

PARENTAL SUPERVISION AND CONTROL AS A FACTOR OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN SERBIA: RESULTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL SELF-REPORT DELINQUENCY STUDY*

Sanja ĆOPIĆ, PhD*
Ljiljana STEVKOVIĆ, MA*

During 2013 and 2014 Serbia took part in the International Self-Report Delinquency Study (ISR3) for the first time. The research was conducted on a sample of 1344 primary (7th and 8th grade) and secondary (all grades) school students in two largest towns – Belgrade and Novi Sad. The data was collected by using a standardised questionnaire. The aim of this paper is to present a part of the research results of the ISR3 in Serbia related to the scope, structure and correlations between examined forms of delinquent and risk behaviour, and the parental control and supervision as a factor of juvenile delinquency. The findings suggest high prevalence of juvenile delinquency, including substance use, in two towns in Serbia where the research was conducted. Juveniles commit less severe offences, while property offences dominate. Violent offences are less frequent, and they mainly refer to group fight and animal cruelty. Boys are more likely than girls to commit offences, while offences committed by boys are more severe and include violence. Additionally, the older respondents are the more they act delinquently. Most of juveniles from the sample consumed alcohol, while almost one forth abused drugs sometimes in their life. The findings show high correlation between all examined forms of delinquent behaviour, including substance use. Parental knowledge, parental supervision and child disclosure, as three dimensions of parental control and supervision, negatively correlate with delinquent and risk behaviour. Additionally, all three dimensions of parental

* The paper presents the findings of the research of juvenile delinquency in Serbia, which was implemented in the scope of the International Self-Report Delinquency Study 3 (ISR3) and within the project *Development of the methodology of crime recording as the basis for creating effective measures for its suppression and prevention*, No. 179044, financed by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia, and implemented by the Faculty of Special Education and Rehabilitation of the University of Belgrade under the supervision of prof. dr Vesna Nikolić-Ristanović. The data collection costs were financed by the Swiss Federal Office for Migration. The findings of this research are published in: Nikolić-Ristanović, 2016.

* Senior Research Fellow, Institute of Criminological and Sociological Research, Victimology Society of Serbia. E-mail: sanja.copic01@gmail.com

* Assistant, Faculty of Special Education and Rehabilitation, University of Belgrade, Victimology Society of Serbia. E-mail: stevkoviclj@gmail.com

control and supervision negatively predict delinquent and risk behaviour. In general, the lack of parental control and supervision is associated with perpetrating of delinquency and is a predictor of juvenile delinquency. Therefore, it is important to work on developing preventive programs, including programs aimed at strengthening parental competencies and skills and enhancing communication and relationship between parents and their children in order to prevent and suppress juvenile delinquency in Serbia.

KEYWORDS: juvenile delinquency / International Self-Report Delinquency Study / parental supervision and control / Serbia

INTRODUCTION

Regular collection of data on prevalence, structure and characteristics of juvenile delinquency is important for assessing trends and registering new forms of juvenile delinquency, which is of immense relevance for developing efficient and effective evidence-based legislation, criminal policy and practical programs of social response to this phenomenon. However, relying on the official statistical records is not enough for getting to know the real scope of juvenile delinquency, since many juveniles may remain out of the system of support and social reaction, such as juveniles who are not yet criminally responsible, whose behaviour has not been criminalized, and whose delinquent behaviour for some reasons has not been detected and recorded. Therefore, in many countries the data from official statistical records are complemented by the data from national and/or international self-report juvenile delinquency studies, which provide information on both registered and unregistered cases of delinquency of juveniles (Nikolić-Ristanović, Stevković, 2015: 260). The self-report study, as a technique for detecting the dark figure of crime, enables the survey of a representative sample of children (criminally irresponsible) and juveniles (criminally responsible), and obtaining information about their delinquent and risk behaviour. The three rounds of the International Self-Report Delinquency Study (ISRD) that have been conducted since the early 1990s speak in favour of the significance of using this particular technique in surveying juvenile delinquency (see more in: Junger-Tas et al., 2010; Nikolić-Ristanović, Stevković, 2015). The ISRD presents internationally comparative survey on offending of young people and their victimization. Serbia took part in the third round of the ISRD project for the first time.

The third round of the International Self-Reported Delinquency Study (ISRD3) started in 2012. It was conducted in 35 countries across the world and it was based on a standardised methodology. The aim of this study is two-folded: firstly, to collect internationally comparable data about juvenile delinquency and victimisation of juveniles, and the factors that contribute to both delinquency and victimisation of juveniles, and secondly, to explore and test theoretical concepts which explain juvenile delinquency and could be relevant for policy purposes, i.e. for designing measures for suppression and prevention of both delinquency and victimisation of juveniles. The research conducted within the ISRD3 in Serbia is a result of cooperation between the Faculty of Special Education and Rehabilitation, University of Belgrade, and the Victimology Society of Serbia.

The aim of this paper is to present a part of the research results of the ISRD3 in Serbia related to the scope, structure and correlations between examined delinquent and risk

behaviour, and the parental control and supervision as a factor of juvenile delinquency. The paper starts with a brief overview of the research methodology, which is followed with presenting key findings on the prevalence and structure of juvenile delinquency in Serbia, as well as on correlations between examined forms of delinquent and risk behaviour. In the second part we analyse and discuss the findings about parental supervision and control as a factor of juvenile delinquency in Serbia. In the final part we point to the main conclusions and give some recommendations relevant for the prevention of juvenile delinquency from the perspective of combating factors that are directly connected to the family and family relationships.

1. THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research of juvenile delinquency was conducted on a city-based sample, which consisted of 1344 primary (7th and 8th grade) and secondary (all grades) school students in two largest towns in Serbia – Belgrade and Novi Sad. The sample encompassed students from 12 to 19 years of age ($M=15.46$; $Mdn=16.00$; $SD=1.760$).¹ The sample was gender uniform, with slightly more boys (52.2%), than girls (47.8%). Therefore, this research enabled for the first time collecting the data on a representative sample on the prevalence, structure and characteristics of juvenile delinquency, factors influencing juvenile delinquency, victimization of juveniles and relationships between juvenile delinquency and victimisation.

