

## Family Cohesion of Juvenile Delinquents at Reformation Schools in Baghdad City

تماسك اسر الأحداث الجانحين في مدارس الإصلاح في مدينة بغداد

**Siham Abdullah Hamoo**/Ministry of health, Al-Rusafa Directorate  
**Dr. Ali Kareem Al-Juboori**/Asst. Prof. University of Baghdad,  
 College of Nursing, Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing.  
**Dr.Nsaif Jasim Al- Hemiary**/ Asst. Prof, College of Medicine /  
 University  
 of Baghdad

### الخلاصة:

**الأهداف:** لتقييم التماسك الاسري الجانحين وتقييم التماسك الاسري غير الجانحين والتعرف على الاختلاف بين الجانحين وغير الجانحين وإيجاد الفرق في التماسك الاسري نسبة الى بعض المواصفات الديموغرافية للحدث الجانح مثل المستوى التعليمي ملكية السكن الحالة الاجتماعية مع من يعيش الحدث. **طريقة إجراء الدراسة:** أجريت الدراسة على عينة مستهدفة ( غير احتمالية) (100) الجانحين الذكور في الإصلاحية (100) غير الجانحين ممن كانوا في نفس منطقة السكن. صممت الاستبانة لتحقيق هدف الدراسة من جزئين: يتضمن المواصفات الديموغرافية للحدث والوالدين والجزء الثاني تتضمن فقرات التماسك حدد صدق وثبات الاستبانة عن طريق مجموعة الخبراء والدراسة الاستطلاعية. 42 . 2 أيلول 2011 2 تشرين 2011 . لمعلومات عن طريق الاحصاء الوصفي كالتكرارات والنسب المئوية والوسط الحسابي **النتائج:** أظهرت النتائج عدم وجود فرق ذي دلالة احصائية في مستوى التماسك الاسري للأحداث الجانحين نسبة الى مواصفاتهم الديموغرافية ولكن هناك فرق كبير ذي دلالة احصائية في التماسك الاسري بين الجانحين وغير الجانحين. **الاستنتاج:** هي مشكلة هامة وخطيرة تواجه . حيث يلعب التماسك الاسري والمجتمع دورا هاما في حدوث هذه المشكلة والتي تضع في مشكلة مع القانون بسبب سلوكهم تثبتت هذه الدراسة العائلة والمشاكل الاسرية تلعب دورا هاما في حدوث هذه المشكلة. **التوصيات:** وتنفيذ برامج تدريبية حول جنوح لمعلمي المدارس الابتدائية والثانوية لتمكينهم من تثقيف طلبتهم حول . التعامل مع المراهق له كرامة وتوفير الحياة الكريمة والسلام والسعي الي ظروف معيشية

### Abstract:

**Objectives:** To assess family cohesion for juvenile delinquents, assess family cohesion of non delinquent juvenile, and to identify the difference between juvenile delinquent and non-delinquent, and find the difference in family cohesion ratio to some specifications demographic of the event delinquent such as age, education level, place of residence, house ownership, social status, size family, with who juvenile live.

**Methodology:** The study carried out on a purposive "non probability" sample of (100) delinquents' juveniles were selected from a Reformation schools for boys in Baghdad City. And 100 subjects who were non delinquents juvenile was selected from general population who living in the same area of residence of cases (from the neighbors of cases). A questionnaire is constructed for the purpose of the present study which is distributed across 2 main parts. Part one included the demographic characteristics of juvenile and their parent, and part two included 16 domains of family context. The family cohesion domain consists of 5 items. The overall items which were included in the questionnaire of this article are 42 items. Validity and reliability of the questionnaire were determined through the review of a panel of experts and the pilot study. Data were collected through the period from September 2nd 2011 to October 2nd 2011. It was analyzed through the descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, and mean of score) and inferential statistics.

**Results:** The results revealed that were no significant difference was found in juvenile delinquents' family cohesion domain with regard to their demographic characteristics. Also there were highly significant differences between delinquents and non delinquents with regard to their family cohesion.

**Conclusion:** The study concluded that juvenile delinquency is a serious problem facing families of children. Where family cohesion plays an important role in the community of this problem and put the juveniles in trouble with the law because of their behavior, as evidenced by this study, that the instability of the family and family problems play an important role in the occurrence of this problem.

**Recommendation:** Preparation and implementation of training programs on juvenile delinquency for primary school teachers and secondary school to enable them to educate their students about the problem of juvenile delinquency. Dealing with the adolescent as a human being with dignity and provide a decent life, peace and security and seeking to better living conditions for growth. University of Baghdad, College of Nursing, Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing.

