

## INFLUENCE OF FAMILY ENVIRONMENT ON CRIME AMONG NIGERIAN INMATES OF CORRECTIONAL CENTRES IN ANAMBRA AND FEDERAL CAPITAL TERRITORY (FCT)

ENE N. OKORO (PhD)<sup>1</sup>  
Social Development Secretariat,  
Federal Capital Territory Administration, Abuja  
+2347039615555  
[enerist@yahoo.com](mailto:enerist@yahoo.com)

&

PROF. ANDREW E. ZAMANI<sup>2</sup>  
Psychology Department,  
Nasarawa State University, Keffi  
+2348059581331  
[zamandeza@gmail.com](mailto:zamandeza@gmail.com)

### Abstract

*The Nigerian family environment and Correctional Centres are witnessing an enormous increase of people going into crime despite adverse consequences. The present study examined the influence of demographic characteristics and family environment on crime among Nigerian inmates of Anambra and Federal Capital Territory (FCT) Correctional Centres. The study adopted a cross-sectional survey design and also a purposive sampling technique to select participants for the study. The entire population of inmates from 4 correctional centres was 2,971. Using an online sample size calculator, the calculated sample size was 333. This number was further proportionately distributed but 170 questionnaires that were adequately filled and returned were analysed. One hypothesis was tested. The result of the hypothesis indicated that components of family environment inversely related with crime; interpersonal relationship ( $r = -0.259$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ); system maintenance ( $r = -0.204$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) and personal growth ( $r = -0.294$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ). The study concluded among others that family environment independently correlate with crime. The study recommended that government's consideration to establish family environment management agency in the ministry of humanitarian and social development that would provide functional family services for training, retraining and capacity building for parents or caregivers on interpersonal relations, system maintenance and children's personal growth and development.*

**Keywords: Influence, Family Environment, Crime, Nigerian Inmates, Correctional Centres.**

### Introduction

The family is the most basic and ancient of all primary institutions and remains the fundamental social unit in every society. Family has two basic functions, first is the socialization of children so that they can truly become members of the society and the second aspect is the environment stability of the adult personality of the society. The family individuals come from and the experiences therein have a profound and pervasive influence

on their later behaviour as adults. This clearly indicates that the family has an important role to play in the life of every individual (Robertson, 2010; Akagu 2006; Parsons & Bales 2002). As well, family plays several significant roles for society, some of which include: family formation, economic support, nurturance, and socialization, as well as protection of vulnerable members (Shaffer, 2000). Regardless of this, it is disheartening, that all criminals or offenders were born into one family or the other. It becomes worrisome of what becomes of our Nigerian family. In assertion, Nwosuji (2008) noted that Nigerian society recently is witnessing a high level of moral decay and there is an implosion in the number of youths and adolescents exhibiting anti-social and immoral behaviours, and Ziehl (2003), as such posited, that it is causing a drastic change in the quality and quantity of relationships in the family.

In this study, family is operationally defined by us as the ontogenesis and fundamental psychosocial unit of the society that every individual child starts learning and teaching life-changing behaviour and personality development.

Psychologically, family environment is referred to the quality and quantity of the cognitive, emotional and social support that has been available to the child within the family and connects the psychological environment of family as perceived by adolescents, Bhatia and Chadha (2004). Family environment can also be described as the core process of every child upbringing, with positive and negative influences. When families experience sudden and unexpected trauma, such as loss of a loved one or an accident, etc., all members of the family are affected in one way or another. The family environment “involves the circumstances and social climate conditions within families. Since each family is made up of different individuals, in different setting or place, each family environment is unique.

It is prominent that family and its environment remain the cornerstone of every society. Equally in pre-contemporary and contemporary societies, the establishment of family is known to be the utmost basic unit of social organization conferred with the obligation of carrying out certain important tasks like socialization (Haralambos, Holborn &Heald, 2008).The family environment involves the circumstances and social climate conditions within families. Since each family is made up of different individuals in a different setting, each family environment is unique. The kind of family environment a child is born into can set limit for life’s adjustment (Isangedighi, 2011). It also provides the basis for individual’s ability to behave and play a role during different activities.

It is believed that a destructive and disturbed family can have a significant influence on socialization because the family is the primary unit in which individuals learn the values, attitudes, patterns and processes that guide their behaviours throughout their lives. It is generally agreed that it is the social interaction between the children and those in their immediate environment that contribute to achieving healthy and normal young and old individuals. Family instability and crime is prevalence, and has become a common phenomenon in Nigeria. Family can also be referred as the basic unit for bonding development and interactions among family members in terms of relationship or day to day transactions that may be positive or negative. Therefore, a healthy family results in positive relationships and transactions; while negative family environment leads to negative relationships and transactions. Other researchers, Fukuyama, (1999); Putnam, (1995); Whitley

& McKenzie, (2005) in their studies argued that the family is the most fundamental source of social capital, and that positive family experiences and environments are associated with high levels of social competence, civic engagement, and trust and tolerance in social groups and institutions.