The data was collected from April 2013 to February 2014 by using a standardised questionnaire. There were also three additional sets of questions, out of which two were national specific: questions about victimization of juveniles by domestic violence and questions about domestic violence committed by juveniles². An online questionnaire was used, but in its offline version, with using special FluidSurveys software. The questionnaires were filled in on the school classes. As for the refusal rate, 25% for schools and 8% for students refused to take part in the survey. Additionally, only 6 students (0.4%) were excluded from the survey by parental decision (Stevković, Nikolić-Ristanović, 2016).

For the purpose of the paper the data was processed by using several methods. For determining prevalence and structure of delinquent behaviour of juveniles a descriptive statistics was used. Additionally, we used the analysis of the reliability of the Parental control and supervision scale (Cronbach's Alfa), analysis of correlation of different forms of delinquent behaviour (Pearson's correlation), analysis of correlation between variables parental supervision and control, on the one hand, and delinquent behaviour, on the other hand (Chi Square test) and analysis of possible predictions of delinquent behaviour based on the absence of parental supervision and control (Logistic Regression).

¹ For the purpose of the research under the term juvenile we meant minor person, i.e. a person below 18 years of age, as it is also defined in the Criminal Code of the Republic of Serbia. Therefore it included both criminally responsible and criminally irresponsible juveniles.

² Data regarding domestic violence committed by juveniles are 'locked' for the purposes of PhD dissertation of Ljiljana Stevković, and only she has access to this data.

2. PREVALENCE AND STRUCTURE OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN SERBIA³

In order to obtain data on the prevalence of delinquent behaviour of juveniles, the respondents were asked to report if they had ever perpetrated one or more forms of delinquent and/or risk behaviours⁴ mentioned in the questionnaire during their lifetime (Table 1). Out of a total of 1344 respondents, 1229 (91.4%) reported that they had perpetrated some form of delinquent behaviour or use alcohol or drugs in their life. When we exclude substance use, the obtained data show that almost two thirds of juveniles in the survey sample (857 or 63.7%) expressed some form of delinquent behaviour understood in its strict sense during their lifetime.

As the data in Table 1 suggests, the most frequent form of delinquent behaviour of juveniles, including substance use, in the given sample, is alcohol abuse (79.5%). However, if we only look into delinquency in its strict sense, we may argue that most frequent forms of juvenile delinquency are: graffiti and shoplifting, followed by group fight and vandalism. On the other hand, juveniles perpetrate delinquent behaviours that present serious crimes, which also include the use of weapons, force or threat, such as robbery and burglary, the least.

Table 1: Lifetime prevalence of different forms of delinquent behaviour

Delinquent behaviour	N	%
Graffiti	475	35.3
Vandalism	165	12.3
Shoplifting	335	24.9
Burglary	16	1.2
Bicycle theft	91	6.8
Car/motor theft	43	3.2
Car break	90	6.7
Robbery	20	1.5
Personal theft	137	10.2
Carrying weapon	152	11.3
Group fight	179	13.3
Assault	62	4.6
Drug trafficking	61	4.5
Animal cruelty	140	10.4
Alcohol abuse	1067	79.5
Drug abuse	297	22.1

In the structure of the lifetime delinquent behaviour of the respondents risk behaviours, such as alcohol abuse, and less severe forms of delinquent behaviour, particularly graffiti and shoplifting prevail (Table 2).

³ This part of the paper is based on the analysis presented in Čopić, 2016, where more details on the prevalence and structure of juvenile delinquency can be found. Additionally, more information about characteristics of juvenile delinquency can be found in Kovačević, 2016.

⁴ In this paper risk behaviour includes alcohol and drug abuse, i.e. substance use, while other forms of delinquent behaviour are considered as delinquency in its strict sense.

Table 2: Structure of the lifetime delinquent behaviour

Delinquent behaviour	N	%
Graffiti	475	38.6
Vandalism	165	13.4
Shoplifting	335	27.3
Burglary	16	1.3
Bicycle theft	91	7.4
Car/motor theft	43	3.5
Car break	90	7.3
Robbery	20	1.6
Personal theft	137	11.1
Carrying weapon	152	12.4
Group fight	179	14.6
Assault	62	5.0
Drug trafficking	61	5.0
Animal cruelty	140	11.4
Alcohol abuse	1067	86.8
Drug abuse	297	24.2

The survey data show that the percentage of boys (92.6%) and girls (90.2%) who have expressed some form of delinquent behaviour in their life is similar. However, when the substance use is excluded from the analysis, it can be noticed that significantly more boys (71.9%) than girls (55.1%) reported that they had perpetrated one of more forms of delinquency ($\chi^2(1)=40.55$, $p=\leq.001$).

Table 3: Lifetime delinquent behaviour and gender

Delinquent behaviour	Boys	Girls	Significance
	%	%	
Graffiti	42.8	27.5	0.000
Vandalism	18.5	5.6	0.000
Shoplifting	28	21.7	0.008
Burglary	1.9	0.5	0.019
Bicycle theft	8.2	5.3	0.038
Car/motor theft	4.9	1.4	0.000
Car break	8.9	4.4	0.001
Robbery	2.3	0.6	0.012
Personal theft	10.3	10.2	0.931
Carrying weapon	18.5	3.6	0.000
Group fight	22	3.9	0.000
Assault	7.7	1.3	0.000
Drug trafficking	6.2	2.8	0.003
Animal cruelty	10.7	10.2	0.732

Nevertheless, it is important to bear in mind that for some forms of delinquent behaviour, although significant gender differences were established, due to a small number of respondents who answered that they had expressed such behaviour, we should be careful in giving some general conclusions. This particularly refers to: assault, car/motor theft and car break. On the other hand, if we look into the most frequent forms of juvenile delinquency, it can be noticed that these forms of delinquency are more often expressed by boys than by girls. This is particularly visible in cases of vandalism and group fight. As for vandalism, the data show that three times more boys (18.5%) than girls (5.6%) reported that they had had such an experience in the lifetime course. When it comes to group fight, five times more boys (22.0%) than girls (3.9%) answered that they had expressed this form of delinquent behaviour. Although statistically significant, this difference is, when looking into percentages, somewhat less in case of graffiti: 42.8% of boys versus 27.5% of girls.