**Keywords:** Family, Cohesion, Juvenile Delinquents, Reformation Schools

## INTRODUCTION:

Families are one of the strongest socializing forces in life. They teach children to control unacceptable behavior, and to respect the rights of others; conversely, families can teach children aggressive, antisocial, and violent behavior (Wright and Wright, 2009). Juvenile delinquency is one of the biggest problems in any society today, the rising divorce rate, increase in teen pregnancy, and Prevalence of single-parent households has caused the definition of family to take on several new meanings, obviously something is going on in today's society if more and more children are committing delinquent crimes (Wright and Wright, 2009). The parents of delinquents either fail to give their sons any supervision at all or tend to discipline them in a severe, contrary to the usual opinion, children raised under a regime of strict but inconsistent discipline have the highest incidence of delinquency, in general; delinquents come from homes that offer them a portrait of human relationships full of conflict and strife, they learn to view the world with suspicion and to conceive of other human beings as threatening, punitive, and aggressive. If the family resides in an area characterized by a delinquent sub-culture, the child not unnaturally turns to the gang as a cure for his frustrations, peers with more coercive interpersonal styles tend to become involved with each other, and this relationship is assumed to increase the likelihood of being involved in delinquent behavior, thus understanding the nature of relationships within the family, to include family adaptability, cohesion, and satisfaction, provides more information for understanding youth (Oltmanns, and Emery, 1998). The cohesiveness of the family successfully predicted the frequency of delinquent acts for non-traditional families (Matherne and Adrian, 2001). The present study attempts to assess family cohesion upon juvenile delinquency. Such an assessment may provide baseline information about the problem and find out the solutions to decrease the prevalence of this problem in our society to protect the health, safety, and quality of life for all, especially children and adolescents.

**Objectives:** To assess family cohesion for juvenile delinquents, assess family cohesion of non delinquent juvenile, and to identify the difference between juvenile delinquent and non-delinquent, and find the difference in family cohesion ratio to some specifications demographic of the event delinquent such as age, education level, place of residence, house ownership, social status, size family, with who juvenile live.

## METHODOLOGY:

**Design of the study:** A case - control study was conducted at (2) Reformatory schools distributed throughout Baghdad City. One Reformatory school in Al-Shaljea for juveniles and early adolescents from age 9-15 years old and another

Reformatory school in Al- Gaiffer for late adolescents from age 16- 18 years old. Both schools are located in Al- Karkh Sector of Baghdad.

These schools may be the most appropriate setting in which subjects of the study can be found. A purposive “non probability” sample of (100) delinquents’ juveniles were selected from a Reformation schools, and 100 of non- delinquents juveniles who were matched with them from general population who living in the same area of residence of cases (from the neighbors of cases). A questionnaire is constructed for the purpose of the present study through:

1. Review of relevant literature and studies.
2. Previous studies scales, which are:
  - a. Effect of family structure on juvenile delinquency scale (Doggett, 2005).
  - b. A study of Socio- Economic Background of Juvenile delinquency (Mohammad, 1992).
  - c. Family functioning subscales (Bloom, 2006).
  - d. Family assessment device (Epstein et al., 2005).

The overall questionnaire includes two parts, part one the demographic characteristics which composed of 37 items, and part two the section of family context which compromised of 16 domain, the family cohesion domain consist of of (5) positive and negative items, the positive items are: (1, 2, 4) and the negative items are: (3, 5). which are concerned with the measurement of family cohesion. Issue rated on 4 levels type likert scale for the positive items, 4 for “strongly agree”, 3 for “agree”, 2 for “don’t agree”, and 1 for “strongly don’t agree”. So far the negative items were scored and rated on the same scale, 4 for “strongly don’t agree”, 3 for “don’t agree”, 2 for “agree”, and 1 for “strongly agree”. The overall questionnaire of this article is composed of 42 items. In order to test the validity of the questionnaires, instruments were forwarded to the panel of experts (20 experts) in different fields for their opinion and suggestions to investigate the clarity and adequacy of items, Then the questionnaire was considered valid after taking into consideration their suggestions and recommendation for modification. A pilot study was carried out for the period of August 8th 2011 to August 30th 2011 and conducted on 10 delinquents’ juveniles who were selected from the Reformatory school in Baghdad City for the purpose of the questionnaire reliability determination. Estimates of The reliability were determined through the use of split – half technique. The result revealed that the split- half technique for the section of family cohesion internal scale was  $r = 0.88$ . A semi-structured interview technique was used for data collection through the period from September 2nd 2011 to October 2nd 2011.