Family is one of the prominent socializing agents in life. Environment on its own is the complex set of psychological, physical, geographical, biological, social, cultural and political conditions that surround a family, individual or organism and that ultimately determine its form and nature of its survival (World Bank 2001). Family environment therefore constitutes conscious and unconscious teaching and learning phenomenon for children and other family members to control unapproved behaviour and accept approved behaviours. In so doing, rules and regulations are created, family norms and family values established to voluntarily or involuntarily guide members of the family to respect the right of others, delay gratification, and become law abiding citizens. In same vein, family environment can be defined operationally, as the basic psychosocial backgrounds stimulating setting behaviours and psychological dispositions of the family that determine the nature, characteristics, behaviours and systematic cause-root of its survival.

Crime today is common among the young people, many have been caught in one criminal behaviour or the other, such as kidnapping, ransom-collection, armed robbery, internet fraud, drug abuse, assault, rape, theft, house breaking, forgery, larceny and culpable homicide, and even suicide. The family is no longer effective and stable as it used to be, and it leads resultant negative effects on the society. The onset of crime can be traced to a deterioration of family bond during childhood marked by a weakened attachment to parents in the family and belief in conventional values. The beginning of crime is supported by residence in a family and social settings in which criminal values and attitudes can be learned and reinforced by criminal peers. Hence, defective family relationship has more effect among criminals than the non-criminals (Thornberry, 1987).

The behavioural definition of crime focuses on criminal behaviour or crime as a certain personality profile that causes the most alarming sorts of crimes. All these crimes involve the use of force, threat, blackmail, fraud, or stealth to obtain domestic, material or relative resources. These behaviours do not conform to the set standard, constitutional laws or cultural norms of a given society or country at a given time, and these behaviours are often negatively punished or sanctioned, and referred to as crime. This implies that non-conformity to a set standard, laws or norms that are acceptable by a majority of people in a given family, society at large or a group of people is a crime. Family or society values conformity to a set standard and expects such to be accepted and obeyed by its members. To sight, family has a setting standards and institutions in place in order to ensure that necessary required order, peace, tranquillity and stability are established for humanity to enjoy necessary progress and development in the society, and socialization becomes one of the vital processes the family carries out such goals.

More so, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) noted that crime is a style or pattern of behaviour characterized by self-centeredness, indifference to the suffering and needs of others, and low self-control. This becomes a serious concern that made us to raise these observations and

questions: the classic looting of treasury in the government, the kidnapping, and armed robbery and unknown gun men in the South East, militancy, drug peddlers, child trafficking and kidnapping in the South-South, rituals, armed robbery and kidnapping in the South West, banditry, kidnapping, drug peddlers/substance abuse and armed robbery in the North Central, terrorism, banditry and kidnapping and ransom collection in the North East and banditry, kidnapping and armed robbery in the North West show that every part of the country has one issue of crime or the other to worry for. As crime becomes serious concerns to the nation building, one may wonder, why individuals from every geopolitical zone are involve in looting the nation treasury? Why some pattern of crime predominant in certain zones than the other? And why terrorism like Boko Haram and banditry in North East cannot be predominant in the South East, or militancy in the South-South predominant in the North West and via versa? The family environment come to mind; the parent-nurturing responsibility, family size, economic status, parent-child bond responsibility and many others. Therefore, it is affirmed that family individuals who engage on crime are characterized by self-centeredness, indifference to the suffering and needs of others, low self-control and their influence is crime as Gottfredon and Hirschi (1990) noted.

Operationally, crime is defined by us as behaviour of engaging or involving in crime or other criminal behaviours by means of betrayal, conspiracy, falsehood, force or pretence depriving the target population their peace and right as stipulated by law, and as well causing physical or psychological pains to humanity at large.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Families play a vital role in the development of individual children. Studies of juvenile delinquency and crime have shown that the family environment can present as either a risk or protective factor (Leonard, 2011). Here, the risk factor is referred as family environment characteristics that when present, encourages and instigate adoption of harmful behaviour like crime in an individual. Research has shown that as the number of risk factors to which individuals are exposed increases, so does the probability that those individuals will engage in crime or delinquent behaviours, (Leonard, 2011).

Leonard, (2011), also reported that the presence of one risk factor in the family may encourage and instigate the existence of another risk factor, which in long run leads to a greater likelihood of criminal behaviour. Therefore, families that is exposed to, or experienced several risk factors are referred as “vulnerable families” or most at-risk families. In contrast, there are protective factors that have the behavioural features to eliminating the negative characteristics of risk factors and reduce the possible opportunity of crime. Thus, by understanding, identifying and addressing the issues surrounding family environment characteristics/risk, on the other hand, protective factors will promote positive family environment and eliminate conduct disorder or crime among family members.

