Tannenbaum Theory of Labeling: Impact Among Juvenile Inmates

Nick Infante Rojas, PLT College, Inc., Philippines
John Bel K. Galumba, PLT College, Inc., Philippines
Chington P. Pinhikan, PLT College, Inc., Philippines
Dennis Ervin E. Thiam, PLT Colege, Inc., Philippines

Abstract
The study aimed at identifying the effects of labeling to juvenile-inmates using the Tannenbaum's Theory. It has used descriptive-comparative and descriptive-correlational approaches in determining the significant differences and correlation in the impact of labeling when grouped according to the inmates' profiles and the labels and labellers for the respondents. For qualitative descriptions, frequency, percentage and mean computations were used to discuss the respondents' profile variables; the labels and the labellers; and respondents' encouragements in their academic life and social life – which were regarded as the impact of labeling as discussed in Tannenbaum's theory and were rated as "STRONGLY AGREE" and "DISAGREE" for positive and negative determinants respectively. Respondents were of ages 16-17 years. Majority were high school levels, belonged to Ilokano ethnicity, and were jailed of theft. There were 21 positive and 16 negative words used to regard them; and most of these were tagged by their friends, families and neighbors. Both labels and labellers were significantly differentiated with the impact of the labeling. Age, ethnicity and educational attainment of the juvenile-inmates showed differences and relationships with the inmates' perceptions. While impact of labeling, as to academic and social life were significantly correlated.

Keywords: Tannenbaum's Theory of Labeling, Juvenile-inmates, Labels,
              Labellers, Academic Life, Social Life

Introduction

According to Frank Tannenbaum, the labeling theory of juvenile delinquency deals with the effects of labels, or stigmas, on juvenile behavior. It holds that society, by placing labels on juvenile delinquents stigmatizes them leading to a negative label for a youth to develop into a negative self-image. Youth who are labeled as "criminals" or "delinquents" may hold these as self – fulfilling prophecies – believing the labels that others assign to them, thereby acting as the labels (cited by Menna, 2007).

Tannenbaum, the *"Grandfather of Labeling Theory"* also suggests that a youth who succumbs to a label may then proceed to act as a "criminal" or act as a "delinquent," abandoning social norms because he or she believes that he or she is a bad person and that this is what bad people are supposed to do.

In the Philippines, the problems among juveniles are much related to social problems. To survive in the street, you almost have to become delinquent. These children are vulnerable to prostitution, drug addiction and pushing and commission of crimes. So many times the streets were cleaned up at the start of tourist season and as a consequence many street children were jailed because of vagrancy laws. (Eduardo et al., 2012)

Benchmarking on the discussion of the said concepts and theories have helped constructed the scaffold of this study entitled "Impact of Labelling to Juvenile-Inmates Using Tannenbaum's Theory", which involved inmates of ages 18 years and below at the Nueva Vizcaya Provincial Jail.

Significance of the Study

This study was anchored at determining the impact of labeling to juvenile inmates using Tannenbaum's Theory. The study specifically sought answers to the following questions:

1. How are the juvenile inmates be described in terms of their demographics along age, school level attained, ethnicity, and offense?
2. What are the (a) labels (positive or negative words) attached; and (b) who gives label to the juvenile-inmates of the Nueva Vizcaya Provincial Jail?
3. What is the impact of labelling to juvenile-inmates in terms of their encouragements and challenges along: (a) academic life; and (b) social life?
4. Is there significant difference with the respondents' perceptions on (a) labels and labelers and (b) impact of labeling to juvenile-inmates along academic life and social life?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the (a) labels, and (b) labellers and the impact of labelling to juvenile-inmates along (a) academic life and (b) social life?

Methodology

This study had used the descriptive method of research to elicit information on the labels and labellers for the juveniles. Hence, this is used to describe the impact of Labelling based on Tannenbaum's Theory in terms of the encouragements and challenges of the juvenile-inmates along their academic life and social life.

Respondents are purposively taken as samples of the study. A total of 29 male juvenile-inmates were counted as of October 15, 2014, who were evaluated based on the variables along with their demographics and determinants for the type of labels attached to them; who give them labels, and the impact of labeling as categorized through academic life, social life, and their aspiration in life.

