

**XII. Juvenile Delinquency, Juvenile Criminal
Justice, and Crisis**

Juvenile delinquency: criminal prosecution or restorative justice

CONSTANTINOS CONSTANTINIDES

Criminologist, Head of 'Constanteion' Institute of Criminology and Forensic Sciences (Cyprus) Research Unit

Crime According to Criminology Is Being Divided into the Legal and the Real Crime

Legal crime is an unlawful and punishable action as stated by the legislator, and is subject of interpretation by the legal system and perception of the legislator of what he/she considers as a crime and had been translated into the law, and by the regional culture. However real crime is being considered as any action that offends the ethical and justice feeling of the society and the majority of its partakers, in this sense, real crime might be considered an action that is not part of the legal ones. On the other hand, for the purposes of this paper crime shall be considered as the legal one for a variety of reasons, among them the legality principal, "nullum crimen sine lege" which is the moral principal, in criminal law and international criminal law that a person cannot or should not face criminal punishment except for an act that was criminalized by law before he/she performed the act. Subtler version of this principal require crimes to be declared in unambiguous statutory text.

Furthermore, the principal of legality is a core value, a human right but also a fundamental defence in criminal law prosecution according to which no crime no punishment can exist without legal ground. Nul-lum crimen, nulla poena sine lege is in fact a guarantee of human liberty, it protects individuals from state abuse and unjust the interfer-

ence, it ensures the fairness and transparency of the judicial authority. The principle is often associated with the attempts to constrain states, governments, judicial and legislative bodies from enacting or retroactive legislation, or *ex post facto* clauses and ensuring that all criminal behaviour is criminalised and all punishments established before the commencement of any criminal prosecution. The origins of the principal date back to post – World War II when a set of compelling criminal statutes were established and the drafters of the Nuremberg Statute affirmed the notion of individual criminal responsibility from a tri-dimensional perspective: legal, moral and criminal.

On the other hand, even if there were a large amount of attempts to establish a common approach path to the understanding of the origin of criminal behaviour and how is it possible to control criminality, nowadays there is a vast amount of evidence that shows that our criminal justice system is the new home for individuals with psychological problems. Although this might seem as a solution for some people, it is also creating a major concern and dilemma for our society. What about stigmatism? Once labelling those individuals as criminals and offenders, it creates also a stigma for those who may suffer from psychological problem.

Going back, at the beginning of the attempts of identifying and understanding criminal behaviour and activity, there are theories to explain criminal behaviour have been around along as recorded history. Aristotle by stating that ‘poverty is the parent of revolution and crime’, was stating at the same time the very first theory of an environmental and societal view of the antecedents of crime. During the 1600s, Sir Francis Bacon, stated that “opportunity makes the thief”, pointing out the power of situation to affect behaviour. In 1700s, Voltaire and Rousseau, had state the core explanations of the classical theory of criminology, “free will, hedonistic decision making, and the failure of the social contract in producing criminal behaviour”. According to classical theory, people choose to behave wrongly when they believe the benefits outweigh the costs. Classical theorists argued for making fair and proportionate punishment and reforming Draconian punishment. The

United States' Bill of Rights protection against "cruel and unusual punishment" is a result of this movement's conceptualization of criminal behaviour.

Moving on from Classical Crime Theories, we are meeting the Modern Crime Theories, where the Positivist School of Criminology emphasizes the understanding of criminal behaviour by uncovering factors which account for criminal behaviour. Positivists use the scientific method and empirical data to aid in psychological, biological, sociological and sociobiological explanations.

Sociological Theories of Crime, examines social and cultural forces that contribute to criminal behaviour. Its structural explanation is that, certain groups within society have less opportunities to achieve the goals most valued by society. In other words, when individuals are prevented from achieving their goals (prospective, success, education) through legitimate paths, they turn to illegal methods of reaching these goals. Society places demands on people to reach these goals. Differential Opportunity within society is seen as a key factor contributing to criminal behaviour. An explanation of crime as a function of criminal opportunity, comes from Nettler's (1974) Rational Crime, according to which, a) Crimes where objects are easy targets for thefts, b) crimes associated with legitimate business, c) Crime as a preferred livelihood and d) business which offer illegal services.