The survey findings also suggest that the older respondents are the more they express delinquent behaviour ($\chi^2(7)=68.13$, $p\leq.001$). Age differences could be also noticed when we exclude the data on risk behaviour from the analysis ($\chi^2(2)=8.93$, $p<.05$).

Table 4: Lifetime delinquent behaviour and age

Delinquent behaviour	12-13 %	14-16 %	17-19 %	Significance
Graffiti	26.9	35.1	40.8	0.001
Vandalism	9.9	9.2	18.1	0.000
Shoplifting	24.5	22.1	29.4	0.024
Burglary	0.8	0.2	2.9	0.000
Bicycle theft	9.1	5.8	6.9	0.222
Car/motor theft	1.6	2.7	4.9	0.036
Car break	8.3	4.7	8.6	0.023
Robbery	1.2	0.6	2.9	0.010
Personal theft	9.9	11.4	8.9	0.398
Carrying weapon	5.2	11.4	14.8	0.001
Group fight	9.9	13.1	15.7	0.092
Assault	2.8	3.6	7.1	0.009
Drug trafficking	1.6	3.3	7.9	0.000
Animal cruelty	9.9	9.8	11.7	0.567

As the data in Table 4 suggests, respondents younger than 14 and those between 14 and 16 commit less delinquent behaviour than older ones, and they mostly commit less severe property crimes. Significant correlation between the age and delinquent behaviour was found for the lifetime delinquency for the following forms of delinquent behaviour: vandalism, burglary, drug trafficking, graffiti and carrying weapon.

When it comes to substance use, the data suggests that alcohol abuse is present in almost the same percentage with boys (78.9%) and girls (80.2%), so there are no significant gender differences. As for the age differences in alcohol consuming, the research revealed that the older respondents are, the more they consume alcohol ($\chi^2(1)=117.20$, $p\leq.001$): this was stated by 59.3% of respondents between 12 and 13 years, 77.7% of those between 14 and 16 and 93.2% of those between 17 and 19. Finally, almost one fourth of respondents (22.1%) reported that they had abused drugs in some moment in their lifetime. Although the survey findings suggest that there are statistically significant gender differences in abusing drugs ($\chi^2(1)=4.53$, $p<.05$), this difference, in percentages, is only five percentage points in favour of boys (24.3% of boys versus 19.5% of girls). As for the age, the data show that the old respondents are the more they express this form of risk behaviour ($\chi^2(2)=125.71$, $p\leq.001$).

Table 5: Correlations of different forms of delinquent behaviour

Delinquent behaviour	Graffiti	vandalism	Shoplifting	Burglary	Bicycle theft	Car/motor theft	Car break	Robbery	Personal theft	Weapon	Group fight	Assault	Drug trafficking	Animal cruelty	Lifetime alcohol abuse	Lifetime hashish abuse	Lifetime synthetic drugs abuse	Lifetime cocaine, heroin abuse
Graffiti		.920	.862	.821	.798	.794	.801	.791	.760	.769	.764	.763	.748	.734	.655	.662	.643	.647
Vandalism	.920		.868	.826	.806	.801	.807	.796	.766	.775	.769	.771	.754	.740	.651	.660	.643	.647
Shoplifting	.862	.868		.864	.845	.839	.845	.831	.808	.808	.801	.803	.772	.764	.667	.668	.647	.651
Burglary	.821	.826	.864		.925	.925	.930	.908	.868	.871	.864	.874	.836	.810	.707	.706	.692	.698
Bic. theft	.798	.806	.845	.925		.903	.917	.884	.851	.851	.848	.851	.814	.791	.689	.688	.672	.677
Car/motor theft	.794	.801	.839	.925	.903		.909	.832	.848	.853	.845	.855	.815	.795	.689	.688	.674	.680
Car break	.801	.807	.845	.930	.917	.909		.897	.868	.863	.860	.862	.823	.810	.698	.694	.681	.688
Robbery	.791	.796	.831	.908	.884	.892	.897		.901	.911	.900	.893	.852	.830	.717	.714	.702	.708
Pers. theft	.760	.766	.808	.868	.851	.848	.868	.901		.880	.874	.859	.817	.802	.695	.686	.672	.675
Weapon	.769	.775	.808	.871	.851	.853	.863	.911	.880		.886	.872	.832	.806	.775	.697	.683	.687
Group fight	.764	.769	.801	.864	.848	.845	.860	.900	.874	.886		.876	.834	.812	.708	.700	.686	.688
Assault	.763	.771	.803	.874	.851	.855	.862	.893	.859	.872	.876		.886	.865	.730	.727	.715	.719
Drug trafficking	.748	.754	.772	.836	.814	.815	.823	.852	.817	.832	.834	.886		.891	.724	.728	.717	.716
Animal cruel.	.734	.740	.764	.810	.791	.795	.810	.830	.802	.806	.812	.865	.891		.705	.705	.692	.965
LT alcohol ab.	.655	.651	.667	.707	.689	.689	.698	.717	.695	.705	.708	.730	.724	.705		.788	.758	.761
LT hash. ab.	.662	.660	.668	.706	.688	.688	.694	.747	.686	.697	.700	.727	.728	.705	.788		.866	.862
LT synt. dr. ab.	.643	.643	.647	.692	.672	.674	.681	.702	.672	.683	.686	.715	.717	.692	.758	.866		.926
LT coc., her. ab.	.647	.647	.651	.698	.677	.670	.688	.708	.675	.687	.688	.719	.716	.695	.761	.862	.926	