The study had used a questionnaire drafted from the different concepts discussing Tannenbaum's Theory. The questionnaire was divided into 3 parts; Part 1 includes Personal Data Sheet (PDS) for respondents' profile variables on age, school level attained, ethnicity, and offense. Part 2 involves items soliciting information for (a) labels (words commonly tagged to the respondents), where inmates were asked to enumerate 5 words (positive or negative) related to this purpose and (b) labelers – those who commonly tagged them with the said words (labels), where respondents were asked to identify (as many there is) their answers among family, friends, and neighbors (for others – respondents were asked to specify them). Part 3 covers item-checklist for their academic and social life, where inmates were asked to evaluate 10 items in each indicator based on their challenges and encouragements on the said aspects (5 positive, 5 negative statements). The evaluation of the items included in Part 3 was based on the following interpretation, using Rensis' Likert scale:

4	3.50 – 4.00	Strongly Agree	Greatly Affected
3	2.50 – 3.49	Agree	Affected
2	1.50 – 2.49	Disagree	Slightly Affected
1	1.00 – 1.49	Strongly Disagree	Not Affected

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze the differences between group means and their associated procedure (Such as variation among and between group) developed by R.A. Fisher. For statistical significance t-test method was also used wherein it is a statistical test for small sample of observation that comes from a larger sample with a standard distribution of statistical properties.

Correlation coefficient was also used to measure degree of relationship between labels/labelers and the respondents' academic life and social life; and between their academic life and social life.

Results and Discussions

Problem 1: How are the juvenile-inmates be described in terms of their profiles on age, ethnicity and highest educational level?

Juvenile delinquency as the main concept of the study is being observed among the said group-age. It is believed that the youth at this point are most vulnerable to acts of delinquency which may result from several factors of pubertal development and/or an implication of labeling as claimed in Tannenbaum's theory.

To give detail on respondents' age, table 1 shows that juvenile-inmates of the Nueva Vizcaya Provincial Jail are aging from 15 years young to 18 years old.

Table 1
Respondents' Profile Distribution according to Age

Age Range	Frequency (F)	Percentage (%)
15 years	7	24.14%
16 years	6	20.69%
17 years	10	34.48%
18 years	6	20.69%
Total	**29**	**100%**
Mean	*16.57*	

A percentage share of 34.48% among the total samples are of age 17 years counting a frequency of ten (10); seven (7) or 24.14% are aging 15 years; and six (6) or 20.69% are for each group of ages 16 years and 18 years.

In average, the computed mean age is 16.57 years signifying that the typical age of the juvenile-inmates is between 16 to 17 years old.

Table 2 gives frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents' profile along school level attained.

Table 2

Respondents' Profile Distribution according to School Level Attained

Highest Educational Attainment	FREQUENCY (F)	PERCENTAGE (%)
Elementary Undergraduate	10	34.48%
High School Graduate	17	58.62%
College Undergraduate	2	6.90%
Total	**29**	**100.00%**

As shown in table 2, most of the target respondents have attended high school with frequency of 17 (58.62%). Others are distributed in the category of elementary undergraduate, totaling to 10 (34.48%) respondents; and the remainder 2 (6.90%) are college undergraduates.

In general, findings in table 2 also validates the age-group of the respondents which ranges from 15 to 18. This age-range is considered to be at the stage of pubertal-development when young people are exposed to physiological, psychological, social, and emotional changes as influenced by some factors which include their education.

Table 3 shows data the distribution of respondents in terms of their ethnicity.

Table 3
Respondents' Profile Distribution according to Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Frequency (F)	Percentage (%)
Ilocano	19	65.52%
Igorot	7	24.14%
Tagalog	3	10.34%
Total	**29**	**100.00%**

Out of the 29 total juvenile-inmates, 19 belonged to the ethnic group Ilokano with a total percentage distribution of 65.52%. 7 (24.14%) of them are belonging to the Igorot ethnic group; and 3 (10.34%) other respondents are distributed to the Tagalog group.

To explain how and why juveniles are greatly affected by labeling, Seisa in 2011 cited that social groups create theories and statements on what is deviant. Those who break the norms are automatically labeled as deviant juveniles. Such social groups in the context of the study are here presented and categorized, which ethnicity is counted as one.

