

1. To examine the factors that promote juveniles involvement in criminal behavior in Taita-Taveta County
2. To find out the level of juvenile involvement in criminal behaviors in Taita-Taveta County
3. To investigate the impact of juveniles involvement in criminal behaviors in Taita-Taveta County

1.5 Research Premises

1. Neglect from parents promotes juvenile involvement in criminal behavior in Taita-Taveta County
2. There is high level of juvenile involvement in criminal behavior in Taita-Taveta county
3. There is insecurity in Taita-Taveta County due to juvenile involvement in criminal behaviors

1.6 Justification and Significance of the study

Crime is a priority concern in Kenya. Of particular concern is the fact that young people make up the largest group of victims of violent crime; and that they are also the majority perpetrators of crime in our cities (Omboto et al. 2013). Indeed, some young people are themselves both victims and perpetrators of crime. Juvenile crime prevention programmes need to find innovative ways of addressing this duality.

Some aspects of children’s behaviors, such as temperament, are established during the first 5 years of life (Elizabeth & Laurence, 2008). This foundation, coupled with children’s exposure to certain risk and protective factors, influences the likelihood of children becoming delinquent at a young age. However, the identification of these multiple risk and protective factors has proven to be a difficult task. Although no magic solutions exist for preventing or correcting child delinquency, identifying risk and protective factors remains essential to
developing interventions to prevent child delinquency from escalating into chronic criminality.

In a bid to ensure social development in the country, as one of the major pillars in the Millennium Development Goals and Kenya’s Vision 2030, the government is putting up measures to deal with crime in the country. Crime among the youth has attracted attention as the government ratified conventions and developed laws to deal with young criminal offenders. The information from this study may help the government in developing more effective strategies in dealing with criminal activities among the minors.

The information from this study might also be useful to the general public in understanding the increase in rate of criminal activities by the minors. The identification of the determinants of minors’ involvement in criminal behaviors may assist the parents and guardians in putting up early measures to curb crime among the minors. Further the information from this study could also assist the community and the society in general in preventing and developing policies to deal with crime.

Crime and ways to deal with crime has received a lot of attention from researchers. However, most studies have focused on the prevention measures of crime among adults (Makoha, 2008). Recently focus have turned on crime among minors as it is generally agreed that preventing criminal behaviors at early age will come a long way in reducing crime in the country. The study on the determinants of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors in Taita-Taveta County will therefore attract researchers and academicians who are in need of educating more and providing solutions to effective and efficient crime prevention and reduction among minors. Hopefully, the information from the study will also form a basis for other researchers and academicians who are willing to carry out studies in the same field in Sub-Saharan Africa.
1.7 Scope and limitations of the study

The study was carried out in Taita-Taveta County. The county was chosen by the researcher following reports in the mainstream media in the month of December 2013 that a large number of youths are involved in crime in the county (Gatonye, 2014). This was witnessed by several clashes in the county that majorly involved the youths. Recent reports by the police also indicate an increase in crime among the youths. Although this is a scourge, according to the police, that is affecting the whole country, studies have mainly focused on counties with major towns such as Nairobi, Kisumu, Nakuru and Mombasa Counties.

The study focused in determining the specific kind of crime activities that juveniles are getting involved in Taita-Taveta County, the level of involvement compared to other parts of the Country, the causes of such involvement and the strategies that can be employed to minimize, control, prevent and eradicate the involvement of juveniles in crime. The study will focus on crime committed within the period 2013 to 2014.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

This chapter therefore starts by presenting the critical review of the literature of the risk factors perpetuating the involvement of minors in criminal activities, the research gaps arising for the literature review, the theoretical framework and finally present the conceptual framework.

2.2 Causes of juvenile involvement in criminal activities

The related literature that has been chosen for this study, providing information on the causes of child delinquency, has been gleaned from many sources. Empirical and theoretical literature is both presented in this discussion to give a lime lights into the causes of child involvement in criminal activities. This is because there is an enormous literature on the determinants of criminal involvement. For purposes of exposition, we adopt a four-part classification scheme: biological; social; criminal justice; and economic. Although this framework is necessarily imperfect, it serves as a useful organizing device for this study.

Ofole (2011) carried out a study in Nigeria to ascertain family background and drug use as determinant of crime type committed by prison inmates in Oyo state and its counseling implications. Descriptive survey design was adopted for the study. Purposive Sampling Technique was used to draw six hundred and seventy-seven (Male= 604, Female= 73) prison inmates with age range of 18 to 49 years and mean age of 29.5 years (SD=7.9) from Agodi prison, Oyo state. Results of Chi-square test show that family background (x2 =443.693, p < 0.05) and types of drug used (x2= 382.031, p < 0.05) have significant relationship with type of crime committed by inmates. The study findings had implications for Counsellors to institute preventive, reformatory and rehabilitative interventions for both in- school and out-of-school youths.
Carmichael and Ward (2001) carried out a study in Britain to assess male unemployment and crimes in England and Wales. The study employed county level data to investigate the relationship between crime and male adult and youth unemployment in Britain. The results of the study indicated that there is a systematic positive relationship between most crime and male unemployment regardless of age. Although this study focused on males only, it acted as a starting point in ascertaining the economic determinants of crime. Their study did not find correlation between age and the probability that one will undertake crime due to unemployment and therefore can be used to explain juvenile involvement in Crime.

Kustepeli and Onel (2006) carried out a study in Turkey to provide an understanding of the factors of aggregate, nonviolent and violent crime categories in Turkey for the period 1965-2009. The determinants of all crime categories are related to selected socio-economic factors. Bounds testing approach to cointegration was employed to test the existence of long-run relationship amongst the variables. The study found out that the major contributors of crime are income and unemployment.

The demographic characteristics of those behind crime in Nigerian cities were given by Ezereonwu (2001). According to him, “most of those who carry out violent crimes associated with lootings and killings are groups of jobless young men who have no means of livelihood. A good number of them are on the streets, unemployed, under-utilized and often attempt to use their youthful vigour negatively (p.7).

Omboto et al (2013) carried out a study in Kenya to determine the factors influencing youth crime and juvenile delinquency. Their paper focused on addressing the factors that influenced involvement in crime among the youth imprisoned at Kamiti Youth Corrective Training centre (Y.C.T.C) which is the only penal institution for young male offenders aged 17 – 21 years in Kenya. The study involved 55 inmates selected by simple random sampling method from a sample frame of 120 inmates. Out of the 55 respondents 31 were aged 17 years while the remaining 24 were aged between 18 and 21 years. The data was collected by the use of
questionnaires and personal interviews. The study found out that some of the major factors promoting juvenile involvement in crime in Kenya include poverty, drug abuse, dysfunctional families and lack of proper education.