Another approach is the subcultural Explanation for crime, which focus on the discrepancy between societal norms and values for a specific subculture. Walter Miller's Theory of Focal Concerns (1958), describes the criminal behaviour lower socioeconomic status (SES) teen age gangs in term of the values and expected norm of the Gang subculture. Within his theory, Miller, had listed also six characteristics which were highly valued by the gang. Since these are highly valued, there is normative pressure for gang members to display these qualities on a regular basis. Criminal behaviour is directed towards living up to these values, Adolescents fight to show they are tough, steal to demonstrate cunning, crimes show autonomy and love for excitement. The greater the discrepancy between the dominant culture's values and the subcul-

ture's values, the more opportunity for norm violating behaviour.

Nevertheless, the same as almost all the stages through the years of the effort of understanding the origin of criminal behaviour and activity, some of the earliest positivist were convinced that criminal behaviour was a result of genetic abnormality. Here comes Lombroso, and his theory, of advanced notion of atavism, which stated criminals represented a savage, earlier from humankind. Hoorten, in 1939, claimed to have found important biological differences in criminals and non-criminals. Sheldon, in 1949 had expressed the theory of His Somatic Typology listing three major somatotypes, however we could say that he was obviously influenced by the stereotypes of his culture and his generation.

Considering the facts that our criminal justice systems is the new home for individuals with psychological problems, and the so called genetic cause of criminal behaviour and activity, should society look towards limiting the reproductive capabilities of individuals who suffer from certain psychological problems to better society? The same question was asked back in the late 19th and early 20th century, when the role of genetics in crime was widely accepted, and prominent researchers believed that genes were fully or almost fully responsible for the criminal activity and behaviour and that criminals could be identified by their physiological characteristics. Along with this information and the idea of a eugenics movement during the same time period, it was not surprising to hear that acts such as sterilizing took place to rid society of criminals, idiots, imbeciles and rapists (Joseph, 2001).

Not long after the practices of controlled breeding, there was evidence to support the idea that the environment also played an important role in crime. Early family studies were conducted that showed a predisposition for criminal behaviour as a result of inherited characteristics, BUT than an individual's characteristics and personality could still be modified by the environment. The environment can also influence individuals to act in a criminal manner. The debate between genetics and environment continues today with much more reliable research and data.

How criminal behaviour is being defined. Law in our societies is defined by social and legal institutions, not in biology (Morley & Hall 2003). Therefore, determining what constitutes criminal behaviour can envelope a wide variety of activities, and for that reason, researchers trend to focus on wider context of antisocial behaviour. Authors Morley and Hall (2003), who have investigated the genetic influence on criminal behaviour, point out three different ways to define antisocial behaviour. First is equating it with criminality and delinquency, which both involve engaging in criminal acts. Criminality can lead to arrest, conviction, or incarceration for adults, while delinquency is related to juveniles committing unlawful acts (Rhee & Waldman, 2002). Secondly, they advise individuals to define antisocial behaviour is through criteria used to diagnose certain personality disorders. A final measure suggested, is by examining personality traits that may be influenced in the criminal behaviour of individuals. Traits such as aggressiveness and impulsivity are two traits that have been investigated the most (Morley & Hall, 2003).

With regards to determining the effects of the environment plays in criminal behaviour there fewer resources available. Observational studies and reports submitted by parents are two sources, BUT not everyone agrees on the validity of the information collected from these sources. Three additional sources that most researchers cite when gathering information about both genetic and environmental influences are twin, family and adoption studies (Tehrani & Mednick, 2000). There has been a great debate regarding those studies. Some claim that these studies support the notion of genetic basis to criminal behaviour (Tehrani & Mednick, 2000). On the other hand, some have concluded that there is not enough evidence from those studies to profess that genetics play a role in antisocial or criminal behaviour.