In table 4, respondents' population is subcategorized according to the offenses given to the juvenile-inmates.

Table 4
Respondents' Profile Distribution according to their Offense

Offense	Frequency (F)	Percentage (%)
Attempted Murder	3	10.34%
Theft	9	31.03%
Murder	1	3.45%
Illegal Drugs	8	27.59%
Robbery	4	13.79%
Rape	1	3.45%
Car Napping	2	6.90%
Total	**29**	**100.00%**

As enumerated in table 4, about 31.03% (9) of the total respondents were jailed because of "theft"; 8 (27.59%) were caught of illegal drugs; 4 (13.79%) are having an offense of robbery; 3 (10.34%) are those with attempted murder as their offense; 2 (6.90%) inmates with an offense of car napping; 1 (3.45%) young male-inmate for each murder and rape.

In lieu with the discussions of labeling theory being presented in the background of the study, Menna in 2007 suggested that young people who are labeled as *"criminals"* or *"delinquents"* may hold these as self-fulfilling prophecies believing the labels that others assign to them, thereby acting as the labels.

Findings presented in table 4 showing the different offenses attached to the juvenile-inmates may suggest a significant implication of labeling to young individuals. Still, although not as the direct cause of the respondents' present condition, labeling may have influenced their actions which led them behind bars.

> ***Problem 2: What are the (a) labels (positive or negative words) attached; and (b) who gives label to the juvenile-inmates of the Nueva Vizcaya Provincial Jail?***

Tables 5 and six 6 explain data on the different words (be it positive or negative) being tagged to the juvenile-inmates and who usually tagged them with these labels.

Table 5
Total Numbers of Positive and Negative Labels being attached to Juvenile-Inmates

Number of Words/Inmate		F	%
Positive	*Negative*		
5	None	16	55.17%
4	1	1	3.45%
3	2	8	27.59%
2	3	1	3.45%
1	4	2	6.90%
None	5	1	3.45%
Total		**29**	**100.00%**

The data in table 5 shows that there are 16 (55.17%) respondents that enumerated 5 positive labels with no negative regards; 8 (27.59%) claimed 3 favorable terms and 2 negative terms; 2 (6.90%) of the young-inmates 1 positive tag and 4 negative regards; 1 (3.45%) respondent for 4 positive and 1 negative terms subsequently; 1 (3.45%) juvenile-inmate provided 1 positive and 4 negative terms; and 1 (3.45%) among the respondents for no positive labels.

Table 6
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Labellers

Labellers	Frequency (F)	Percentage (%)
Family	24	82.76%
Friends	29	100.00%
Neighbors	23	79.31%

Table 6 shows data on how the study is being associated with the Tannenbaum's theory focusing in the implication of labeling on juvenile delinquency as evaluated using variable on who gives the labels to the target-respondents.

All juvenile inmates claimed that labels are usually given by the respondents' friends. 24 or 82.76% percentage share of the respondents said that they are usually tagged by their own family. And 23 (79.31%) of the population said that the labels are from the people in their own neighborhood.

Although it shows that majority of the total samples answered that they are usually tagged within their own circle of friends, the statistics counted for family and neighbor still determines as main contributors in labeling the juveniles. Thus, it is but necessary that family-relations, peer-influences and community encounters should be given attention in the total development of the youth as to minimize the incidence of crimes committed by young individuals.

In light of the ongoing study, Gault in 2013 emphasized that delinquency suggests a failure of the parents and society to raise the child rather than the failure of the child. It is in this context that item-determinants shown in table 5 were considered valuable in the conduct of the study as to point-out how to deal properly with juvenile delinquents. Although these young people have done acts punishable by law (in short, unlawful acts), they should not be regarded negatively. Yet, most people would do even their own significant others (family). As Gault claimed, their being delinquent is more associated with parental guidance and more of a social responsibility.

> ***Problem 3: What is the impact of labelling to juvenile-inmates in terms of their encouragements and challenges along: (a) academic life; and (b) social life?***

The respondents were evaluated on how they regard their life in the aspect of their academics and social interactions. These data were considered indicators as to identify the impact of labeling among the juvenile-inmates.

Table 7 shows information for respondents' academic path as sub-categorized into 10 specific item-indicators.