Lochner and Moretti (2004) carried out a study in USA on the effect of education on crime among the prison inmates, arrests and self-reports. The study focussed of the effect of education on participation in criminal activity accounting for endogeneity of schooling. The study employed incarceration analysis using census data and changes in state compulsory attendance laws over time as an instrument for schooling. The study found out that the biggest impacts of education are associated with murder, assault, and motor vehicle theft. On self-reported crime the study found out that imprisonment and arrest are caused by changes in criminal behavior and not educational differences. However the study concluded that offering education to students ensures they are involved in their studies and have limited time for involvement in criminal activities.

Machin and Vujic (2006) carried out a study to assess the empirical connections between crime and education, using various data sources from Britain. As with Lochner and Moretti’s (2004) US work, the study recognized the need to ensure that the direction of causation flows from education to crime. Therefore, the study identified the effect of education on participation in criminal activity using changes in compulsory school leaving age (SLA) laws over time to account for the endogeneity of education. Looking at individual-level data on imprisonment from the 2001 Census and cohort-level panel data on offending rates from the Home Office Offenders Index Data (OID) in the period from 1984 to 2002, the study found out that schooling significantly reduces imprisonment rates and property crime offending. The implications of these findings are clear and they show that improving education amongst offenders and potential offenders should be a key policy tool in the drive to reduce crime.
However, education can also increase the earnings from crime and the tools learnt in school may be inappropriately used for criminal activities. In this sense, education may have a positive effect on crime. Levitt and Lochner (2001) carried out a study in Chicago to identify the determinants of juvenile crime. Their study found out that controlling for a number of factors (family background, region, ethnicity, etc.), males with higher mathematic scores commit fewer offences, but those with higher scores on mechanical information tests had increased offence rates.

Education may also be important for teenagers in terms of limiting the opportunity for participating in the criminal activity. It can affect selection of peer groups, which may have positive impacts on future behaviour. In economics, the empirical evidence suggests that peer effects are very strong in criminal decisions. For example, Case and Katz (1991), using the data from the 1989 NBER survey of youths living in low-income Boston neighbourhoods, find that a 10 percent increase in the neighbourhood juvenile crime rate increases the individual probability of becoming a delinquent by 2.3 percent. Using data from the Moving to Opportunity experiment in USA, Ludwig et al. (2001) estimate that relocating families from high- to low-poverty neighbourhoods reduces juvenile arrests for violent offences by 30 to 50 percent of the arrest rate for control groups. Calvó-Armengol and Zenou (2004) study the role of social networks and social structure in facilitating criminal behavior in Mexico. They find that otherwise identical individuals connected through a network can end up with very different equilibrium outcomes – either employed, or isolated criminals or criminals in networks.

Loeber and Loeber (2006) carried out a study in USA on family factors as correlates and predictors of juvenile conduct, problems and delinquency. The study conducted an analysis of longitudinal data and found out that socialization variables, such as lack of parental supervision, parental rejection, and parent-child involvement, are among the most powerful
predictors of juvenile behavior problems and delinquency. Medium strength predictors according to the study included background variables such as parents' marital relations and parental criminality. Weaker predictors are lack of parental discipline, parental health, and parental absence. The study additionally concluded that effects of these factors seem to be about the same for both boys and girls. Finally, the study found out that the presence of one child with delinquency, aggression, or covert conduct problems increases the probability that other children in the family will exhibit these behaviors.

Outside the family, the degree of “social control” exerted by a community is hypothesized to reduce crime (Hirschi 2009; Sampson 2008). For example, a willingness of other adults in a neighborhood to discipline youths, positive role models, and limited amounts of unsupervised youth activity are hypothesized to reduce crime (Wilson 2007). Positive peer group interactions have also been shown to be important predictors of criminal activity (Case and Katz 2001). In Kenya, studies indicate that some youth get into crime due to peer pressure and rebellion against parental authority (Maseko, 2009). Cases of the young offenders whose offences were being in possession of bhang (cannabis sativa) were noted at YCTC and they confessed to have been recruited by friends. This reinforces Erickson (2001) observation that drugs also lead the youth to crime.

In Kenya it is estimated that 50% or the crime committed by youths are often related to drug abuse. There were some youth who claimed to have committed criminal activities under the influence of chang’aa (traditional liquor) and bhang. This confirms Dentler (1997) assertion that addiction to narcotics destroys the moral fibre of the addict; therefore, their character deteriorates and habits become evil. Makhoha (2008) in a study on the factors that influence male delinquents to commit capital offences among Kamiti inmates established that drugs were one of the factors. The cases of unrest in schools and colleges have also been attributed to drug abuse where bhang smoking is common.
Cultural background was also found to be a correlate of criminality. Studies in the USA based on official statistics show that blacks have higher arrest rates than whites, while the findings from self-report studies are less clear (Elliott, Huizinga & Menard 2009). In Australia, official statistics show that young Aboriginal people are consistently over represented in the juvenile justice system. For example, in NSW Aboriginals account for 1.9 per cent of the general youth population, yet they account for 16 per cent of Children’s Court appearances and 25 per cent of the youth held in NSW detention centres (Freeman 2006).

Various observations further indicate that most of the youth are in crime because of poverty, which drove them into criminal acts for survival. According to study carried out in Kenya at the KYTC, over 70%; more than 40 out of 55 of the inmates were poor or came from poor family backgrounds based on where they lived, property ownership and the types of offences committed. For instance, some boys indicate that they had run from home to beg for survival in the streets because they lacked basic needs. In those streets they latter committed crimes to survive, they were involved in petty offences like stealing goods or properties whose value were less than Kshs 500 (Omboto et al., 2013).

2.3 Gaps in the Literature Review

An extensive amount of research has been conducted on the risk factors underlying juvenile delinquency, mostly in the USA and Britain. This leaves a gap of knowledge on the risk factors to involvement of minors in criminal activities. This study seeks to fill this gap of knowledge by basing the location of the study in the coastal parts of Kenya which is a developing country.