* Significance for all correlations: $p \leq .001$

All examined forms of delinquent behaviour, including substance use, highly correlate with each other at the level of significance $p \leq .001$, which indicates possibility that in some juveniles one delinquent behaviour leads to another (non-violent or violent) delinquent behaviour (Table 5). Extremely high correlation ($r > .900$) is present among various property crimes, primarily with violent or non-violent criminal behaviour. For example, the highest correlation is present between burglary and the car break ($r = .930$), which can contain the element of violence in its modus operandi in situations when the car had been broken before the object was stolen from it. This suggests the high level of likelihood that the juvenile who had at some moment committed burglary, also committed a car break and theft. High correlation is also present between abuse of synthetic and the so-called heavy drugs, such as cocaine, heroin and crack ($r = .926$), as well as between abusing hashish and synthetic drugs ($r = .866$) and heavy drugs ($r = .862$). High correlation was also established between carrying of weapons in a public place (including school) and robbery ($r = .911$). This indicates the risk that while committing a robbery, a juvenile may use a weapon and possibly inflict injury to another person. Accordingly, the high correlations between carrying weapons and other property and violent crimes, such as theft ($r = .880$) and participation in a group fight ($r = .886$) should not be neglected.

3. PARENTAL SUPERVISION AND CONTROL AS A FACTOR OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The Parental control and supervision scale consisted from 12 items (variables) that examined three dimensions of this factor of juvenile delinquency: *parental knowledge* (Parents know where I am; Parents know which friends I am with, and Parents know what am I doing in free time), *parental supervision* (Parents ask where, with whom, what I did in my leisure time; Parents tell when to come after going out; I must call parents when I'm late; Parents check homework, and Parents check what I watch), and *child disclosure* (I tell parents who I spend time with; I tell parents how I spend money; I tell parents where I am after school, and I tell parents what I do in leisure time). Coefficients of the Cronbach's Alpha for the Parental control and supervision scale ($\alpha=.87$), as well as for each of the three sub-scales (Parental knowledge: $\alpha=.83$; Parental supervision: $\alpha=.85$; Child disclosure: $\alpha=.88$) reflect good internal consistency of the scale as a whole, and of each of the three sub-scales separately. The Parental control and supervision scale is a five-level Likert scale, with answers from 'almost always' to 'almost never'. When analyzing data for each item, a new variable with three answers was created: never (rarely), sometimes, often (always).

The obtained data suggests that all three variables of the *parental knowledge* sub-scale negatively correlate with most of the examined forms of delinquent behaviour (Table 6). Namely, the lack of parental knowledge on where the child is, i.e. where a child spends his/her time when he/she is not at home correlates with all forms of delinquent behaviour, as well as with substance use, except with the car break and animal cruelty. Additionally, the lack of parental knowledge on which friends the child spends time with when he/she is not at home is associated with all forms of delinquent behaviour, except bicycle and personal theft. Finally, the third variable that refers to parental knowledge on how a child spends leisure time when he/she is not at home is associated with all forms of delinquency, except personal theft.

Table 6: Parental knowledge and delinquent behaviour (results of χ^2 test)

Delinquent behaviour	Parental knowledge		
	Parents know where I am	Parents know which friends I am with	Parents know what am I doing
	p (φ)	p (φ)	p (φ)
Graffiti	.000 (-.22)	.000 (-.29)	.000 (-.21)
Vandalism	.000 (-.37)	.000 (-.39)	.000 (-.33)
Shoplifting	.000 (-.15)	.002 (-.14)	.002 (-.12)
Burglary	.000 (-.39)	.000 (-.32)	.000 (-.31)
Bicycle theft	.026 (-.11)	>.05 (-.05)	.000 (-.19)
Car/motor theft	.005 (-.17)	.009 (-.19)	.001 (-.18)
Car break	>.05(-.04)	.005 (-.20)	.001 (-.15)
Robbery	.000 (-.28)	.003 (-.11)	.001 (-.13)
Personal theft	.007 (-.19)	>.05 (-.05)	>.05 (-.05)
Weapon	.000 (-.39)	.000 (-.35)	.001 (-.13)
Group fight	.000 (-.37)	.000 (-.39)	.000 (-.19)
Assault	.000 (-.29)	.000 (-.19)	.002 (-.12)
Drug trafficking	.000 (-.35)	.000 (-.34)	.000 (-.17)
Animal cruelty	>.05 (-.05)	.010 (-.19)	.000 (-.15)
LT alcohol abuse	.000 (-.17)	.000 (-.28)	.001 (-.13)
LT hash. abuse	.000 (-.35)	.000 (-.34)	.000 (-.32)
LT synt. dr. abuse	.000 (-.39)	.000 (-.44)	.000 (-.34)
LT coc., her. abuse	.001 (-.14)	.000 (-.27)	.000 (-.26)

The level of correlation: $\varphi < .29$ - weak; $.30 \leq \varphi < .49$ - moderate; $\varphi > .50$ - strong

The less parents are informed about how, where and with whom a child spends leisure time, the more delinquency is present, and vice versa, as the level of parents' information on these issues is increasing the level of perpetrating of delinquency, as well as substance use, is decreasing. The strongest relationship of all three variables of parental knowledge, on the level of modest strength, is present with committing property crimes (vandalism and robbery), violent crimes (carrying weapon and group fight), drug trafficking, as well as with drug abuse (hashish and synthetic drug abuse, e.g. ecstasy, amphetamine, LSD).