Moving on, Brunner, Nelen, Breakfast, Ropers and Van Oost (1993) conducted a study utilizing a large family. In their study they found that a point mutation in the structural gene for monoamine oxidase A (MAOA), a neurochemical in the brain, which they associated with aggressive criminal behaviour, among a number of males in the family

(Alper, 1995). These males were reported to have selective MAOA deficiency, which can lead to decreased concentrations of 5-hydroxyindole-3-acetic acid (5-HIAA) in cerebrospinal fluid. Evidence suggest that low concentration of 5-HIAA can be related to the compulsive aggression.

Neurochemicals are responsible for the activation of behavioural patterns and tendencies in specific areas of the brain (Eliot, 2000). There have been attempts to determine the role of them in influencing criminal or antisocial behaviour. Included in the list of neurochemicals already cited by researchers are monoamine oxidase (MAOA), epinephrine, norepinephrine, serotonin and dopamine.

Monoamine Oxidase (MAOA) is an enzyme that has been shown to be associated to antisocial behaviour. Specifically, low MAOA activity results in disinhibition which can lead to impulsive and aggression (Eliot, 2000). Deficiencies in MAOA activity can be more common and as a result may predispose individuals to antisocial behaviour (Brunner *et al.*, 1993). MAO is associated with many neurochemicals that already have link to antisocial or criminal behaviour. Norepinephrine, serotonin and dopamine are metabolized by both MAOA and MAOB (Eliot, 2000). While MAO is related to norepinephrine, epinephrine and dopamine, which are all related to the personality factor of psychosis (Eysenck, 1996).

Serotonin is a neurochemical that plays in important role in the personality traits of depression, anxiety and bipolar disorder (Larsen & Buss, 2005). It is also involved with brain development and disorder in this system could lead to an increase in aggressiveness and impulsivity (Morley & Hall, 2003). "Studies point to serotonin as one of the most important central neuro-transmitters underlying the modulation of impulsive aggression" (Lowenstein, 2003). Low levels of serotonin have been found to be associated with impulsive behaviour and emotional aggression, which can be further associated with antisocial behaviour. In addition, children who suffer from conduct disorder have also been shown to have low blood serotonin (Eliot, 2000).

Dopamine is a neurotransmitter in the brain that is associated with

pleasure and is also one of the neurotransmitters that is chiefly associated with aggression. Activation of both affective (emotional driven) and predatory aggression is accomplished by dopamine (Eliot, 2000). Genes in dopaminergic pathway have also been found to be involved with Attention Deficit Hyperactive Disorder (ADHD) (Morley & Hall, 2003). Also a relationship had been pointed between the dopaminergic pathway, impulsivity, ADHD and violent offenders. Obviously, from those listed for neurochemicals it seems plausible that there is a genetic component to antisocial or criminal behaviour.

Personality traits and disorders have recently become essential in the diagnosis of individuals with antisocial or criminal behaviour. These traits and disorders do not first become evident when an individual is an adult, rather this can be seen in childhood. Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), Conduct Disorder (CD) and Oppositional Defiance Disorder (ODD) are three of the more prominent disorders that have been shown to have a relation with later adult behaviour (Holmes, Slaughter & Kashani, 2001).

ODD is characterised by argumentativeness, noncompliance, and irritability, which can be found in early childhood (Holmes *et al.*, 2001). When a child with ODD grows older, the characteristics of their behaviour also change and more often to the worse. They start lie and steal, engage in vandalism, substance abuse, and show aggression towards peers (Holmes *et al.*, 2001). Frequently ODD is the first disorder that is identified in children and if sustained can lead to the diagnosis of CD (Morley & Hall, 2003). It is important to emphasise that not all the children who are diagnosed with ODD will develop.