Studies on delinquency have employed a variety of survey methods and study populations, including both official records and self-report surveys, and cross-sectional and longitudinal studies. Some studies have focused on initiation into delinquency, while many have focused
on serious delinquency or chronic offenders. A wide range of factors, including developmental factors, substance use and association with delinquent peers have been found to be correlates of juvenile involvement in crime. There is much stronger evidence for some of these factors than for others and some of these factors are widely thought to have a causal influence on juvenile involvement in crime, while the causal status of other factors remains unclear. To be able generate effective measures in dealing with crime among minors, there is need to identify and define the risk factors with clarity and in particular context. Different environments pose different magnitudes to the risk factors. Since most of the studies in the literature review were not carried out in Kenya, there is a gap of knowledge on the risk factors to juvenile involvement in crime in Kenya. This study will fill this gap of knowledge by assessing determinants of juvenile crime in Taita-Taveta County.

2.4 Theoretical Framework

Criminal behaviours are explained by several theories. Among the relevant theories, is the self-control theory, deterrence theory and social learning theory.

2.4.1 Self-Control Theory

Gottfredson and Hirschi’s (1990) General Theory of Crime, now known as self-control theory, is one of the most popular crime theories (Tibbetts & Gibson, 2002). The key component of their theory is low self-control. Low self-control is the time-stable individual difference that regulates behaviour. Individuals with low self-control are the probable result of ineffective or poor parenting practices early in life-before the age of eight. Specifically, parents that are not effective or consistent in forming an emotional attachment with their child will make the task of monitoring their child’s behaviour difficult. The difficulty of monitoring the child’s behaviour reduces the probability that the parents will recognize their child’s deviant behaviour. This will reduce the opportunity for parents to apply non-corporal punishment for deviant behaviour. Thus, these individuals are more likely to prefer simple
and easy tasks; prefer physical rather than mental activities; prefer risky behaviours; prefer to focus on themselves; and prefer not to control their temper. That is, these individuals are likely to have low self-control and be more likely to disregard the long-term effects of their decisions for themselves and for others (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990).

With this disregard, low self-control manifests itself in several ways. One way is in the form of criminal behaviour. For Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990), crime is an act of force or fraud that an individual pursues to satisfy their interests. Crimes are attractive to those with low self-control because crime shares many of the characteristics of low self-control. For instance, crimes are risky, immediately gratifying, easy and simple to perform (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). Thus, low self-control should have a link with juvenile involvement in criminal activities. That is, juveniles with low self-control may not be able to delay their criminal behaviours. The individual with low self-control is likely to get involved in criminal behaviour because they find it simple to perform activities related to crime.

2.4.2 Deterrence Theory

Siegel (2004) distinguishes between two theories namely general and specific deterrence. General deterrence holds that people make a cost benefit analysis before embarking on criminal activities. Where the benefits outweigh the costs, people are more likely to indulge in criminal activities. When punishments are severe, certain and speedy, people may opt not to indulge in criminal activities. Special deterrence is concerned with known criminals and the severity of punishment, assuming that if punishments are severe, known criminals will not repeat their criminal activity.

Winfree and Abadinski (2003) make a distinction between formal deterrence and informal deterrence. They hold that formal deterrence view people as rational beings, able to differentiate between good and bad, pain and pleasure, and ultimately making informed
decisions about their actions. Informal deterrence believe that informal social groups can play an important role in reducing crimes, as people care about what their close relatives and friends think about their actions, than do what the court and jury have to say.

The researcher has observed that deterrence theories are concerned with the punishment given to potential criminals for the purpose of deterring them from indulging in criminal activities. They are also concerned with preventing a recurrence of the criminal activities of known criminals by ensuring that punishment is effected with certainty and timely (Siegel, 2004). These theories may be applicable to juveniles from the perspective of influences of close relatives on the patient. Punishment may be very effective especially to the young ones who get initiated into criminal activities without knowing that they are breaking the law and the result could be a severe punishment.

2.4.3 Social learning Theory

Social learning theory is constructed on the belief that people are not born with the ability to act violently, rather they learn to be aggressive through their life experiences (Siegel, 2004). Social learning theory believes that mental or physical traits can predispose a person to violence, although activating that person’s violence will rely on factors in the society. Siegel, (2004) supports this by stating that “The specific forms that aggressive behaviour takes, the frequency with which it is expressed, the situation in which it is displayed, and the specific targets selected for attack are largely determined by social learning”. The learning process, also called behaviour modelling, is dependent on three sources namely: family members; environmental experiences; and mass media. The learning process which operates in the context of social structure, interaction and situation produces both conforming and deviating behaviours (Akers, 2002).
An individual may therefore learn what conforms to society or what deviates the societal norms from the family, environment and the mass media. Akers (2002) also state that deviant and criminal behaviour is learned and modified, that is, acquired, performed, repeated, maintained and changed through the same process as the conforming behaviour. The difference is said to be confined to the content, direction and outcome of the learned behaviour. Siegel (2004) proposes the following four factors that may contribute to aggressive or violent behaviour: a) an event that heightens arousal: an example is a frustrating or provoking act such as an assault or verbal abuse; b) aggressive skills: includes aggressive skills learned from observing others or from the mass media; c) expected outcomes: the assumption that the aggression will be rewarded. Examples include, assuming that one will have improved self-esteem, financial gain, reduction in one’s tension and praise from others; and, d) consistency of behaviour with values: the belief obtained from observing other people acting aggressively, that it is appropriate and justified for one to behave aggressively.

The researcher is of the opinion that social learning theory assumes that an individual has the responsibility to exercise some form of choice in what they learn. This is so in that the theory holds that the learning process of both good and bad behaviour is the same, the only difference is the direction of the learning process. Depending on their age and the people they interact with, juveniles are also capable of learning from their life experiences. Their behaviour may also be strongly influenced by factors in the family, the environment and the mass media. This theory is relevant to the current study as it looks at various factors contributing to the learned criminal behaviour.

2.5 Conceptual Framework

A research conceptual framework is the basic structure on which a study is built and, inter alia, it provides the grounds for research (Bell, 2005). The framework also facilitates
understanding of the study’s findings for practitioners and researchers. In fact, the construct is the research study's frame of reference and it provides a satisfactory foundation on which the study stands. The framework supports the research problem, the questions arising from the problem, and thus leads to the formation of hypotheses.