Table 7: Parental supervision and delinquent behaviour (results of χ^2 test)

Delinquent behaviour	Parental supervision				
	Parents ask where, with whom, what I did	Parents tell when to come after going out	I must call parents when I'm late	Parents check homework	Parents check what I watch
	p (φ)	p (φ)	p (φ)	p (φ)	p (φ)
Graffiti	.009 (-.19)	.000 (-.25)	.000 (-.28)	.026 (-.17)	.000 (-.18)
Vandalism	>.05 (-.05)	.000 (-.19)	.000 (-.19)	>.05 (-.05)	>.05 (-.06)
Shoplifting	>.05 (-.09)	>.05 (-.06)	>.05 (-.07)	>.05 (-.06)	>.05 (-.04)
Burglary	.000 (-.19)	>.05 (-.09)	.010 (-.21)	>.05 (-.06)	>.05 (-.07)
Bicycle theft	>.05 (-.09)	>.05 (-.08)	>.05 (-.08)	>.05 (-.10)	>.05 (-.06)
Car/motor theft	>.05 (-.08)	>.05 (-.07)	>.05 (-.04)	>.05 (-.03)	>.05 (-.03)
Car break	>.05 (-.08)	.013 (-.20)	>.05 (-.06)	>.05 (-.09)	>.05 (-.06)
Robbery	>.05 (-.04)	.004 (-.23)	.002 (-.19)	>.05 (-.11)	>.05 (-.05)
Personal theft	>.05 (-.10)	>.05 (-.07)	>.05 (-.07)	>.05 (-.06)	>.05 (-.06)
Weapon	.017 (-.18)	.000 (-.30)	.001 (-.29)	>.05 (-.10)	.000 (-.23)
Group fight	>.05 (-.04)	.000 (-.28)	.000 (-.28)	>.05 (-.08)	.001 (-.16)
Assault	.000 (-.21)	.000 (-.19)	.001 (-.26)	>.05 (-.08)	>.05 (-.07)
Drug trafficking	>.05 (-.03)	.001 (-.20)	.009 (-.19)	>.05 (-.07)	>.05 (-.08)
Animal cruelty	>.05 (-.05)	>.05 (-.04)	>.05 (-.09)	>.05 (-.57)	>.05 (-.08)
LT alcohol abuse	>.05 (-.06)	.000 (-.27)	.001 (-.18)	.000 (-.38)	.000 (-.48)
LT hashish abuse	.004 (-.17)	.000 (-.36)	.005 (-.16)	.000 (-.32)	.000 (-.26)
LT synt. drugs abuse	.001 (-.21)	.000 (-.20)	.000 (-.22)	.036 (-.17)	>.05 (-.08)
LT coc., heroin abuse	>.05 (-.06)	>.05 (-.07)	>.05 (-.05)	>.05 (-.04)	>.05 (-.03)

The sub-scale *parental supervision* examined the level of parents' interest in where, how and with whom a child spends his/her leisure time, setting of boundaries (when to come back home after going out, obligations to call parents when he/she is late) and supervision (check of certain issues, such as checking homework and if videos a child watches are allowed and appropriate for its age) (Table 7). Unlike parental knowledge, parental supervision as an aspect of parental control has proved less significant for delinquent behaviour. Namely, most of the examined delinquent behaviours, including alcohol and drug abuse, are not associated at all to the variables of parental supervision or the association is rather weak. A somewhat stronger relationship, but still on a moderate level, was established between the reduced involvement of parents in setting of boundaries (determining the time when a child needs to return home in the evening), on the one hand, and carrying weapons ($p \leq .001$; $\varphi = -.30$) and the light drugs abuse ($p \leq .001$; $\varphi = -.36$), on the other hand. In addition, the variables that point to parental supervision, in terms of the reduced control of whether a child has completed homework and whether video content is allowed and appropriate for his/her age, contribute to alcohol and light drugs abuse.

Table 8: Child disclosure and delinquent behaviour

Delinquent behaviour	Child disclosure			
	I tell parents who I spend time with p (φ)	I tell parents how I spent money p (φ)	I tell parents where I am after school p (φ)	I tell parents what I do in leisure time p (φ)
Graffiti	.000 (-.20)	.000 (-.24)	.000 (-.25)	.000 (-.17)
Vandalism	.000 (-.26)	.000 (-.29)	.000 (-.31)	.000 (-.20)
Shoplifting	.041 (-.12)	.001 (-.22)	.018 (-.12)	>.05 (-.08)
Burglary	.000 (-.29)	.000 (-.19)	.000 (-.26)	.003 (-.17)
Bicycle theft	.005 (-.15)	.014 (-.18)	>.05 (-.06)	>.05 (-.03)
Car/motor theft	.003 (-.14)	.003 (-.13)	.037 (-.06)	>.05 (-.08)
Car break	.013 (-.17)	.013 (-.08)	>.05 (-.09)	>.05 (-.06)
Robbery	.005 (-.12)	.004 (-.16)	.001 (-.14)	>.05 (-.05)
Personal theft	.008 (-.11)	.002 (-.19)	>.05 (-.09)	.021 (-.17)
Weapon	.000 (-.36)	.000 (-.34)	.000 (-.37)	.000 (-.19)
Group fight	.000 (-.37)	.000 (-.32)	.000 (-.25)	.000 (-.17)
Assault	.000 (-.26)	.000 (-.27)	.000 (-.26)	.000 (-.23)
Drug trafficking	.001 (-.13)	.001 (-.18)	.001 (-.22)	.001 (-.18)
Animal cruelty	>.05 (-.02)	>.05 (-.10)	>.05 (-.07)	>.05 (-.07)
LT alcohol abuse	.001 (-.14)	.000 (-.36)	.002 (-.13)	.001 (-.18)
LT hashish abuse	.000 (-.18)	.000 (-.36)	.000 (-.31)	.000 (-.29)
LT synt. drugs abuse	.000 (-.33)	.000 (-.39)	.000 (-.38)	.001 (-.29)
LT coc., heroin abuse	.000 (-.26)	.000 (-.27)	.000 (-.20)	.001 (-.244)

Finally, when it comes to the third dimension of parental control and supervision – *child disclosure*, the data suggests that reduced children self-reporting (child disclosure) contributes to somewhat higher level to perpetrating of delinquent behaviour, including alcohol and drug abuse (Table 8). Children who rarely or never tell their parents where, how and whom with they spend their leisure time and how they spend money express most forms of delinquent behaviour, including substance use, more often than children who share these information with their parents. Reduced children self-reporting on spending leisure time and spending money is associated with almost all forms of delinquent behaviour, except with animal cruelty. A somewhat stronger relationship, on the level of moderate relationship, is present between reduced self-reporting and carrying weapons, group fight and abuse of alcohol, hashish and synthetic drugs ($p \leq .001$; $.30 < \phi < .49$).

