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Abstract: The study was conducted on the titled caption, “A comparative study of high and low delinquency prone adolescents of Ganderbal, on the various dimensions of adjustment – Kashmir”. The general objective of the study is to identify high and low delinquency prone adolescent, to compare these high and low delinquency prone adolescent groups on the various dimensions of adjustment viz ; home, emotion, social, health and total adjustment respectively. The sample of 100 adolescents was drawn randomly, Lidhoo`s delinquency proneness scale and Bell`s adjustment inventory were administered. The criterion of extreme group technique was used, to categorize high and low delinquency prone group and these groups were compared on the various dimensions of adjustment by using appropriate statistical technique viz, Mean, S.D, and ‘t’-value respectively to extract out the results of the study. The results of the said study revealed that the high and low delinquency prone adolescents shows no significant difference on home and social dimension of adjustment, But on emotional health and total adjustment dimensions of high and low groups of delinquency proneness subjects shows significant difference providentially.
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different psychologists, sociologists and researcher’s are as:-

Beccaria, (1764) relates delinquency with physique and crime, the delinquent offender’s depicts on the intensive survey and research report grounds that the delinquency is directly related to physical makeup and the crime rate in the social set up. The robust physical makeup of an individual is appealed towards the acts of delinquency, approximate high crime rate also reveals the high delinquency rate positively. The review of literature is supported by Gluck and Gluck (1950), Kavaraceus (1966) and Gluck (1960) depicts that the delinquency is not always associated with under the roof environment, but in some instances it is more related to personality makeup i-e, physique.

Slawson, (1926) relates delinquency with intelligence, Delinquency and intelligence have positive correlation up to certain intensity level than after words does not shows any interactions i-e, some works show that delinquency is negatively related with intelligence, but certain survey reports shows as the intelligence rate exceeds so the delinquency.

W. Healy, (1915) relates delinquency with social conditions, The socio-environmental conditions are also governing the rate of delinquency. Several sociologists (Ohlin, 1960; Cohen, 1955; Clardin, 1942; Merton, 1957; Reckless, 1955; Sutherland, 1937; Lindesmith, 1941; to name a few) have conceptualized crime and delinquency as social phenomena, developed through reasons embedded in the functioning of the social process. For instance it may be due to the association with antisocial groups and consequent absorption of criminal values. This group of scientists put the entire emphasis on the characteristics of different social conditions and social processes.

Glacer and Rice, (1959) relates delinquency with poverty, Even in the current scenario of this decade the Socio-economic variable is directly related with the delinquency. Those societies which are traditional in nature have agrarian economy, have interactions with delinquency ascendance as the poverty is severe.

Gitten’s, (1952) relate it with broken homes and Trenamen, (1952) relates delinquency with size of the family, Broken homes and the size of family are the demographic criterions of delinquency. Using a psychodynamic procedure, different degrees of maladjustment among the delinquents were spotted by Schachtel (1951), Stott (1959), Shally and Toch (1962), Johnson and Szuerk (1952), Maitra (1965) and Shammugam (1975) and many others. The overview of the literature and the works of above researcher’s reveals that home environment is directly influence the individuals behaviour either on normal or deviant behaviour.

2. Objectives
1. To identify high and low delinquency prone adolescents.
2. To compare high and low delinquency prone adolescents on home adjustment.
3. To compare high and low delinquency prone adolescents on emotional adjustment.
4. To compare high and low delinquency prone adolescents on social adjustment.
5. To compare high and low delinquency prone adolescents on health adjustment.
6. To compare high and low delinquency prone adolescents on total adjustment.

3. Hypothesis
1. There will be no significant difference between high and low delinquency prone adolescents on home adjustment.
2. There will be no significant difference between high and low delinquency prone adolescents on emotional adjustment.
3. There will be no significant difference between high and low delinquency prone adolescents on social adjustment.
4. There will be no significant difference between high and low delinquency prone adolescents on health adjustment.
5. There will be no significant difference between high and low delinquency prone adolescents on total adjustment.