The objective of this study is to investigate the factors affecting juvenile involvement in criminal activities in Taita-Taveta County. The study’s conceptual framework therefore provides the means to demonstrate the aspects contributed by environmental, economic and social factors that will eventually improve or deteriorate juveniles’ participation into criminal behaviors, as well as considering other factors that have influence on the relationship between the identified factors promoting involvement into criminal behavior and the actual act of the juveniles getting involved in criminal activities.

In the literature on involvement in criminal behaviors, conceptually and in practice, three causation factors are generally identified, namely biological factors, social factors and economic factors (Akers & Sellers, 2008). Biological factors entail inherited genes, evolutionary factors, sex orientation and low intelligence and high discount rates. Social factors promoting criminal behaviors include; parental supervision or rejection, family structure, social control exerted by community, positive peer group interactions, substance use and cultural background. Finally, involvement in criminal behaviors is also perpetuated by economic factors that include Income inequality, poverty, employment opportunities and training.

However, the relationship between the risk factors and their ability to push juveniles to get involved in criminal activities or behaviors is controlled by the existing rules and regulations of the land. Therefore juveniles might be exposed to risk factors to criminal behaviors but fail to get involved in criminal behaviors because of the existing government policies and
regulations and criminal laws (Akers & Sellers, 2008). The relationship between risk factors and juvenile involvement in criminal behaviors is shown in figure 2.1 below.

### Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biological factors</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Inherited genes</td>
<td>Involvement of juveniles in criminal activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Evolutionary factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Sex orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Low intelligence and high discount rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social factors</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Parental supervision or rejection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Family structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Social control exerted by community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Positive peer group interactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Substance use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Cultural background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic factors</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Income inequality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Poverty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Employment opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2014)

**Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework**
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research methodology of the study. It highlights the research design, the target study population, the sampling procedure and the sample, data sources, data collection instruments and procedures as well as the data analysis techniques that were employed to put meaning into the data. It also outlines the presentation techniques that were used.

3.2 Research Design

Coopers & Schindler (2006) defines research design as the blue print for the collection measurement and the analysis of data. A cross-sectional descriptive research design was used in this study to assess the determinants of juvenile involvement in criminal activities in Taita-Taveta County. The study was cross-sectional since the data was collected at one particular time across the residents of Taita-Taveta County (Schurink, 2009). Descriptive research is designed to obtain pertinent and precise information of the phenomena (Lokesh-Koul, 2004). This design is appropriate for this study since the study aims at analyzing and describing the current determinants to juveniles’ involvement in criminal activities in Taita-Tavata County.

3.3 Location of the study

The study will be carried out in taita-Taveta County. Taita-Taveta County is located in the Coastal region of Kenya, it borders Makueni, Kitui and Tana River counties to the North, Kilifi and Kwale Counties to the East, Republic of Tanzania to the South and South-west, and Kajiado County to the North West. The county lies approximately 200 km northwest of Mombasa and 360 km southeast of Nairobi. The main economic activities in the county include sisal farming and mining of minerals such as iron ore, asbestos, chalk and limestone. The county also houses popular tourist destinations in Kenya such as Mzima springs and the
Tsavo East and Tsavo West National Park. The map of the county is attached in Appendix III.

3.4 Target Population

The target population for this study included all juveniles in Taita-Taveta County, correction centers, police stations, administrative centers and children rights advocacy centers who have interacted or offered assistance to juvenile aged 18 years and below involved in criminal activities. The county according to the 2009 census has a total population of 284,657.

3.5 Sampling technique and sample size

3.5.1 Sampling Techniques

The respondents from the Taita-Taveta County correction centers (Voi Prisons and Manyani Maximum Prison), police stations, administrative centers and children rights advocacy centers was selected purposively. Purposive sampling was employed since it allowed the researcher select only those individuals who were able to provide in-depth information on the subject of the study. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) describe purposive sampling as “a sampling technique that allows a researcher to use cases that have the required information with respect to the objectives of his or her study.” Kombo and Tromp (2006), observe that “the strength of purposive sampling depends on selection of information rich cases.” They inform that it is used when the population contains few relevant cases as is the case of the respondents who were available at one particular time to participate in the study. The respondents were therefore handpicked based on their informativeness and if they possess the required characteristics in relation to the objectives of the study.

Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) observe that most qualitative and quantitative studies with a focus on in-depth information as opposed to making generalization use non probability sampling. This study therefore employed purposive sampling, which is a non-probabilistic
sampling method, since it focused on collecting in-depth information on the current determinants to juveniles’ involvement in criminal activities in Taita-Tavata County. The Respondents however were first divided into their respective groups: respondents from police stations, administrative centers, children correction centers (Voi Prisons and Manyani Maximum Prison) and organizations advocating for children rights. The specific respondents from each group were then selected purposively based on the likelihood of being information rich in relation to the subject of the study.

3.5.2 Sample Size

The researcher selected a small sample size of 50 respondents composed of Administration officers, regular officers, officers from directorate of criminal investigation, officials in administrative centers, officials in children correction centers and organizations advocating for children rights. This is because although the respondents are drawn from different groups, their experiences in juveniles’ involvement in crime, which is the interest of this study, are likely to be the same. Additionally, the researcher intends to select a small number of respondents because given the qualitative nature of the study, having a large sample may make it difficult to extract rich data. The sample size will also be considered because having a very small sample size may make it difficult to achieve data saturation.

Moreover, as Powell and Connaway (2004) suggest, purposive sampling requires fewer cases to achieve a specified degree of accuracy. Rohillo (2010) further point out that sample size might be constrained by cost in terms of time and money. In view of all these considerations, the researcher used a smaller sample size of 50 respondents.

This sample was considered appropriate as the variability of the perceptions on the determinants to juveniles’ involvement in criminal activities is usually deemed to be low. This sample helped to reduce the time of study as it facilitated faster collection and analysis.
of data. The sample also significantly reduced the research costs as it was confined to a smaller manageable sample which was handled by fewer project assistant researchers who were easier to train and supervise.

**Key Informants**

A sample of 30 respondents from the police stations, administrative centers and organizations advocating for children rights was purposively sampled and interviewed to triangulate the data. These included 5 prison warders in the correction centers, 5 policemen in the police stations, 5 administrators in the organizations advocating for children rights, 5 chiefs (administrative leaders) and 10 juvenile in the correction centers. Purposive sampling was used to select administrators and leaders since the researcher was interested in obtaining data from specific individuals who was having the knowledge and information on children involvement in criminal behaviors thus giving the study its internal validity (Ahuja 2005).