Table 7
Respondents' Encouragements/Challenges along their Academic Life

ACADEMIC LIFE	MEAN	Description	Interpretation
I am encouraged to perform well in school.	3.72	Strongly Agree	Greatly Affected
I am encouraged going back to school.	3.69	Strongly Agree	Greatly Affected
I am encouraged to finish my study.	3.83	Strongly Agree	Greatly Affected
I am encouraged to participate in extra-curricular activities in school.	3.69	Strongly Agree	Greatly Affected
I am encouraged to submit school requirements.	3.45	Agree	Affected
Positive Encouragements (Overall Mean)	**3.68**	**Strongly Agree**	**Greatly Affected**
I am discouraged to perform well in school.	1.41	Strongly Disagree	Not Affected
I am ashamed to go back to school.	1.86	Disagree	Slightly
I am discouraged to participate in extra-curricular activities in school.	1.59	Disagree	Slightly Affected
I am discouraged to finish my study.	1.34	Strongly Disagree	Not Affected
I am discouraged to submit school requirements.	1.55	Disagree	Slightly Affected
Negative Encouragements (Overall Mean)	**1.55**	**Disagree**	**Slightly Affected**
Reversed (Overall Positive Mean)	**3.56**	**Strongly Agree**	**Greatly Affected**

Table 7 gives information on the academic life of the respondents being classified into 10 specific statements for self-encouragement (first 5 items for positive encouragement and the 5 items for discouragement). As an aftermath of their present conditions, these data gives better understanding on the implication of labeling among juveniles.

Significantly, all items for positive encouragements – all focusing on their education were qualitatively described as *"AGREE"* or interpreted as *"AFFECTED"* and *"STRONGLY AGREE"*, interpreted as *"GREATLY AFFECTED"*. Among these specific statements, item #3: *I am encouraged to finish my study* slated the highest mean computed as 3.83 *(GREATLY AFFECTED)*; item #1: *I am encouraged to perform well in school* ranked second with a computed mean of 3.72 *(GREATLY AFFECTED)*; items #2: *I am encouraged to go back to school* and #4: *I am encouraged to participate in extra-curricular activities in school* tied on a mean of 3.69 *(GREATLY AFFECTED)*; and item #5: *I am encouraged to submit school requirements* computed a mean of 3.45 *(AFFECTED)*. In general, all 5 self-

encouragements are computed for a mean of 3.68 with a qualitative interpretation of *"GREATLY AFFECTED"*.

Positive findings for the first 5 item indicators are intensified with the data shown in the responses of the respondents in item indicators 6 to 10. These statements are more focused in one's self-discouragement. Among which, item #9: *I am discouraged to finish my study* showed the lowest mean score of 1.34 *(NOT AFFECTED)*; item #6: *I am discouraged to perform well in school* showed a mean of 1.41 *(NOT AFFECTED)*; item #10: *I am discouraged to perform well in school* has a mean of 1.55 *(SLIGHTLY AFFECTED)*; item # 8: *I am discouraged to participate in extra-curricular activities in school* counted a mean of 1.59 *(SLIGHTLY AFFECTED)*; and item #7: *I am ashamed to go back to school* computed a mean of 1.86 *(SLIGHTLY AFFECTED)*. In summary, the mean score for the negative statements counted a value of 1.55 qualitatively described as *"SLIGHTLY AFFECTED"*.

Overall, if negative statements were reversed to positive, the computed mean would show 3.56 with a qualitative interpretation of **"GREATLY AFFECTED".** Thus, this denotes that juvenile-inmates have strong desire to pursue with their education.

Table 8 identifies the impact of labeling as evaluated through juvenile-inmates' social life. Similar with earlier indicator on academic life, it is also classified into 5 positive statements and other 5 for negative items.