At this stage the majority of the readers believes that juvenile delinquency and adult criminal behaviour and activity are being originated from genetically and psychological disorders factors. In this sense we shall not make any judicial trail, any effort in controlling criminality, any program based to evidence based policing, or build correctional institutions and develop correction programs, since those situations are inescapable and those persons convicted prior to their unlawful acts. We shall also forget about correctional science and its work on research

and in correctional institution. Instead we shall build mental health care hospital for the offenders and lock them in there.

Such a case is unacceptable and impossible, we shall never give up the effort of controlling criminality, in all levels of prevention, criminal prosecution and corrections. We cannot accept that in the case of genetically predisposition the person is pre-convicted to delinquency and criminality. According to Tiihonen *et al.* 2014, where Finnish attempted in a large scale research to point the relation between the MAOA mutation with violent criminal behaviour, over 40% of the participants who had developed violent criminal behaviour and activity, in combination with MAOA mutation, were victims of abuse during their child hood. This indicates that the factors are there, however they had to somehow be stimulated in order to be activated leading in unlawful life.

Relatively psychological disorders are not untreatable, according to Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders 5 (DSM-5), all of the mentioned disorders and even more which were seemed to be related with antisocial and criminal behaviour, can be treated and the individual to overcome or learn how to handle those disorders in order to have a healthier and more 'normal' life, restoring social and communication skills accordingly, keeping in mind that the soonest the possible those disorders are being identified, diagnosed and treated the better for those individuals and the easiest the work, which the therapist has to carry on. This early stage time frame is also crucial for the level of success and time duration of the rehabilitation.

Taking in account the above, we can clearly view the big picture of the criminal behaviour and activity origin, where multidisciplinary factors are affecting the behaviour in a degree where an individual might develop and express such antisocial behaviour, which with steady steps can lead to a variety of unlawful actions, from delinquency to crimes, but also from bullying to violent criminal activity. This is why the approach of controlling juvenile delinquency and the future criminality have to be holistic, including all levels of prevention, prosecution and correction – rehabilitation programs, including a variety of alternative methods.

But first we have to identify juvenile delinquency. Juvenile delinquency is being considered as the unlawful and antisocial behaviour of underage people, minors. Is such a behaviour of a child or youth that is so marked by violation of law, persistent mischievousness, antisocial behaviour, disobedience, or intractability as to thwart correction by parents and constitute a matter of action by the juvenile courts (American Psychological Association, APA, 2016).

Commonly antisocial behaviour is identified in self-harming youths or in youths that are truant with school and engage in theft or drug-taking activity (Luncheon, Bae, Gonzalez, Lurie and Singh 2008). A large factor in youth delinquency can also be attributed to a form of antisocial behaviour known as aggression. Aggression is a major factor in youth delinquency as acts of aggression are usually carried out on other people and as such are a crime. Two types of aggression identified by Baumeister and Bushman (2008) are "hostile aggression" and "instrumental aggression". Hostile aggressions constitute crimes or acts with impulsive or emotive motivations whereas instrumental aggression is more calculated and motivated by goal-driven behaviour. The difference in motivation behind aggressive behaviour has led researchers to explore whether aggression in youths and subsequently adults, is a result of the increasing violence shown in the media, the situational circumstances one is in or if there are physiological factors such as personality that determine how aggressive one is.

The young of age and the unformed and immature criticism are making juveniles and young people even more vulnerable, not only to the factors mentioned above, in a higher level, but also to a whole new range of factors of our nowadays culture and way of living. Among them there are media and video games. In the early 1950s horror comics were criticised and linked to juvenile delinquency. Since then television as well as video and computer games have been accused of undermining moral values and cultivating a more violent and criminally oriented social climate (Gunter, 1994). Clint Eastwood's movie "Dirty Harry" has been linked to copy-paste serial killings and more recently the school shootings at Columbine (1999) have been linked to violent

video games (Carnagey, Anderson and Bartholow). Numerous studies have been undertaken to see what effects video game playing has on feelings of aggression and subsequent acts of aggression.