#### **Data collection:**

Data were collected through the use of the constructed questionnaire; delinquents’ juveniles fill the questionnaire as semi- structured interview after receiving the information and instructions required from the investigator to filling the questionnaire and the investigator stay with juvenile in the room during process of data collection.

#### **Data analysis**

Data was analyzed through the application of the following statistical data analysis approaches: 1. Descriptive statistical data analysis approach was used for determining the following measurements:

- a. Frequencies (F)
- b. Percentages (%)
- c. Mean of Score (MS)

A mean of score concerning section of family context, greater than 3 was considered highly significant, from 2 -3 was considered significant, while it was non-significant when the scores was less than 2.

- d. Standards deviations (SD)
- e. Statistical table.

2. Inferential statistical data analysis approach:

This approach was performed through the application of the following method:

- a) Cronbach alpha correlation co-efficient

Alpha correlation co-efficient was employed for the determination of the questionnaire's internal consistency and reliability. The correlation coefficient was computed through:

- b) t- test: Is used to compare between groups in regard age, level of education, place of residence and comparative between the cases and control group in regarding to family context domain (Polit and Hanger, 1995).

- c) One - way analysis of variance (ANOVA)

Was applied to determine the significant relationship of family cohesion and delinquent's demographic characteristic such as (age, educational level, place of residence, ownership, social status, family size, and with whom juvenile live

**RESULTS:****Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of the sample**

Variable		(case = 100)		(control =100)	
		No.	%	No.	%
<b>Age</b>	12- 13	22	22.0	22	22.0
	14- 15	<b>51</b>	<b>51.0</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52.0</b>
	16- 17	27	27.0	26	26.0
<b>Education</b>	Can't read and write	14	14.0	14	14.0
	Read and write	16	16.0	16	16.0
	Primary	<b>59</b>	<b>59.0</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>59.0</b>
	Intermediate	11	11.0	11	11.0
<b>Place of residence</b>	Urban	<b>71</b>	<b>71.0</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>71.0</b>
	Rural	29	29.0	29	29.0
<b>House ownership</b>	Private	28	28.0	<b>47</b>	<b>47.0</b>
	Renting	<b>58</b>	<b>58.0</b>	32	32.0
	Share with another	11	11.0	21	21.0
	Illegal	3	3.00	0	0.00
<b>social status</b>	Single	<b>92</b>	<b>92.0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100.0</b>
	Married	3	3.00	0	0.00
	Widower	0	0.00	0	0.00
	Divorce	2	2.00	0	0.00
	Separate	3	3.00	0	0.00
<b>Family size</b>	1 - 3	7	7.00	17	17.0
	4 -6	16	16.0	<b>30</b>	<b>30.0</b>
	7 - 9	<b>40</b>	<b>40.0</b>	23	23.0
	10 – 12	23	23.0	20	20.0
	13	14	14.0	10	10.0
<b>Living with</b>	Both parents	<b>38</b>	<b>38.0</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>41.0</b>
	Mother	22	22.0	26	26.0
	Father	17	17.0	10	10.0
	Biological mother and stepfather	13	13.0	15	15.0
	Biological father and stepmother	8	8.00	6	6.00
	Other guardian(s)	2	2.00	2	2.00

No. = number, % percent

The results reveal that nearly half (51%) of case and control were age 14-15 years old, while (59%) of them have primary school educational level, whereas most of them (71%) were live in urban area, 58% of their families were renting houses to be residence for them, (92%) were single, 40% have 7-9 family member, 38% were live with their two parents together. Regarding to control group, nearly half of them have private residence and all were single, 30% of them have 4-6 family members and 41% live with their two parents together.

**Table 2: Family context of juveniles**

Family context domain	Case (n=100)		Control (n=100)	
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D
<b>Cohesion</b>	10.67	2.43	16.25	3.00
<b>Expressiveness</b>	<b>11.12</b>	2.87	<b>16.71</b>	2.48
<b>Conflict</b>	10.59	2.48	16.37	3.09
<b>Intellectual</b>	10.51	2.51	16.38	3.14
<b>Laissez- Faire</b>	10.70	2.48	16.30	2.98
<b>Recreational</b>	10.89	2.90	16.27	3.09
<b>Religious</b>	10.54	2.61	16.44	3.24
<b>Organization</b>	10.53	2.26	<b>16.47</b>	<b>3.05</b>
<b>Sociability</b>	10.71	2.31	16.30	3.11
<b>Locus of Control</b>	10.63	2.91	16.41	3.24
<b>Idealization</b>	10.42	2.43	16.38	3.11
<b>Disengagement</b>	10.84	2.46	<b>16.41</b>	<b>2.94</b>
<b>Democratic</b>	<b>10.86</b>	<b>2.45</b>	16.37	2.90
<b>Problem Solving</b>	10.75	2.33	16.04	3.16
<b>Authoritarian</b>	10.49	2.63	15.98	3.05
<b>Economic</b>	10.46	2.57	16.16	2.90
<b>Average family context</b>	10.67	2.54	16.33	3.53