Table 8
Respondents' Encouragements/Challenges along their Social Life

SOCIAL LIFE	Mean	Description	Interpretation
I am challenged to show people that I am a good person.	3.79	Strongly Agree	Greatly Affected
I am encouraged to join social gatherings.	3.55	Strongly Agree	Greatly Affected
I am encouraged to change my ways and reform for good.	3.69	Strongly Agree	Greatly Affected
I am encouraged to support projects that involve community services.	3.48	Agree	Affected
I am encouraged to become a socially responsible person.	3.55	Strongly Agree	Greatly Affected
Positive Challenges (Overall Mean)	**3.61**	**Strongly Agree**	**Greatly Affected**
I am discouraged in showing to people that I am a good person.	1.66	Disagree	Slightly Affected
I am discouraged in joining social gatherings.	1.79	Disagree	Slightly Affected
I am discouraged to change my ways and reform for good.	1.62	Disagree	Slightly Affected
I am discouraged to support projects that involve community services.	1.69	Disagree	Slightly Affected
I am discouraged to be socially responsible person.	1.52	Disagree	Slightly Affected
Negative Challenges (Overall Mean)	**1.66**	**Disagree**	**Slightly Affected**
Reversed (Overall Positive Mean)	**3.48**	**Agree**	**Affected**

As manifested in the given table, determinants for positive statements were generally interpreted as *"GREATLY AFFECTED"* with a computed mean value of 3.61, while the other determinants for the negative statements describing the social interactions of the target respondents were qualitatively interpreted as *"SLIGHTLY AFFECTED"* with a mean score of 1.66.

Eduardo et al. in 2012 presented "juvenile delinquency" as one of the social problems in the Philippines. Particularly, they identified street children having a higher potential to become delinquent. This is because of several factors making them more vulnerable and exposed with "social problems" for them to survive in the street.

To itemize the findings in table 8, for the positive statements, item #1: *I am challenged to show people that I am a good person* ranked 1st in showing how positively challenged the target respondents are in terms of their social life. This item-indicator has a computed mean score of 3.79 of a qualitative interpretation of

"GREATLY AFFECTED". Meanwhile, item #3: *I am encouraged to change my ways and reform for good* has a mean value of 3.69 *(GREATLY AFFECTED)*; items #2: *I am encourage to join social gatherings* and #5 *I am encouraged to become socially responsible person*, both has computed means of 3.55 *(GREATLY AFFECTED)*; and item #4: *I am encouraged to support projects that involve community services* has a mean of 3.48 *(AFFECTED)*.

On the other hand, from the set of negative statements, item #10: *I am discouraged to be socially responsible person* shows the least mean value of 1.52 *(SLIGHTLY AFFECTED)*; item #8: *I am discouraged to change my ways and reform for good* weighed a mean of 1.62 *(SLIGHTLY AFFECTED)*; item #6: *I am discouraged in showing people that I am a good person* has a mean of 1.66 *(SLIGHTLY AFFECTED)*; item #9 *I am discouraged in joining support projects that involve community services* calculated a mean value of 1.69 *(SLIGHTLY AFFECTED)*; and item #7: I am discouraged in joining social gatherings has a mean of 1.79 *(SLIGHTLY AFFECTED)*. All forms of discouragements were generally negated by the juvenile-inmates, which validated their positive social encouragements.

When negative statements were treated positively, it would show a computed mean of 3.48 of a qualitative interpretation of *"AFFECTED"*. This means that respondents are also motivated to be socially responsible individuals.

> ### Problem 4: Is there significant difference with the respondents' perceptions on (a) labels and labelers and (b) impact of labeling to juvenile-inmates along academic life and social life?

The labeling theory holds the significant effect of the words being tagged to young people on their behavior. In this study, it shows that respondents are given word-attachment regardless of their profile variables and thus would behave according to what they are tagged for as claimed by the Tannenbaum's theory.

Table 9 gives detail on the differences of respondents' perceptions when grouped according to their Age.

Table 9
Differences in Respondents' (a) Labels and Labellers, (b)
Encouragements/Challenges along their Academic Life and Social Life according to
their Age

Age	ANOVA for Differences at 0.05 level of significance				
Variables	df	Computed F	P-value	Critical F	Decision
Labels	9	0.17	0.91050	6.59	Not Significant
Labellers	11	6.52	0.01528	4.07	Significant
Academic Life (Positive)	19	10.06	0.00058	3.24	Significant
Academic Life (Negative)	19	3.54	0.03865	3.24	Significant
Social Life (Positive)	19	6.74	0.00378	3.24	Significant
Social Life (Negative)	19	26.93	0.0000	3.24	Significant

With regards to the words being tagged to the respondents as categorized according to their ages, table 9 shows no significant variations on this aspect. This signifies that the attached words (be it positive or negative) do not vary according to the age of the juvenile-inmates. However, it shows the significant difference on who gives the labels (labelers) to the respondents according to their ages. This implies that social groups play significantly in labeling young individuals and it varies notably as juveniles grow older.