The past research has led to the application of the General Aggression Model (GAM) in violent video game studies (Bartlett, Harris and Baldassaro 2007). The GAM encompasses all past theories on aggression and relies on short term affect, arousal and cognition components (Anderson & Bushman 2002) According to Anderson (2002), the GAM can account for the wide variety of effects seen in the media violence literature which lead to the child exposed becoming more desensitized to violence and habitually more aggressive. The GAM suggests that individual factors interact with the situational factors, which may lead to a person's feeling impacting on real world actions (Bartlett et al 2007). The concern surrounding movies, television and their effects on the youth watching them stem from the social learning theory of imitation (Leyens, Herman and Dunand 1984). In 1961 Albert Bandura conducted an experiment measuring levels of aggression in children (1961). The experiment consisted of an adult exhibiting physical and verbal aggression towards the doll. Afterwards Bandura would place the child in a room with the doll and see what would happen. It was found that it was much more likely for those who had witnessed acts of aggression to act out such acts when placed in the same situation than those who did not (Bandura 1961). The experiment was run with live models as well as a video taped model with no difference in the results. Thus it can be reasonably applied to youths that witness violent acts in movies and television would be more likely to repeat those acts than those who don't. Criticism came about the contrived nature of the experiment and the use of artificial films however, was quietened by numerous field experiments that yielded the same results (Leyens *et al.*). Numerous studies have also found the proclivity to act out aggressively strengthen upon watching violent acts carried out and that the movie or show will act as a primer for an individual to act out (Berko-witz, 2008).

Socioeconomic factors – Class is considered an important social marker that plays an undeniable role in deviance (Wahrman, 1972). Studies have been done and replicated using a range of measures of socioeconomic factors including income, poverty and status (Ferguson, Campbell & Horwood, 2004). Each study has led to the same conclusion; youth in lower socioeconomic standing are more likely to be delinquent. This idea was further explored by the strain theory (Merton, 1938). According to the strain theory, individuals in a lower socioeconomic status are more likely to engage in delinquent behaviour to try and alleviate the imbalance and strain of the social situation (Ferguson *et al.*). The dilemma faced is able to be adapted to in five ways according to Merton, they are: 1. *Innovation*: individuals who accept socially approved goals, but not necessarily the socially approved means. Individuals who may adapt using innovation may aim to achieve socially approved goals but in order for them to attain them may be more likely to engage in delinquent behaviour as they do not have the same opportunities as the higher classes may have. 2. *Retreatism*: those who reject socially approved goals and the means for acquiring them. These individuals may entirely shun societal norms and follow just what they want without regard for societal laws thus engaging in delinquent activity. 3. *Ritualism*: those who buy into a system of socially approved means, but lose sight of the goals. Merton believed that drug users are in this category. 4. *Conformity*: those who conform to the system's means and goals. 5. *Rebellion*: people who negate socially approved goals and means by creating a new system of acceptable goals and means (Wikipedia 2008) Peer relationships Ferguson, Campbell and Howood (2004) further suggest a differential association theory that may act as an influencing social factor in youth delinquency. The differential association states that an increase in youth delinquency and its relation to socioeconomic status are due to the fact that youths in the lower socioeconomic class have a larger exposure to criminal peers and environments. Sutherland's (1947) original finding that personal networking leads to either a favourable or unfavourable view of delinquency, which supports Haynie's (2002) finding that adolescents who

report that their friends are delinquent tend to report higher levels of delinquency than adolescents with fewer or no delinquent friends. Blackorby and Wagner (1996) found that many juvenile delinquents are unable to attain skills and knowledge that would help them in employment opportunities or the chance to further their academic career due to expulsion or dropping out of school. Studies show that children who are provided with adequate parental supervision are less likely to engage in criminal activity, while children from dysfunctional family settings such as conflict, inadequate parental control and premature autonomy are more closely associated with juvenile delinquency (World Youth Report 2003) hostility and rejection as well as low child involvement are the most salient predictors of behavioural problems and delinquency (Simons, Simons, Chen, Brody & Lin 2007). These lines of study are important as Gerstien and Briggs (1993) found 30 percent of violent offenders in their study were reared in the absence of a father. Connel, Dishion, Yasui and Kananagh (2007) focuses on preventing substance abuse in youths. It does this by targeting problems in the family arena, primarily in parental monitoring and management of children engaging in delinquent activities. The research demonstrates that the motivation of parents to manage and monitor their children results in less delinquent behaviour exhibited by the youth.