S.D = Standard deviation

Table (2) shows that all means in the controls were consistently much higher about 5 to 6 point in means compared to cases.

**Table 3: The difference between cases and controls with regard to their family cohesion**

Variable	Mean	df (99)	Sig. p≤0.01
<b>Cohesion / Case</b>	10.6700	- 14.469-	H.S
<b>Cohesion / Control</b>	16.2500		

df= degree of freedom, Sig = significance

Table (3) reveals that there were highly significant difference between cases and controls with regard to their family cohesion at p = 0.01.

**Table 4: Analysis of variance for Juvenile delinquents' family cohesion with regard to their age groups**

At	Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.p ≤ 0.05
Cohesion	Between Groups	5.468	2	2.734	0.457	0.635 N.S
	Within Groups	580.642	97	5.986		

df= degree of freedom, Sig = significance

Table (4) reveals that there were no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family cohesion with regard to their age groups at  $p = 0.05$ .

**Table 5: Analysis of variance for Juvenile delinquents' family cohesion with regard to their educational level**

At	Source of variances	Sum of square	df	Mean square	F	Sig. $p \leq 0.05$
Cohesion	Between Groups	17.242	3	5.747	0.970	0.410 N.S
	Within Groups	568.868	96	5.926		

df= degree of freedom, Sig = significance

Table (5) show that there were no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family cohesion with regard to their educational level at  $p = 0.05$ .

**Table 6: Analysis of variance for Juvenile delinquents' family cohesion with regard to their residence**

At	Source of variance	Sum of square	df	Mean square	F	Sig. $p \leq 0.05$
Cohesion	Between Groups	0.287	1	0.287	0.048	0.827 N.S
	Within Groups	585.823	98	5.978		

df= degree of freedom, Sig = significance

Table (6) indicates that there were no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family cohesion with regard to their residence at  $p = 0.05$ .

**Table 7: Analysis of variance for Juvenile delinquents' family cohesion with regard to their house ownership**

At	Source of variance	Sum of square	df	Mean square	F	Sig. $p \leq 0.05$
Cohesion	Between Groups	30.343	3	10.114	1.747	0.163 N.S
	Within Groups	555.767	96	5.789		

df= degree of freedom, Sig = significance

Table (7) reveals that there were no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family cohesion with regard to their ownership at  $p = 0.05$ .

**Table 8: Analysis of variance for Juvenile delinquents' family cohesion with regard to their social status**

At	Source of variance	Sum of square	df	Mean square	F	Sig. $p \leq 0.05$
<b>Cohesion</b>	Between Groups	1.965	3	0.655	0.108	0.955 N.S
	Within Groups	584.145	96	6.085		

df= degree of freedom, Sig = significance

Table (8) indicates that there were no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family cohesion with regard to their social status at  $p = 0.05$ .

**Table 9: Analysis of variance for Juvenile delinquents' family cohesion with regard to number of their family members**

At	Source of variance	Sum of square	Df	Mean square	F	Sig. $p \leq 0.05$
<b>Cohesion</b>	Between Groups	20.159	4	5.040	0.846	0.500 N.S
	Within Groups	565.951	95	5.957		

df= degree of freedom, Sig = significance

Table (9) reveals that there were no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family cohesion with regard to number of their family members at  $p = 0.05$ .

**Table 10: Analysis of variance for Juvenile delinquents' family cohesion with regard to relative they are living with**

At	Source of variance	Sum of square	Df	Mean square	F	Sig. $p \leq 0.05$
<b>Cohesion</b>	Between Groups	19.205	5	3.841	0.637	0.672 N.S
	Within Groups	566.905	94	6.031		

df= degree of freedom, Sig = significance

Table (10) indicates that there were no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family cohesion with regard to their relative they are living with at  $p = 0.05$ .