Having in mind these results, we wanted to see what the possibility of predicting delinquent and risk behaviour based on the absence of parental control and supervision is. We used Logistic Regression to analyse possible predictions of delinquent behaviour based on the absence of parental supervision and control. Based on this analysis, statistically significant regression models for all three dimensions of parental control and supervision were established. Results of logistic regression are presented in Table 9.

Table 9: Parental knowledge, supervision and child disclosure as predictors of delinquent and risk behaviour

Parental control and supervision	B	SE	Wald	df	Exp. (B)	p
<i>Parental knowledge</i>						
Delinquent behaviour	-.572	.057	101.115	1	1.772	.000
Alcohol abuse	-1.358	.068	401.665	1	3.887	.000
Drug abuse	-1.273	.066	370.657	1	.280	.000
<i>Parental supervision</i>						
Delinquent behaviour	-.571	.057	99.863	1	1.770	.000
Alcohol abuse	-1.365	.068	400.577	1	3.915	.000
Drug abuse	-1.270	.066	366.313	1	.281	.000
<i>Child disclosure</i>						
Delinquent behaviour	-.569	.057	99.752	1	1.766	.000
Alcohol abuse	-1.355	.068	399.787	1	3.876	.000
Drug abuse	-1.274	.066	370.388	1	.280	.000

When it comes to *parental knowledge*, logistic regressive model is significant for prediction of delinquent behaviour ($\chi^2(3)=37.34$; $p\leq.001$; successfully classifies 63.9% of cases), alcohol abuse ($\chi^2(3)=82.56$; $p\leq.001$; successfully classifies 79.5% of cases) and drug abuse ($\chi^2(3)=74.52$; $p\leq.001$; successfully classifies 78.5% of cases).

Logistic regression model for *parental supervision* as predictor is significant for delinquent behaviour ($\chi^2(5)=38.18$; $p\leq.001$; successfully classifies 64.3% of cases), alcohol abuse ($\chi^2(5)=114.770$; $p\leq.001$; successfully classifies 79.6% of cases) and drug abuse ($\chi^2(5)=73.769$; $p\leq.001$; successfully classifies 64.3% of cases).

Finally, logistic regression model for *child disclosure* as predictor is also significant for delinquent behaviour ($\chi^2(4)=50.89$; $p\leq.001$; successfully classifies 63.8% of cases), alcohol abuse ($\chi^2(4)=41.72$; $p\leq.001$; successfully classifies 79.5% of cases) and drug abuse ($\chi^2(4)=52.55$; $p\leq.001$; successfully classifies 78.1% of cases).

All three aspects of parental control and supervision are the most predictable for alcohol abuse. Juveniles whose parents are less informed how, with whom and where they spend leisure time are at 3.89 higher risk of alcohol abuse than juveniles whose parents are more informed. Similarly, juveniles who are less supervised by parents are at 3.91 higher risk, and those who rarely inform or do not inform their parent at all about how, with whom and where they spend their leisure time are at 3.88 higher risk of alcohol abuse than juvenile who are more supervised by parents and more often inform their parents about these aspects of leisure time (Table 9).

More precisely, parental knowledge on *how* ($B=-.485$; $\text{Exp}(B)=.62$; $p\leq.001$) and *with whom* ($B=-.469$; $\text{Exp}(B)=.63$; $p\leq.001$) a child spends leisure time significantly contribute to the regression model for delinquent behaviour. Parental knowledge on *how* a child spends leisure time also significantly contributes to the regression model for alcohol abuse ($B=-.403$; $\text{Exp}(B)=.67$; $p<.01$). Finally, parental knowledge on *how* ($B=-.361$; $\text{Exp}(B)=.70$; $p<.01$) and *where* ($B=-.472$; $\text{Exp}(B)=.62$; $p\leq.001$) a child spends leisure time significantly contribute to the regression model for drug abuse.

For prediction of delinquent behaviour by parental supervision the most significant is absence of boundaries or less frequent setting of boundaries for a child: 'when to come home after going out' ($B=-.175$; $\text{Exp}(B)=.84$; $p<.05$), obligation to 'call parents when he/she is late' ($B=-.202$; $\text{Exp}(B)=.82$; $p<.05$), and 'parents check what he/she watches' ($B=-.235$; $\text{Exp}(B)=.79$; $p<.05$). Setting of boundaries – 'when to come home after going out' ($B=-.299$; $\text{Exp}(B)=.74$; $p<.01$), checking homework ($B=-.427$; $\text{Exp}(B)=.65$; $p\leq.001$) and what kind of video a child watches ($B=-.558$; $\text{Exp}(B)=.57$; $p\leq.001$) negatively predict alcohol abuse. These three indicators of parental supervision significantly contribute to the regression model of drug abuse, as well.

When it comes to child disclosure, (not) telling parents how he/she spends money significantly negatively predicts delinquent behaviour ($B=-.462$; $\text{Exp}(B)=.63$; $p\leq.001$). This aspect of child disclosure also significantly negatively predicts alcohol abuse ($B=-.569$; $\text{Exp}(B)=.57$; $p\leq.001$) and drug abuse ($B=-.433$; $\text{Exp}(B)=.65$; $p\leq.001$). Not telling parents where he/she is after school, negatively predicts drug abuse ($B=-.238$; $\text{Exp}(B)=.79$; $p<.05$), as well.