The three major personality factors according to Eysenck (1977) are: psychoticism, extraversion and neuroticism. According to Eysenck's criminal theory, juvenile delinquents would score highly on all three of the personality dimensions (Van Dam, Coleta, De Bryun & Janssens 2007). To test his theory Eysenck surveyed a sample of males in juvenile detention to assess their levels in the personality dimensions compared to a control group of college participants. The study found that of statistically high significance were the high extraversion levels in juvenile offenders, suggesting that highly extraverted juveniles that score low on neuroticism and psychoticism are more at risk of becoming delinquent. Block and Block (1980) looked at personality in two areas: ego control and ego resiliency, later used to determine three types of personalities: over-controllers, under-controllers and resilient (Akse,

Hale, Engels, Raaijmakers & Meeus 2007). Over controllers tend to be internalising problems, under controllers tend to externalise problems while resilient strike a healthy balance (Akse *et al.*) In internalising their behaviour, over controllers tend to reject help from others, isolate themselves and have increased anxiety and depression, whereas under controllers who externalise their problems are more likely to act out in a deviant manner (Akse *et al.*)

Delinquency is found to be more prevalent and more frequent among young males with a low IQ (Koolhof, Loeber, Wei, Pardini & D'Escury 2007). An experiment run by Koolhof *et al.* compared impulsivity, psychopathy and empathy between high and low IQ individuals. The results found a significant difference in the impulsivity of individuals with a lower IQ as well as finding those with a lower IQ less empathetic and with less reported feelings of guilt. This is an important finding as those factors are related to delinquency, and would seem to suggest that due to those factors individuals with a low IQ are more prone to juvenile delinquent behaviour (Koolhof *et al.*).

Bowlby (1969) theorised that as children we create internal working models which are based on the responsiveness of our primary caregiver. He states that these internal working models would allow for us to predict the future and how to react to our environment and the people in it. He predicted that children who formed secure attachment would feel free to explore their environment and interact freely with it as they would feel comfortable having their mother as a secure base should anything happen. This idea is based on previous experience and the mother or primary caregiver responding to needs. This is likely to continue on through life and set them up to be able to maintain strong social connections (Sigelman & Rider 2006). Conversely, if a child had not had all needs consistently met as a child they may form an insecure attachment. Children who develop an insecure form of attachment may develop a penchant to avoid social situations or have trouble regulating mood, emotion and behaviour. A study by Elger, Knight, Sherman and Worrall (2003) found support for Bowlby's insecure attachment theory. In surveys completed by youth delinquents

reporting on attachment characteristics, substance abuse and behavioural problems, it was found that insecure attachment was related to the internalising and externalising of behaviours. As previously discussed those who have problems in doing this often act out in a deviant manner. It also showed a relation to antisocial and aggressive behaviour, which is a precursor to delinquent behaviour.

Concluding, juvenile delinquency is not a new phenomenon; however it is a fact that there is an increasing trend, due to the fact that media, video games and technology is available every day and any time, but also the fact that parents in their effort to cover all of their families' financial needs and achieve their financial goals, their everyday tight and demanding programme, lays also a lot of pressure on them and takes a lot of their time, which they were supposed to spend with their children, observing them and in a more constructive way, as they were supposed to do. Also those fact makes the parents more aggressive and impatient against their children, which creates negative influence and a bad parental models for their children. As we had seen, juvenile delinquency is being affected and caused by a variety and a large amount of factors, however what we have to underline none of those factors in its own cannot be enough to conclude in antisocial behaviour and delinquency, combination of those factors has to be in place. Keeping in mind that no one is being born with delinquency and criminal behaviour, but those are heritable behaviours, we have to tried juvenile delinquency in an alternative manner from crime, and criminal prosecution.