## DISCUSSION:

The findings of the present study show that 51% of the cases and 52% of the controls group was age between 14 – 15 years (table 1). This result comes along with Mohammed (1992) that the majority 54.4% of the study sample were age between 14 – 15 years old. Regarding educational levels, the majority of the sample 59% of both case and control group have primary school graduate (table 1). The study of Sakir et al, (2005) reported that about 51% of the sample was not student at the time of offence behavior. Also the study of Mohammed (1992) reported that the majority of study has low level of education which is agreement with the present findings.

The study results show that the majority of the sample (71%) for both case and control group living in urban area (table 1). The study of Mohammed (1992) found the majority of the sample (91%) is living in urban residential area Regarding to the ownership of residence, the majority of the case (58%) of their families were renting houses to be residence for them and the control group 47% of their families were private houses (table 1). This result is supported by the study of Gorman et al. (2001) which indicated that the majority of the sample has low socio-economic status of working fathers, high percentage of jobless mothers, homeless or living at rent home. which is consisted with the present study findings. Regarding to the ownership of residence, the majority of the case (58%) of their families were renting houses to be residence for them and the control group 47% of their families were private houses (table 1). This result is supported by the study of Gorman et al. (2001) which indicated that the majority of the sample has low socio-economic status of working fathers, high percentage of jobless mothers, homeless or living at rent home.

Concerning with social status, the majority of the sample case (92%) are single and 100% of control group were single (table 1) and as the investigator's point of view this is not strange because as we know this age not suitable for marriage.

Regarding to the number of family member, the findings of present study reveal that the most of study case (40%) came from big and extend families with 7- 9 members, and 30% of the control group come from families with 4 – 6 members (table 2). This result supported by the study of Sakir et al (2005) that reported most of the families were crowded and had rather low economical and educational levels. Also supported by Mohammed (1992) which revealed that (77.2%) of the study sample came from big and extend families with 7 or more member.

Regarding with whom juvenile live, the study results show that the majority of the sample case (38%) and control group (41%) live with both parents, (table 1). This result supported by study of Stephen and Susan (2004) which revealed that (3.57%) of the sample live with biological parents.

The more important statement is that all means in the controls were consistently much higher about 5 to 6 point compared to cases. And as the researcher's point of view is that the family atmosphere in juvenile cases was unfavorable compared to the family context among juvenile controls (table 2)

Concerning the difference between cases and controls, the result of the present study indicated that there were highly significant difference between cases and controls with regard to their family contexts (totals and its domains) (table 3). Gary et al. (1995) agree with the present study, they reported that there was higher

significant difference between the non-delinquent and delinquent adolescents in all aspects of family environment

The results of the present study illustrated that there was no significance differences in juvenile delinquents' family cohesion regarding their age groups (table 4). And as the investigators point of view is that all delinquents age less than 18 years may exposed to the same problem under risk factor.

In regard to the level of education, the finding of the study indicated that there is no significant difference in juvenile delinquents' family cohesion regarding their level of education (table 5). The study of Kudirat et al. (2010) agrees with the present study, they found that there is no significant correlation between family environment and student level of education.

Concerning the place of residence, the result of the present study revealed that there is no significant difference in juvenile delinquents' family cohesion with regard to their residence (table 6). The study of Homoud, (2011) agrees with the present study, he showed that there was no significant difference between urban and rural adolescents in total delinquency; and as the investigator's point of view is that all juveniles in this sample may expose to the same problem in all regional areas.

In regard to the ownership, the finding of the study indicated that there is no significant difference in juvenile delinquents' family cohesion with regard to their ownership (table 7). This result agrees with the study of Witten born (2002) he reported that delinquent behavior in their children are not related to family cohesion.

Concerning the social status, the result of the study indicates that there is no significant difference in juvenile delinquents family cohesion with regard to their juvenile social status (table 8). The study of Sakir et al, (2005) agrees with the present study finding, they reported that there is no relationship between marital status and juvenile delinquency.

Regarding number of family member, the results of the present study illustrated that there were no significance differences in juvenile delinquents family cohesion with regard to their number of family member (table 9). The study of ILongo (2009) reported that about two-thirds of the juvenile delinquents come from homes that exposed to the risk factor. Concerning with whom juvenile lives, the result of the study indicates that there were no significant difference in family cohesion with juvenile delinquency regarding with whom juvenile lives (table 10). This result agrees with the study of Stephen and Susan (2004) reported that about 3.57% live with biological parents, 3.28% of the subject live with single mother families, while 4.11% live with single father families, and 2.95% of subject live with mother and step father, while 3.43% live with father and step mother, delinquency consistently not significant in which juvenile live with.