CONCLUSION

The findings of the ISRD3 in Serbia suggest high prevalence of examined forms of delinquent behaviour, including risk behaviour (alcohol and drug abuse) in two towns in Serbia where the research was conducted. If substance use is excluded, the data suggests that almost two thirds of juveniles in the given sample expressed some form of delinquency in their life. The structure of juvenile delinquency in Serbia confirms the results of some previous research and is in line with the official statistics in both Serbia and abroad: juveniles commit less severe offences, while property offences dominate. Violent offences are less frequent, and they mainly refer to group fight and animal cruelty. Nevertheless, carrying weapons should not be ignored as it appears to be a high risk behaviour that may result in violence. The research confirmed significant gender differences in self-reported juvenile delinquency: boys are more likely than girls to commit offences, while offences committed by boys are more severe and include violence. Children (below 14) and younger juveniles (14-16) commit less offence, while offences they commit are less serious and usually relate to property offences. Most of juveniles from the sample consumed alcohol (79.5%), while almost one fourth abused drugs sometimes in their life (22.1%). Boys abuse drugs more often than girls, while alcohol use is present in both boys and girls in similar percentage.

The findings also show high correlation between all examined forms of delinquent behaviour, including substance use, which suggests possibility that, in some juveniles one delinquent behaviour leads to another one. Not surprisingly, the highest correlation is present among various property crimes, primarily with violent or non-violent offences. High correlation is also present between abuse of synthetic and the so-called heavy drugs, such as cocaine, heroin and crack, as well as between abusing hashish and synthetic drugs and heavy drugs. This suggests the possibility that some juveniles try out all the available types of drugs, i.e. that they start with light drugs and gradually switch to synthetic and heavy drugs, thus, develop dependence on psychoactive substances. The findings also show high correlation between carrying of weapons in a public place (including school) and robbery, theft and participation in a group fight, which indicates the risk that juveniles may use the weapons and possibly inflict injury to another person.

This data suggests the need for developing different programs for prevention of juvenile delinquency, which would encompass different activities directed towards early detection and reaction, assistance and support, constructive spending of leisure time, as well as informing and raising awareness of juveniles about the risks of delinquent behaviour.⁵

The obtained data suggests that parental knowledge, parental supervision and child disclosure negatively correlate with delinquent and risk behaviour. This confirms the findings of similar studies in which it has been established that lack of parental knowledge of ways to which adolescents spent leisure time, lack of boundaries and supervision, as well as the lack of child disclosure contribute to adolescents' delinquent and risk behaviour (Padilla-Walker et al., 2008; Kiesner, Poulin, Dishion, 2010; Kerr, Sattin, Burke, 2010; Branstetter, Furman, 2013). Similar to previous studies (Kejisers et al., 2009; Tilton-

⁵ More information on the recommendations developed on the basis of the research results could be found in: Nikolić-Ristanović, 2017

Wiewer et al., 2013) the association between disclosure and delinquency was significantly stronger than the association between parental knowledge or control and delinquency.

Parental knowledge and supervision, as well as child disclosure negatively predict delinquent and risk behaviour. The less parents' know and supervise child's activities during leisure time and the less child tells parents what, how and with whom he/she spends leisure time, the greater is the possibility for him/her to express delinquent behaviour and to use alcohol or drug, and vice versa. In general, out of the three explored dimensions of parental control and supervision, child disclosure has proved to be the most important predictor of delinquent behaviour, while parental knowledge and parental supervision are more significant predictors of substance use than the child disclosure. According to Branstetter and Furman (2013), child's will to share information with parents depends on child's relationship with them. Delinquent behaviour disturbs relationship between the child and the parent, and therefore it can lead to a reduced child's willingness to tell the parents how, where and with whom he/she spends free time. The less child tells to parents, the less they will have control over him/her and the more will be the risk for him/her to behave delinquently.

Parental knowledge and supervision, as well as child disclosure have the strongest predictive effect on alcohol abuse, which suggests that the lack of parental control and supervision (its passive and negative element) increase the risk for alcohol abuse more than three times. These findings confirm results of other studies on parental control and supervision (Keijsers et al., 2009; Kiesner, Poulin, Dishion, 2010; Kerr, Stattin, 2000; Kerr, Stattin, Burk, 2010; Stattin, Kerr, 2000; Branstetter, Furman, 2013).

The research findings about the relationship between the lack of parental control, on the one hand, and juvenile delinquency, including substance use, on the other hand, point to relevance parental control in general has for the prevention of delinquency. Therefore, it seems important to work on developing (counselling) programmes, which would aim at empowering families and strengthening parental competencies, building parental skills, restoring family relationships and enhancing communication between parents and children, which is important for preventing juvenile delinquency, including substance use. It is also relevant to work on establishing and strengthening cooperation between family, children and schools, as well as their cooperation with the local community, since only synergetic efforts could lead to prevention of juvenile delinquency.

LITERATURE

1. Branstetter, S. A., Furman, W. (2013) Buffering effect of parental monitoring knowledge and parent-adolescent relationships on consequences of adolescent substance use. *Journal of Child & Family Studies*, 22(2), 192-198.
2. Čopić, S. (2016) Delinkventno ponašanje maloletnih lica: obim i struktura. In: V. Nikolić-Ristanović (ed.) *Delinkvencija i viktimizacija maloletnih lica u Srbiji: Rezultati Međunarodne ankete samoprijavlivanjem delinkvencije*. Beograd: Prometej, 23-48.
3. Junger-Tas, J., Marshall, I. H., Enzmann, D., Killias, M., Stekete, M., Gruszczynska, B. (2010) *Juvenile Delinquency in Europe and Beyond: Results of the Second International Self-Report Delinquency Study*. New York: Springer.
4. Kerr, M., Stattin, H. (2000) What parents know, how they know it, and several forms of adolescent adjustment: Further support for a reinterpretation of monitoring. *Developmental Psychology*, 36(3), 366-380.