When grouped according to their ages, the respondents' academic life showed variations in their encouragement to pursue with their discontinued education. Descriptively shown, with the computed means per age-group, younger respondents are more encouraged to pursue with their studies. However, those that are older still show high interest for their academics. The finding for positive outlook of the respondents toward their academic life is intensified along with the negative statements; younger respondents generally disagreed with the determinants presented in the survey-questionnaire. This implies further that younger inmates are more motivated in terms of their academic life.

As for the variations in the respondents' perceptions along their school level attended, table 10 still shows no significant for the type of labels being tagged to juvenile-inmates and no significance along their academic life.

Table 10
Differences in Respondents' (a) Labels and Labellers, (b)
Encouragements/Challenges along their Academic Life and Social Life according to
their Age

School Level Attended Variables	ANOVA for Differences at 0.05 level of significance				
	df	Computed F	P-value	Critical F	Decision
Labels	5	1.242371	0.40453	9.552094	Not Significant
Labellers	6	9.142857	0.03222	6.94427	Significant
Academic Life (Positive)	14	0.09852	0.09852	3.885294	Not Significant
Academic Life (Negative)	14	0.209479	0.81391	3.885294	Not Significant
Social Life (Positive)	14	4.655848	0.03187	3.885294	Significant
Social Life (Negative)	14	16.43214	0.00037	3.885294	Significant

As justifies in table 10; labellers, academic life, and social life of the respondents are significantly differentiated with the respondents' school level attended, denoting that the null hypothesis is rejected in this context.

Specifically, the computed F values along these components are: for labellers, 9.142857 and a P-value of 0.03222; along positive indicators for their social life, it has a computed F value of 4.655848 and a P-value of 0.03187; and for the negative indicators for their social life, it scaled at 16.43214 and P-value of 0.00037. This implies that their classification along their school level attended give variations on who give labels to these juveniles and how they perceive their social functions.

Table 11 shows that the types of labels are not differentiated among the juvenile-inmates when they are classified according to ethnicity, however, significant differences are shown to other components.

Table 11
Differences in Respondents' (a) Labels and Labellers, (b) Encouragements/Challenges along their Academic Life and Social Life according to their Ethnicity

Ethnicity Variables	ANOVA for Differences at 0.05 level of significance				
	df	Computed F	P-value	Critical F	Decision
Labels	4	0.858342	0.53811	19	Not Significant
Labellers	7	13.07332	0.00482	5.786135	Significant
Academic Life (Positive)	14	16.76201	0.00034	3.885294	Significant
Academic Life (Negative)	14	18.00066	0.00024	3.885294	Significant
Social Life (Positive)	14	19.77832	0.00016	3.885294	Significant
Social Life (Negative)	14	17.52042	0.00027	3.885294	Significant

The labellers, academic life and social life of the juvenile-inmates are significantly differentiated with their groupings along ethnicity. The computed F-values for the said componets are as follows: labellers (13.07332); academic life (positive – 16.76201); academic life (negative – 18.00066); social life (positive – 19.77832); and social life (negative – 17.52042) respectively. All components showed P-values lower than the significance level of 0.05 denoting significant findings, thus, the null hypothesis is then rejected.

This denotes that their ethnicity determines variations along the said components.

Table 12

Differences in Respondents' (a) Labels and Labellers, (b) Encouragements/Challenges along their Academic Life and Social Life according to their Offences

Offenses Variables	ANOVA for Differences at 0.05 level of significance				
	df	Computed F	P-value	Critical F	Decision
Labels	12	1.434527	0.33619	4.283866	Not Significant
Labellers	16	7.52451	0.00297	3.217175	Significant
Academic Life (Positive)	34	11.72611	0.0000	2.445259	Significant
Academic Life (Negative)	34	0.831937	0.55547	2.445259	Not Significant
Social Life (Positive)	34	5.583087	0.00065	2.445259	Significant
Social Life (Negative)	34	0.377985	0.88677	2.445259	Not Significant

Table 12 signifies that classification along offenses does not affect the labels; negative encouragements for both academic and social life. However it showed differences for the labellers and positive encouragements for the juveniles academic life and social functions.