## CONCLUSION:

The study concluded that juvenile delinquency is a serious problem facing families of children. Where family cohesion plays an important role in the community of this problem and put the juveniles in trouble with the law because of their behavior, as evidenced by this study, that the instability of the family and family problems play an important role in the occurrence of this problem.

## RECOMMENDATION:

1. Educational programs about juvenile delinquency can be constructed and implemented to primary and intermediate schoolteachers to be able to educate their pupils.
2. Human: Works on enhancing children and adolescents' dignity in searching for a decent life, peace, security, and safety. It will also seek to provide better living conditions
3. appropriate for physical, mental, spiritual, morale, and social growth; and eliminate gender discrimination based on language, ethnicity, religion, and sect.

## REFERENCES:

1. Bloom, B.: A factor analysis of self- report measures of family functioning. Family process, Download as PDF file, 2006, 24: pp. 225-239.
2. Doggett, A.: Juvenile Delinquency and Family Structure. Crime: A Policymakers Guide. Research Summary. Washington DC: US, 2005, PP. 1-8.
3. Epstein, N., Baldwin, L., and Bishop, D.: The Mc Master Family Assessment Device, Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 2005, 9: pp.171- 180.
4. Gary, P., Sandra, M., Martha, L.: Family environments of adolescent sex offenders and other juvenile delinquents. Washington, D.C. metropolitan, 1995, pp.1-11 Available at [www.taasa.org/library/pdfs/TAASALibrary64.pdf](http://www.taasa.org/library/pdfs/TAASALibrary64.pdf).
5. Gorman, S., Deborah, P., Tolan, A., and Sheidow, B: Parenter Violence and Street Violence among Urban Adolescents: Do the Same Family Factor Relate, Journal of Research on Adolescence ,Vol. 11, No. (23), 2001, p. 14.
6. Homoud, M. Al Anazi: Sensation Seeking and Delinquency among Saudi Adolescents, Northern Border University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, European Journal of Social Sciences, Vol. 21, No.(2), 2011, pp. 265.
7. ILongo, F.: Family Structure and Juvenile Delinquency: Correctional Center Betamba, Institute of Education, National University of Lesotho, Lesotho-Southern Africa. Internet Journal of Criminology, 2009, pp. 1-15.
8. Kudirat, S., Nsiong, U., Abayomi, O., Felicia, M., and Leonard, E.: Family Types and Juvenile Delinquency Issues among Secondary School Students in AkwaIbom State, Nigeria: Counseling Implications, Educational Foundations Guidance and Counseling, Faculty of Education, University of Uyo, AkwaIbom State, Nigeria. Journal of SocSci, Vol. 23, No. (1) pp. 21-28, 2010.
9. Matherne, M.; Adrian, T.: Family environment as a predictor of adolescent delinquency. Adolescence, 36, 2001, p.655, 65. Cited by Anika Doggett: Juvenile Delinquency and Family Structure, Elon University. Internet Journal of Criminology, p. 1-15, 2009.
10. Mohammad, A.: A study of Socio- Economic Background of Juvenile delinquency, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, College of Medicine, University of Baghdad, 1992, pp. 7- 19.
11. Oltmanns, T., and Emery, R.: Abnormal Psychology, New Jersey, Prentic Hall, 2nd ed., 1998, pp. 287.
12. Polit, F., Hungler, P.: Nursing Research : Principles and Methods, New York. 1995, pp.411- 418.

13. Sakir, O., Aydin, E., Remzi, O., Yasar, T., Suleyman, G.: Juvenile delinquency in a developing country: A province example in Turkey, International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, Vol. 28, No(4), July–August 2005, Pp. 430–441.
14. Stephen, D., Susan, B.: Family Structure, Family Process and Adolescent Delinquency, USA, Carolina Population Center, 123West Franklin Street, Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 41, No. (1), February 2004, PP. 58-81.
15. Witten born, M.: The Relations between Parenting Styles and Juvenile Delinquency in Southern Illinois, USA. Honors Theses, University Honors Program at Open SIUC, 2002, pp. 1-9. Available at [http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/uhp\\_theses/266](http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/uhp_theses/266).
16. Wright, K.; Wright, E.: Family Life, Delinquency, and Crime: A Policymakers Guide. Research Summary. Washington DC, OJJDP.2009, pp. 4 - 21. Available by [WWW.Internet journal of criminology.Com](http://WWW.Internetjournalofcriminology.Com) .