**3.6 Research Instruments**

The data collection tool used for the study was questionnaires to obtain data from primary sources and a document review and analysis for secondary sources. These tools were selected after carefully considering the nature of the data to be collected, the target population, the time frame and the objectives/ research questions of the study.

**Questionnaires**

Questionnaires were used in this study since it has the advantages of relative ease of administration and lower expense, high return rate and reliability. Questionnaires were used to collect data from police officers, officials in administrative centers, officials in children correction centers and organizations advocating for children rights. The questionnaire was semi-structured consisting of both open-ended and close-ended questions. The questionnaires were very simple but comprehensive thus the respondents did not experience any difficulties
completing them. The questionnaire sought to collect background information of the respondents which included the respondent’s age, gender and education background and key considerations they take into account in juveniles’ involvement in criminal activities.

**Interview guides**

Interview guides were used to collect information from the selected juveniles in the correction centers, administrative bodies and the organization defending children rights.

**3.7 Instrument Validity and Reliability**

**3.7.1 Instrument validity**

According to Robinson (2002), validity is the degree to which result obtained from the analysis of the data actually represents the phenomenon under study. Validity was ensured by having objective questions included in the questionnaire. To ensure content validity of the instruments, the researcher carried out a pilot study. A discussion involving a youth counseling expert was also sought to review the instruments. This ensured that the content addresses the intended response and also avoid ambiguity.

**3.7.2 Instrument reliability**

Reliability refers to a measure of the degree to which research instruments yield consistent results (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). A test and re-test was conducted where randomly selected respondents were exposed to the tools of data collection. This was used to ensure the research is accurate, correct and meaningful. The questionnaire was pre-tested through a pilot test.

**3.8 Data Collection Procedures**

Data collection techniques refer to the protocol that ensures that data collection tools are applied in an effective manner. The researcher requested for the details of the respondents from the relevant police stations, administrative centers, correction centers and local
organizations dealing with children rights advocacy in Taita-Taveta County. This was for the purpose of facilitating sampling. The researcher visited and interacted with respondents to explain the purpose of the study and build rapport. The researcher then personally administered the questionnaire. The researcher collected the data within a period of five (5days) to provide ample time for the respondents to access the data collection instruments. The completed questionnaires were hand scored.

3.9 Data Analysis

On receipt of the completed questionnaires, the collected data was checked for errors in responses, omissions, exaggerations and biases. Data analysis and presentation was both qualitative and quantitative in nature. Qualitative data obtained from questionnaires was edited/cleaned and classified into classes or groups with common characteristics or themes. The content within the themes was then analyzed guided by the research objectives. Quantitative data was analyzed and interpreted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). All the quantitative data was entered and verified after effective coding. Data was scrutinized in relation to the objective of the study, otherwise with a potential abundance data; vast numbers of irrelevance summaries would be produced. Checking of Inconsistencies, anomalies, missing values, outliers (say data cleaning) was done in SPSS. Descriptive statistics was used for the analysis of the collected data, and this included parameters such as measures of central tendencies and the measure of dispersion. The descriptive statistics aimed at identifying the pattern of the data and consistency of the responses in each of the hypothesized risk factors enhancing involvement in crime. Results were then presented in tables and graphs with emphasis on graph analysis.

3.10 Ethical and Legal Considerations

Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2007), view research ethics as the appropriateness of one’s behavior in relation to the rights of the subjects of one’s study or those affected by it. They
rightly point out that research ethics will inevitably be affected by the broader social norms of behavior. The researcher adhered to ethical research behaviour by: Seeking permission from relevant authorities to carry out the research; Assuring respondents of confidentiality and privacy of data collected and upholding that confidentiality; Seeking informed consent for participation in the study; Assuring respondents that the results of the study will only be used for academic research purpose; and avoiding research plagiarism and fraud.
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

This study sought to examine the determinants of juvenile involvement in criminal behavior in Taita-Taveta County. The study was guided by three specific objectives including; to examine the factors that promote juveniles involvement in criminal behavior in Taita-Taveta County; to find out the level of juvenile involvement in criminal behaviors in Taita-Taveta County; to investigate the impact of juveniles involvement in criminal behaviors in Taita-Taveta County. The study targeted a sample size of 50 respondents from which 49 filled in and returned the questionnaires making a response rate of 98%. Twenty interviews involving 3 prison warders in the correction centers, 3 policemen in the police stations, 3 administrators in the organizations advocating for children rights, 2 chiefs (administrative leaders) and 9 juvenile in the correction centers. The characteristics of the respondents sampled are presented in the first part of this chapter. The second part involves analysis on the determinants of juvenile involvement in criminal behaviour in Taita-Taveta County, Kenya.

4.1 Profile of the sampled respondents

According to the data collected, Table 4.1 presents the gender of the respondents who participated in the study. Majority of the respondents (63%) were male while the rest 37% were females. This is an indication that both genders were involved in the study, thus the findings of the study did not suffer from gender biasness.
Table 4.1: Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age of the respondents

Majority of the respondents (31%) were aged between 26 to 35 years while the minorities were above 45 years of age as shown in Table 4.2. These results show that the study sample was sensitive to the age of the respondents capturing opinions across all the age groups.

Table 4.2: Age in years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 – 25 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 35 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 – 45 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Position

The position held by the respondents can affect their opinion. This section sought to establish the position of the respondents who took part in the study. Majority of the respondents were police officers (65%) while 10% were Local administrators (e.g. chief, village elder etc) and the remainder 24% were members of local organisations supporting the rights of children.
Table 4.3: Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police officer</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local administration members (e.g. chief, village elder etc)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of local organisations supporting the rights of children</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Causes of juvenile involvement in criminal behaviors

To evaluate causes of juvenile involvement in criminal behaviors respondents were presented with twelve statements on five point likert scale and asked to rate their level of agreement with each statement. Figure 4.1 displays the findings in percentages of cases for each statement.
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Figure 4.1: Causes of juveniles involvement in criminal behaviors
Almost half of the respondents (47%) agreed that low intelligence and high discount rates of some youngsters could lead to juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors. The quality of parenting was agreed upon by 62% of the respondents as a cause of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors. These findings are in agreement with those of Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber (2006) who observed that family factors including poor parental supervision, parental rejection of the child, lack of involvement with the child, and inconsistent, erratic discipline are amongst the strongest predictors of delinquency among the youth.