5. Kerr, M., Stattin, H., Burk, W. J. (2010) A reinterpretation of parental monitoring in longitudinal perspective. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 20(1), 39–64.
6. Kiesner, J., Poulin, F., Dishion, T. J. (2010) Adolescent substance use with friends: Moderating and mediating effects of parental monitoring and peer activity contexts. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 56(4), 529-556.
7. Keijsers, L., Frijns, T., Branje, S. J. T., Meeus, W. (2009) Developmental links of adolescent disclosure, parental solicitation, and control with delinquency: Moderation by parental support. *Developmental Psychology*, 45(5), 1314-1327.
8. Kovačević, M. (2016) Karakteristike delinkventnog ponašanja maloletnih lica. In: V. Nikolić-Ristanović (ed.) *Delinkvencija i viktimizacija maloletnih lica u Srbiji: Rezultati Međunarodne ankete samoprijavlivanjem delinkvencije*. Beograd: Prometej, 49-54.
9. Nikolić-Ristanović, V. (2016) (ed.) *Delinkvencija i viktimizacija maloletnih lica u Srbiji: Rezultati Međunarodne ankete samoprijavlivanjem delinkvencije*. Beograd: Prometej.
10. Nikolić-Ristanović, V. (2017) (ed.) *Delinkvencija i viktimizacija maloletnih lica u Srbiji: rezultati Međunarodne ankete samoprijavlivanjem delinkvencije – Sažetak i preporuke*. Beograd: Prometej.
11. Nikolić-Ristanović, V., Stevković, Lj. (2015) Međunarodna anketa samoprijavlivanjem maloletničke delinkvencije: Istraživanje delinkventnog ponašanja i viktimizacije maloletnih lica. In: I. Stevanović (ed.) *Maloletnici kao učinioci i kao žrtve krivičnih dela i prekršaja*, Beograd: Institut za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja, 259-274.
12. Padilla-Walker, L. M., Nelson, L. J., Madsen, S. D., Barry, C. M. N. (2008) The role of perceived parental knowledge on emerging adults' risk behaviors. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 37(7), 847–859.
13. Stattin, H., Kerr, M. (2000) Parental monitoring: A reinterpretation. *Child Development*, 71(4), 1072–1085.
14. Stevković, Lj., Nikolić-Ristanović, V. (2016) Istraživanje maloletničke delinkvencije u Srbiji primenom Međunarodne ankete samoprijavlivanjem (ISR3) – metodološki okvir In: V. Nikolić-Ristanović (ed.) *Delinkvencija i viktimizacija maloletnih lica u Srbiji: Rezultati Međunarodne ankete samoprijavlivanjem delinkvencije*. Beograd: Prometej, 7-18.
15. Tilton-Weaver, L. C., Burk, W. J., Kerr, M., Stattin, H. (2013) Can parental monitoring and peer management reduce the selection or influence of delinquent peers? Testing the question using a dynamic social network approach. *Developmental Psychology*, 49(11), 2057–2070.

Dr Sanja Čopić
Viši naučni saradnik Instituta za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja
Viktimološko društvo Srbije, Srbija

Mr Ljiljana Stevković
Fakultet za specijalnu edukaciju i rehabilitaciju Univerziteta u Beogradu,
Viktimološko društvo Srbije, Srbija

RODITELJSKI NADZOR I KONTROLA KAO FAKTOR MALOLETNIČKE DELINKVENCije: REZULTATI MEĐUNARODNE ANKETE SAMOPRIJAVLJIVANJEM DELINKVENCije

Tokom 2013. i 2014. godine Srbija je po prvi put uzela učešće u Međunarodnoj anketi samoprijavlivanjem delinkvencije (ISR3). Istraživanje je sprovedeno na uzorku of 1344 učenika osnovnih (VII i VIII razreda) i srednjih škola (I do IV razreda) u dva najveća grada - Beogradu i Novom Sadu. Podaci su prikupljeni pomoću standardizovanog upitnika. Ovaj rad ima za cilj da prikaže deo nalaza istraživanja koji se odnose na obim, strukturu i korelacije različitih oblika delinkventnog i rizičnog ponašanja koji su ispitivani, kao i na roditeljski nadzor i kontrolu kao faktor maloletničke delinkvencije. Podaci do kojih se došlo pokazuju visok stepen rasprostranjenosti ispitivanih delinkventnih ponašanja, uključujući rizična ponašanja, posebno konzumiranje alkohola, u populaciji maloletnih lica u gradovima u kojima je istraživanje sprovedeno. Maloletna lica češće ispoljavaju delinkventna ponašanja manje društvene opasnosti, a među njima preovlađuju dela imovinske prirode. Nasilna dela su manje zastupljena i najčešće se ispoljavaju u učestvovanju u grupnoj tuči na javnom mestu i u zlostavljanju životinja. Dečaci vrše više delinkventnih ponašanja od devojčica, pri čemu su ponašanja dečaka teža i češće uključuju nasilje. Takođe, što su ispitanici strariji to više vrše delinkventna ponašanja. Većina maloletnih lica iz uzorka je konzumirala alkohol, a oko četvrtine njih je konzumiralo drogu u nekom momentu tokom života. Nalazi istraživanja pokazuju visoku korelaciju između svih ispitivanih oblika delinkventnog ponašanja, uključujući konzumiranje alkohola i droge. Sve tri ispitivane dimenzije roditeljskog nadzora i kontrole (roditelji znaju gde, kako i sa kim dete provodi slobodno vreme, roditeljski nadzor i informisanje roditelja od strane deteta o tome kako, gde i sa kim provodi slobodno vreme van kuće) negativno koreliraju sa delinkventim i rizičnim ponašanjem. Takođe, sve tri dimenzije roditeljskog nadzora i kontrole predstavljaju prediktore delinkventnog i rizičnog ponašanja maloletnih lica. Ukupno gledano, odsustvo roditeljskog nadzora i kontrole povezano je sa ispoljavanjem delinkventnog ponašanja i predstavlja prediktor maloletničke delinkvencije. Polazeći od toga, važnim se čini rad na razvijanju različitih preventivnih programa, uključujući programe usmerene na razvijanje i jačanje roditeljskih kompetencija i veština, kao i unapređenje komunikacije i odnosa na relaciji roditelji-dete kako bi se delovalo u pravcu prevencije i suzbijanja maloletničke delinkvencije u Srbiji.

KLJUČNE REČI: maloletnička delinkvencija / Međunarodna anketa samoprijavlivanjem delinkvencije / roditeljski nadzor i kontrola / Srbija