> **Problem 5: Is there a significant relationship between the (a) labels, and (b) labellers and the impact of labelling to juvenile-inmates along (a) academic life and (b) social life?**

Bearing the most significant findings of the study, table 13 shows the impact of labelling to the academic life and social life of the juvenile-inmates based on Tannenbaum's Theory.

Table 13

Correlations in Respondents' (a) Labels and Labellers, (b) Encouragements/Challenges along their Academic Life and Social Life according to their Offences

Indicators	Correlation Coefficient	P-value	Decision
Labels versus Labellers	0.215738	0.261022	Not Significant
Labels versus Academic Life	0.427055	0.016969	Significant
Labels versus Social Life	0.437899	0.01751	Significant
Labellers versus Academic Life	0.267059	0.161369	Not Significant
Labellers versus Social Life	0.326778	0.030242	Significant
Academic Life versus Social Life	0.386625	0.035969	Significant

Labels are significantly correlated to the respondents' academic life and social life; while labellers are significantly correlated to the respondents' social life. And academic life of the respondents' are also correlated with their social life.

Meanwhile labels versus labellers are not significantly associated which means that labels can be from any of the sources of the said tags. Also, labellers versus academic life does not also show significant correlation which implies a contraindication on the claim of Tannenbaum's Theory suggesting that these labellers significantly affect the juveniles and consequently act what is/are being tagged to them.

Conclusions and Generalizations

The following conclusions were formulated assumed to be true in the context and parameters considered in the conduct of this research.

1. All respondents are males of ages 16 to 17 years. Most of them have attended high school, belonging to the Ilocano group and were jailed because of theft.
2. There were 21 positive labels and 16 negative words that are commonly tagged among the juvenile-inmates. They are commonly tagged by their friends, families and neighbors.
3. The impact of labeling based on academic life and social life of the inmates are considered greatly affected.
4. All profile variables in one or the other significantly affect the components being evaluated for the labeling theory.
5. Labels are significantly associated with the encouragements in academic life and social life; while labellers are only related with the encouragements in social life. Academic life is also linked with the social life of the juvenile-inmates.

Recommendations

 After evaluating the significant findings and implications of these results using Tannenbaum's theory, the following recommendations are enumerated.

1. Future researchers may also include other variables that are not included in the study. They may also include several factors relative to labeling and other variables based on Tannenbaum's theory or other theories of Labeling. Hence, they may also include comparison of other theories to intensify the implications of labeling to juvenile delinquency and should consider a larger research setting and may consider the over perceptions of the community people regarding labeling.
2. Juvenile delinquency is more of a social responsibility entailing a collaborative effort of all agencies. Every citizen should have an in-depth understanding on the juvenile behaviors to avoid crimes and unlawful acts brought by delinquency.
3. Impact of juvenile delinquency aside from those being identified in the study should also be given importance in the implementation of Juvenile Justice System, especially in the country so as to minimize numbers and/or incidence of juvenile crimes and juvenile- inmates.
4. Important aspects to be included in Juvenile Justice System should be encouraged the juvenile-inmates to finish their studies and participating social activities. These may include having formal schooling for sentenced youth. Hence, social activities that maybe so significant inside the jail would be livelihood projects and sports.

References

J. P. Eduardo et al. (2012) *Juvenile Delinquency and Crime Prevention. Bulacan:* TCS Publishing House

Frank Tannenbaum (1997, cited by Menna in 2007) *Theoretical Basis of Labeling and other Known Theorists.* Retrieved from http: //en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Labeling theory

Becker, H. (N.D.) *Outsider: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance.* Retrieved from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deviance

Seisa, L. (2011) *Society, Norms and Juveniles.* Retrieved from http://www.amazon.com

Newmeyer, C (2010) *Families Contribution to Children's Behavior. Pschology Today, 22 (3),* 52-56. Retrived from http://www.psychologytoday.com/

Menna, E. (2007) *A Self Fulfilling Prophecy* (Kindle DX version). Retrived from http://www.amazon.com

Gault (2013) *Problem-solving Interactions between Parents and Children.* Child Family Behaior Therapy, *26* (1), 1-16.