For those reasons the best way in treating juveniles is the restorative justice system, which is restorative justice views crime as more than breaking the law – it also causes harm to people, relationships, and the community. So a just response must address those harms as well as the wrongdoing. If the parties are willing, the best way to do this is to help them meet to discuss those harms and how to about bring resolution. Other approaches are available if they are unable or unwilling to meet. Sometimes those meetings lead to transformational changes in their lives. Notice three big ideas: (1) repair: crime causes harm and justice

requires repairing that harm; (2) encounter: the best way to determine how to do that is to have the parties decide together; and (3) transformation: this can cause fundamental changes in people, relationships and communities.

A more formal definition is this: restorative justice is a theory of justice that emphasizes repairing the harm caused by criminal behaviour. It is best accomplished through cooperative processes that allow all willing stakeholders to meet, although other approaches are available then that is impossible. This can lead to transformation of people, relationships and communities. The foundational principles of restorative justice have been summarized as follows, (1) crime causes harm and justice should focus on repairing that harm, (2) the people most affected by the crime should be able to participate in its resolution, (3) the responsibility of the government is to maintain order and of the community to build peace. If restorative justice were a building, it would have four corner posts, inclusion of all parties, encountering the other side, making amends for the harm and reintegration of the parties into their communities.

Restorative justice is a different way of thinking about crime and our response to crime and focuses on repairing the harm caused by crime and reducing future harm through crime prevention. It requires offenders to take responsibility for their actions and for the harm they have caused, it also seeks redress for victims, recompense by offenders and reintegration of both within the community. Restorative justice requires a cooperative effort by communities and the government. In his magnificent work, Cesare Beccaria, back in 1764, express among others, the governmental and authorities' responsibility against crime. In the case of Juvenile Delinquency their responsibility is even higher, because we are talking for underage persons, who are vulnerable more than anyone else and the benefit by treating them correctly for society, from those people who they are at the beginning of their lives, is even more higher, than the adult criminals.

Considering all of the above we could conclude that juvenile delinquency shall never be treated as criminal behaviour and activity, juve-

niles are expressing such behaviours for a reason, unfortunately, even if we know that the development of such unlawful actions is being by a variety of factors, those we had already talked about, there are no evidence regarding the level of affection of those factor up on individuals. Never the less, in any case professionals such as teachers, police officers, social well fairs officers, judges of juvenile courts and any one whose profession is to deal in daily base with children, or is an important part of justice system, they have to be constantly trained on how they have to talk and treat children, but also how they can recognise any of the above factors, and how they can ask for further diagnosis and / or investigation. Sometimes juvenile delinquency, is a desperate scream seeking attention for help and support, and by treating juveniles as criminals is like stigmatising them and telling that, this is what they are and what they deserve, juveniles ARE NOT common criminals, and that alternative methods shall be in place and be used for the best interest of all stakeholders, and for this governmental and local authorities are responsible, but never the less schools administrations have their responsibility and their role to play. Governmental and local authorities have also the huge responsibility in training and providing seminars to parents, creating awareness and providing them with knowledge they need in how they can rise well their children and how they shall treat such behaviours, promoting a good and healthy parental model, indicating the correct and accepted norm for the best interest of their children. Closing up, from Kahlil Gibran to Sigmund Freud, children are not our property and shall not be treated as our ownership, children belong to the whole world, and the societies, what we have to do is to protect them, guide them, provide them with all the necessities for their surviving, and for their wellbeing. No one is being born as a criminal, but every one under the appropriate conditions and the necessary factors in place every one is capable to commit offending and unlawful actions.