On the other hand 72% of the respondents did not support erratic/harsh discipline at school or home being a cause of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors. These findings contradicted those of Daag (2010) and Sampson and Laub (2009) who concluded that there was a strong link between erratic/harsh discipline, lack of adequate supervision and juveniles’ criminal involvement.

More than half of the respondents (53%) agreed that lack of adequate supervision could be attributed to juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors. Another 59% of the respondents agreed that rejection by the mother/father can cause juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors. Lack of parents’ involvement with the child was supported by 52% of the respondents as a cause of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors. Maltreatment of children including neglect and abuse and youth homelessness was disagreed upon by 56% of the respondents. These findings support those of McCarthy & Hagan (2002) who reported that other family factors such as socio-economic status, parental and sibling criminality, maltreatment of children including neglect and abuse and youth homelessness have been shown to be predictors of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors.

Peer pressure as a cause of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors was supported by 55% of the respondents. More than half of the respondents (58%) agreed that rebellion
against parental authority could be attributed to juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors. These findings are in agreement with those of Maseko (2009) who concluded that some youth get into crime due to peer pressure and rebellion against parental authority.

Substance use and income inequality was disagreed by 66% and 78% respectively of the respondents as a cause of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors. However, most of the respondents (64%) agreed that poverty was a cause of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors. This reinforces Erickson (2001) observation that drugs also lead the youth to crime. The findings also support those of Wish & Johnson (2006) who reported that numerous studies of offenders and drug users both adult and juvenile, as well as representative studies such as the USA National Youth Survey indicate that as drug use increases so does criminal behaviour. Findings of Makhoha (2008) in a study on the factors that influence male delinquents to commit capital offences among Kamiti inmates which established that drugs was one of the factors that was supported. These findings also reinforce those of Soares (2009) who observed that international comparisons have repeatedly found a strong link between income inequality and crime rates.

Cross-tabulation table was developed for opinions on causes of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors against respondents’ position to draw the association between the two. Chi-square test was used to determine the significance of the observed difference in causes of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors factors and respondents position. The test measured the null hypothesis that; there is no association between respondent perceived causes of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors and their position. A p-value less than 5% indicated that there was sufficient evidence to associate the likelihood of perceived causes of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors and respondents position.

The statements on causes of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors were on a likert
scale with responses ranging from 1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree. The responses were averaged per statement. An average closer to 5 indicated strong agreement while one close to 1 indicated strong disagreement with the statements. Table 4.4 below shows the relationship between causes of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors against respondents’ position.

**Table 4. 4: Causes of juveniles involvement in criminal behaviors by respondents position**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Position</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low intelligence and high discount rates of some youngsters</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>49 45.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of parenting</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>49 4.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erratic/harsh discipline at school/home</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>49 54.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of adequate supervision</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>49 3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection by the mother/father</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>49 4.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of parents involvement with the child</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>49 4.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltreatment of children including neglect and abuse and youth homelessness</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>49 40.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer pressure</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>49 4.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebellion against parental authority</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>49 3.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance use</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>49 4.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income inequality</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>49 4.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty (lack of basic needs)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>49 4.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The police were observed to agree more with the statements that low intelligence and high discount rates of some youngsters was a cause of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors. This association was significant with a $\chi^2$ (df=4, p<.001)=45.7. The police disagreed with erratic/harsh discipline at school/home as a cause of juveniles’ involvement in
criminal behavior compared to the other categories of respondents. This association was significant with a $\chi^2$ (df=4, $p<.001$)=54.8. On the other hand the police disagreed with maltreatment of children including neglect and abuse and youth homelessness as a cause of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors compared to the other categories of respondents. This association was significant with a $\chi^2$ (df=4, $p<.001$)=40.6.

Results from interviews showed that majority of the juveniles belonged to poor socio-economic background with low parental education and income. However, from data records of most juvenile their families were not victims of criminal record, these children were in conflict with law for easy money, peer influence and pressure from the parents to have income of their own.

Respondent from Voi sub-county a police officer (code 010) indicated that “The peer group had significant impact on the juveniles not only in terms of amount of time spent with friends, but also in committing any offence or acts that were in conflict with law.”

4.3 Level of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviour

To assess juveniles’ involvement in criminal behavior, respondents were presented with five statements on likert scale and asked to rate their level of agreement with each. The results, in Figure 4.2 showed that majority of the respondents were either neutral or disagreed with the statements; there was increase in theft and robbery behaviour among the juveniles.
Figure 4.2: Level of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behavior in the past one year

Most of the respondents (65%) disagreed with rise in use of arms in political and communal conflicts involving juveniles. Most of the respondents (75%) were either neutral or disagreed with the statements that there was rise in Political thuggery by juveniles. Increase in Police harassment, intimidation and arrest of juveniles was disagreed by most of the respondents (83%). However, most of the respondents (55%) agreed with the statement that there was increase in theft and robbery behaviour among the young children. These findings support those of Jansson (2007), who reported that since the inception of a justice system that ensures young law breakers are dealt with in the same standard as adults reports indicate that the levels of crime has decreased and have been stable since 2005/06.

Cross-tabulation table was developed for opinions on level of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviour against respondent’s position to draw the association between the two. Chi-square test was used to determine the significance of the observed difference in level of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviour, factors and respondent’s position. The test measured the null hypothesis that there is no association between respondent perceived level
of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behavior and their position. A p-value less than 5% indicated that there was sufficient evidence to associate the likelihood of perceived level of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behavior and respondent’s position.

The statements on level of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behavior were on a likert scale with responses ranging from 1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree. The responses were averaged per statement. An average closer to 5 indicated strong agreement while one close to 1 indicated strong disagreement with the statements.

Table 4.5 shows the relationship between level of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behavior against respondent’s position.