4. Sample
For this study, the adequate sample was drawn from the various government higher secondary schools of district Ganderbal, i.e the population for the said study are 11th and 12th class adolescents of district Ganderbal. Random sample N=100 students were selected for the study, considering the general criterion in which equivalent subjects were selected on class wise dimension from the government higher secondary schools of district Ganderbal of Kashmir province. The sample subjects (N=100), studying in the higher secondary schools of Ganderbal, were from the various higher secondaries of district Ganderbal on random basis viz; Govt. Boys Higher Secondary Duberhama, Govt. Boys Higher Secondary Kangan, Govt. Higher Secondary Safapora (co-education) and Govt. Higher Secondary Kurhama (co-education) Ganderbal respectively. From the above mentioned Higher Secondaries, 25 subjects were selected from each institution on random basis. Also the equal criterion for class was taken into consideration i.e, from class 12th, 12-13 students and class 11th, 12-13 students were taken
from the said higher secondary schools of Ganderbal – Kashmir.

5. **Tools used**

1. LIDHOO’S DELINQUENCY PRONENESS SCALE (1984) WAS USED FOR THE MEASUREMENT OF DELINQUENCY PRONENESS.

2. BELL’S ADJUSTMENT INVENTORY (1934) WAS USED FOR THE MEASUREMENT OF ADJUSTMENT.

**Statistical technique used**

Mean, S.D and t-test were employed for the analysis of the data, t-test results depicts the difference between high and low delinquency prone subjects on the various dimensions of adjustment, also extreme group technique was used to chalkout high and low delinquency prone subjects.

### Statistical Analysis

**Table A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.D</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.330</td>
<td>NS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.D</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A shows the significance of mean difference between high and low delinquency prone adolescents on ‘home adjustment’.

**Table B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.D</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.521</td>
<td>NS** 0.01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.D</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B shows the significance of mean difference between high and low delinquency prone adolescents on ‘emotional adjustment’.

**Table C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.D</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>NS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.D</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C shows the significance of mean difference between high and low delinquency prone adolescents on ‘social adjustment’.

**Table D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.D</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>1.508</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.134</td>
<td>0.01 level NS**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.D</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D shows the significance of mean difference between high and low delinquency prone adolescents on ‘health adjustment’.

**Table E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.D</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>1.926</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.05 level NS***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.D</td>
<td>24.33</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E shows the significance of mean difference between high and low delinquency prone adolescents on ‘total adjustment’.

**Key**

i. HD = High delinquency proneness group
ii. LD= Low delinquency proneness group
iii. NS* = Not Significant
iv. NS** = Significant at 0.01 level
v. NS*** = Significant at 0.05 level
7. Discussion and Interpretation of the Results

**Table A:** The ‘t’-value of the said table (t=1.330) depicts that the table value is not significant at any of the levels, which infer that (HD) ‘high delinquent’ and (LD) ‘low delinquent’ prone subjects do not differ significantly on ‘home adjustment’, in district Ganderbal.

**Table B:** The ‘t’-value of the said table (t=3.521) depicts that the table value is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Which infer that (HD) ‘high delinquent’ and (LD) ‘low delinquent’ prone subjects differ significantly on ‘emotional adjustment’, in district Ganderbal.

**Table C:** The ‘t’-value of the said table (t=0.233) depicts that the table value is not significant at any of the levels, which infer that (HD) ‘high delinquent’ and (LD) ‘low delinquent’ prone subjects do not differ significantly on ‘social adjustment’, in district Ganderbal.

**Table D:** The ‘t’-value of the said table (t=4.134) depicts that the table value is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Which infer that (HD) ‘high delinquent’ and (LD) ‘low delinquent’ prone subjects differ significantly on ‘health adjustment’, in district Ganderbal.

**Table E:** The ‘t’-value of the said table (t=2.06) depicts that the table value is significant at 0.05 level of significance. Which infer that (HD) ‘high delinquent’ and (LD) ‘low delinquent’ prone subjects differ significantly on ‘total adjustment’, in district Ganderbal.

8. Conclusion

The following outcomes of the present study are presented on the basis of the discussion and interpretation of the data which are as:

1. No significant difference was found between high and low delinquency prone subjects on home adjustment.
2. Significant difference was found between high and low delinquency prone subjects on emotional adjustment.
3. No significant difference was found between high and low delinquency prone subjects on social adjustment.
4. Significant difference was found between high and low delinquency prone subjects on health adjustment.
5. Significant difference was found between high and low delinquency prone subjects on total adjustment.
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