**Table 4. 5: Level of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behavior by respondent’s position**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Position</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in theft and robbery among the juveniles</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rise in use of arms in political and communal conflicts involving juveniles</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rise in Political thuggery by juveniles</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Police harassment, intimidation and arrest of juveniles</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;.001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Respondents who seemed to agree with the statements that there is increase in theft and robbery among the juveniles were in police sub group. This association was significant with a \( \chi^2 \) (df=4, p<.001)=45.1. The police were also observed to disagree with increase in police harassment, intimidation and arrest of juveniles compared to the other respondents. This association was significant with a \( \chi^2 \) (df=4, p<.001)=29.1.
4.4 Impact of juvenile involvement in criminal behaviors

Respondents were asked in an open ended question to state how juvenile involvement in criminal behaviors impacted on Taita-Taveta County. All the responses on how juvenile involvement in criminal behaviors impacted on Taita-Taveta County were classified into two themes; insecurity and lack of development. According to the respondents, where there is high rate of crime there is no normal life. Majority of the respondents were of the view that crime is a social problem that affects the lives of people, lowers the dignity of people, it affects people psychologically, physically, emotionally, economically and socially. As a result high levels of crime is likely to affect community development.

One of the respondents from Mwatate sub-county a member of local organisations supporting the rights of children (code 012) said that “Criminal justice system has three interrelated departments (that is police, justice and correctional services). If these three departments are not effective and efficient enough, crime always go up and affect any social services in the community.”

A respondent from Wundanyi sub-county a local administrator (code 009) reported that “Some police officers are corrupt and accept bribery from juvenile criminal guardians which escalates crime thus affecting any community development.”

These research findings support those of Hirschi (2009) who observed that in relation to crime there will be no sustainable development if there is high rate of crime.

4.5 Strategies to minimize juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors

To assess strategies to minimize juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors, respondents were presented with a list of six items on a five point likert scale and asked to rate their agreement with each statement. Results are displayed in figure 4.3.
Most of the respondents (76%) supported constant presence of police in the neighborhood and the establishment of more police stations in juveniles’ prone areas. Close to half of the respondents (48%) supported constant presence of well-equipped and trained vigilante groups to deal with juveniles. Preventing the free usage of small arms/weapons by members of the community was supported by almost all of the respondents (85%). Most of the respondents (72%) were not for the idea of allowing people to use personal licensed guns. Creation of training/job opportunities for idle youngsters to prevent them from engaging in crime and violence was supported by 90% of the respondents while 59% agreed to presence of privately-owned and community established vigilantes in the neighborhood. These findings support those of Wilson (2007) who observed that a willingness of other adults in a neighborhood to discipline youths, positive role models, and limited amounts of unsupervised youth activity are hypothesized to reduce crime.
Cross-tabulation table was developed for opinions on strategies to minimize juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors against respondents position to draw the association between the two. Chi-square test was used to determine the significance of the observed difference in strategies to minimize juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors and respondents position. The test measured the null hypothesis that there is no association between respondent perceived strategies to minimize juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors and their position. A p-value less than 5% indicated that there was sufficient evidence to associate the likelihood of perceived strategies to minimize juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors and respondents position.

The statements on strategies to minimize juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors were on a likert scale with responses ranging from 1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree. The responses were averaged per statement. An average closer to 5 indicated strong agreement while one close to 1 indicated strong disagreement with the statements. Table 4.6 shows the relationship between strategies to minimize juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors against respondents position.
Table 4.6: Strategies to minimize juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors by respondents’ position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Position</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>χ² df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant presence of police in the neighbourhood and the establishment of more police stations in juveniles prone areas</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant presence of well equipped and trained vigilante groups to deal with juveniles</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>&lt;.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing the free usage of small arms/weapons by members of the community</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing people to use personal licensed guns</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>&lt;.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of training/job opportunities for idle youngsters to prevent them from engaging in crime and violence</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of privately-owned and community established vigilantes in the neighborhood</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>.021*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Other respondents (Local administration members (e.g. chief, village elder etc) and member of local organisations supporting the rights of children) were observed to agree more on constant presence of well equipped and trained vigilante groups to deal with juveniles in juveniles prone areas and presence of privately-owned and community established vigilantes in the neighborhood as a strategy to minimize juveniles involvement in criminal behaviors. This associations were significant with a χ² (df=4, p<.001)=20.6 and χ² (df=4, p<.001)=.021. On the other hand, police supported the strategy of allowing people to use personal licensed guns more than their other counterparts. This associations was significant with a χ² (df=4, p<.001)=29.1.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter gives the summary of findings, conclusion and the recommendations of the research study based on the findings from the collected data.

5.2 Summary of findings
Almost half of the respondents agreed that low intelligence and high discount rates of some youngsters could lead to juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors. The quality of parenting was agreed upon by most of the respondents as a cause of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors. More than half of the respondents agreed that lack of adequate supervision could be attributed to juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors. On the other hand majority of the respondents did not support erratic/harsh discipline at school or home being a cause of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors. Most of the respondents agreed that rejection by the mother can cause juveniles involvement in criminal behaviors. Lack of parents’ involvement with the child was supported by most of the respondents as a cause of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors. Maltreatment of children including neglect and abuse and youth homelessness was disagreed upon by more than half of the respondents. Peer pressure as a cause of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors was supported by most of the respondents. More than half of the respondents agreed that rebellion against parental authority could be attributed to juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors. Substance use and income inequality were agreed by majority of the respondents as a cause of juveniles involvement in criminal behaviors. Most of the respondents agreed that poverty was a cause of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviors.

The findings of this study showed that majority of the respondents were either neutral or disagreed with the statements that there was increase in theft and robbery among the
juveniles. Most of the respondents disagreed with rise in use of arms in political and communal conflicts involving juveniles. Most of the respondents were either neutral or disagreed with the statements that there was rise in Political thuggery among juveniles. Increase in Police harassment, intimidation and arrest of juveniles was disagreed by most of the respondents. However, most of the respondents agreed with the statement that there was increase in theft and robbery.

All the responses on how juvenile involvement in criminal behaviors impacted on Taita-Taveta County were classified into two themes; insecurity and lack of development. According to the respondents, where there is high rate of crime there is no normal life. Majority of the respondents were of the view that crime is a social problem that affects the lives of people, lowers the dignity of people, it affects people psychologically, physically, emotionally, economically and socially. As a result high levels of crime is likely to affect community development.

Most of the respondents supported constant presence of police in the neighborhoods and the establishment of more police stations in juveniles’ prone areas. Close to half of the respondents supported constant presence of well-equipped and trained vigilante groups to deal with juveniles. Preventing the free usage of small arms/weapons by members of the community was supported by almost all of the respondents. Most of the respondents were not for the idea of allowing people to use personal licensed guns. Creation of training/job opportunities for idle youngsters to prevent them from engaging in crime and violence was supported by almost all of the respondents while a good number agreed to presence of privately-owned and community established vigilantes in the neighborhood.

5.3 Conclusions
The results revealed that the main causes of juveniles involvement in criminal behaviors include; the quality of parenting; lack of adequate supervision; rejection by the mother/father,
lack of parents involvement with the child, maltreatment of children including neglect and abuse and youth homelessness; rebellion against parental authority, income inequality and poverty.

The findings of this study showed that there was increase in theft and robbery among the juveniles. However, rise in use of arms in political and communal conflicts involving juveniles was not reported. On the other hand there was a decrease in police harassment, intimidation and arrest of juveniles.

Crime among the juveniles was reported as a social problem that affects the lives of people, lowers their dignity, affects people psychologically, physically, emotionally, economically and socially, thus affecting community development.

The proposed strategies to curb juveniles involvement in criminal behaviors included; constant presence of police in the neighborhoods and the establishment of more police stations in juveniles prone areas; preventing the free usage of small arms/weapons by members of the community, creation of training/job opportunities for idle youngsters to prevent them from engaging in crime and violence; and presence of privately-owned and community established vigilantes in the neighborhood.

5.4 Recommendations

The following measures are suggestions that can help reduce the rise in the number of the young people involved in criminal activities;

i. Police-community relations: Improve the image of the police. The police play a major role in securing the community. However, police performance would increase if a good relationship with the community is created.
ii. Increased foot patrol- Visibility of the police is deterrent to criminal activity. Juvenile prone areas need to be patrolled day and night. However acknowledgment must be made of the serious manpower and resources shortage faced by the police force.

iii. The establishment of the community policing forums: Community policing forums entail voluntary involvement on the part of the community in policing activity, and the creation of a community officer who acts as a direct link between the police and the community officer not only serve to combat crime but also solve the particular problems experienced in the community.

iv. The parents must also take responsibility over their children up to the time when they would be in the position to stand on their own. This involves providing for their children’s material needs and giving them moral guidance. Many parents have forfeited the former role and have left it to the movies and advertising agencies to run their children’s lives. There must be a realisation that in adulthood, values come from the family, religious and education background. Therefore, parenthood should be taken more seriously thus parents must not be too busy to know and monitor the activities of their teenage sons and daughters.

v. Education and training have a role in juvenile criminality as observed earlier; subsequently, the Kenyan government deserves every support from local and international organizations as well as individuals to sustain the constitutional free basic education, and ensure its quality.

5.5 Areas for further research

This study will provide a way for future investigation on determinants of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviour in different environments and other factors that will be proved to cause juveniles involvement in criminal behaviors.
The limitation of this study is that it analyzes only one County in Kenya. Hence, future research should examine the determinants of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviour with a larger sample incorporating several Counties in Kenya.

Whereas this research has relied on quantitative approaches to examine the determinants of juveniles’ involvement in criminal behaviour, an in-depth analysis of individual responses can generate useful inductive information and provide a richer understanding of the factors important in predicting determinants of juvenile involvement in criminal behaviour.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE

INTRODUCTION

I am Christopher Mwanjala, a student at Kenyatta University pursuing a master’s degree in Public Policy and Administration. I’m carrying out a study to establish and better understand the determinants of juvenile involvement in criminal behaviour in Taita-Taveta County.

Kindly respond to the following questions as honestly as possible. All information collected in this study is purely for academic purposes and will be treated with confidentiality. Your answers will be grouped with the answers of other people like you and will not make any reference to your names. You are free to participate only if you wish. Thank you for your cooperation.

Part A: Demographics

1. What is your age group:
   a. 18 – 25 years [1]
   b. 26 – 35 years [2]
   c. 36 – 45 years [3]
   d. 46 – 55 years [4]
   e. Above 55 [5]

2. Sex
   a. Male [1]
   b. Female [2]

3. Position
   a. Police officer [1]
   b. Local administration members (e.g. chief, village elder etc) [2]
c. Member of local organisations supporting the rights of children [3]

**Part B: Level of juveniles involvement in criminal behavior**

4. In the past five years how do you agree with the following statements regarding juveniles involvement in criminal behaviors (where 5- strongly agree, 4- Agree, 3- Neutral, 2- Disagree, 1- Strongly disagree)

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Increase in theft and robbery among the juveniles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Rise in use of arms in political and communal conflicts involving juveniles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Rise in Political thuggery by juveniles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Increase in Police harassment, intimidation and arrest of juveniles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Increase in theft and robbery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part C: Causes of juveniles involvement in criminal behaviors**

5. How do you agree with the following statements regarding Causes of juveniles involvement in criminal behaviors (where 5- strongly agree, 4- Agree, 3- Neutral, 2- Disagree, 1- Strongly disagree)

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Low intelligence and high discount rates of some youngsters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>The quality of parenting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Erratic/harsh discipline at school or home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Lack of adequate supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Rejection by the mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Lack of parents involvement with the child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Maltreatment of children including neglect and abuse and youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebellion against parental authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income inequality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Please state others causes of juveniles involvement in criminal behaviors not mentioned above

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Part D: Strategies to minimize juveniles involvement in criminal behaviors

7. How do you agree with the following strategies to minimize juveniles involvement in criminal behaviors (where 5- strongly agree, 4- Agree, 3- Neutral, 2- Disagree, 1- Strongly disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Constant presence of police in the neighbourhood and the establishment of more police stations in juveniles prone areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Constant presence of well equipped and trained vigilante groups to deal with juveniles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Preventing the free usage of small arms/weapons by members of the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Allowing people to use personal licensed guns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Creation of training/job opportunities for idle youngsters to prevent them from engaging in crime and violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Presence of privately-owned and community established vigilantes in the neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Please state others strategies to minimize juveniles involvement in criminal behaviors not mentioned above

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX II: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Factors contributing to the criminal behavior among juveniles

1. Kindly share with me some of the major risk factors associated with children involvement in criminal activities?

2. How would you describe the role of the government in juvenile involvement on crime?

3. Does the country have criminal laws that govern juvenile involvement in crime? How does such laws contribute to crime among juveniles?

4. In your opinion, what are the measures that can be put in place to control juvenile involvement in crime?

5. What are the major challenges in addressing juvenile involvement in crime?

6. Is there any other information that you would like to share with me?
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