Most experts on the study of crime agree that family is a frontline defence against crime. Again, disrupted family environment may encourage any pre-existing crime forces and sustain crime over the family course. The influence of family today has greatly receded, thus, the average family has failed in its functional responsibility to provide adequate moral

foundations for their children, and most people, particularly the young people are all product of this influence in the family environment.

The problem of family environment warrants a serious investigation to assess its influence on crime. The problem of crime among Nigerians has persisted over the years. These violent wrongdoings have either been carried out individually by young people, adults or as group individuals rising from one family environment or the other which often result to anxiety, depression, grief, loss of life, economic crises, and total confusion and revolting crises. There is no doubt that crime among Nigerians (inmates) generally militates against sound moral upbringings and stable pattern of living and producing of useful acceptable members of the family and society at large. It is therefore, observed that some parents appear to have failed in parental roles or responsibilities towards their family members. This is evident in the high influx of crimes and criminals everywhere today, it may drive an individual to introspectively wonder whether those involve in crimes are actually coming from families, but no doubt since there is basic proofs that everyone who ever lived and are still alive came from a family. At this point, one may query the kind of family environment they are coming from. These show high level of family decay or how weak and irresponsible families and their environments are, and as such, crime becomes a product of weak family environment. Where family environment loses trust and control over individual children, the children now lack the bonds (attachment bond, commitment bond, involvement bond and belief bond) connecting or attaching them to the society, then, crime becomes inevitable or predictable. Convincingly, the family environment that lacks in practicing these four basic family environment bonds is asserted by Pratt, Gau and Franklin, (2011), arguably predisposed to crime than family environment that such family bonds are practiced or taught.

Crime consumes and remains the nuisance and a psychologically pandemic monster that Nigeria encounters in this modern era. Certainly, no individual seems like standing protected against the hostile possessions of crime. Indeed, crime is today a forceful disease that triumphs nearly in every single chunk of our national existence. The opposing possessions in the country has reached nearly prevalent magnitudes that seems like all hope is lost in the fight against crime in Nigeria. This titanic “pandemic” call crime ruins beyond comprehension the peace of its victims, it creates a lasting pains and stampedes the progress of our common national growth and development. Nevertheless, crime is overbearing, and it is significant to understand and disclose the factors that are abetting crime in the society (Demombynes&Ozler, 2005).

It is also, worrisome the rate at which young people who ought to be under the loving, caring and supervision of their parents in the family engage in crime. Currently, Nigeria is at the peak of atrocious and dreadful types of crime and the rate of these crimes, such as, armed robbery, abduction, human trafficking, banditry-kidnapping, unknown gun men and terrorism just to mention a few, become nightmares in different parts of the country, and very frightening that every geopolitical zone and ethnic group in Nigeria wail for this “titanic psychological pandemic” called, Crime.

However, the unequalled epidemic of kidnappings, unknown gun men, terrorism and other criminal behaviours are alarming, and making individual psyche to ponder “why crime”,

seek for an answer and consider a significant question, “Do individuals perpetrating these atrocities come from a family or family environment at all?”. The present study sought to provide an answer to that, as there is paucity of literatures to that effect.

### **Empirical Review of Literatures**

It is also important to note the significant influence of family environment on crime. Take for instance, Cassidy (2011) in his study explored the role of family factors and psychological distress in relation to delinquency and youth offending to try and explicate the relative importance of family structure, family relations, and levels of youth offending, in 219 older children and adolescents aged between 12 - 17 years living in areas associated with high levels of youth offending in the UK. The study found out that personal growth, family relations and system maintenance of the dimensions of family environment significantly predict delinquency among offending youths.

In another related study by Sanni, Udoh, Okediji, Modo and Ezeh (2010), it was established that participants from non-intact family environment reported more symptoms of delinquency more than participants from intact family environment. Furthermore, the study revealed that lack of family cohesion have a statistically significant influence on delinquency. In their study, the data analysis showed that out of the 114 respondents that have symptoms of delinquency, 47 or 41 percent of the subject never spent valuable time with their parents, while 98 or 86 per cent never enjoyed parental supervision, and 80 or 70 per cent have never enjoyed close association with parents and other family members. Thus, it is clear that family cohesiveness has a significant influence on juvenile delinquency among secondary school students. The study finally averred that lack of family adaptability (violence in the family) predicts delinquency.

Apel and Kaukinen, (2008); Price and Kunz, (2003) stated that the two main factors influencing crime or juvenile are the family environment that child is exposed to and the relationships that children or adolescents have with parents. With the prevalent nature and patterns of crime or juvenile delinquency, family environment in the United States has also changed dramatically over the last century, becoming very diverse in today’s society (Kierkus, Johnson, & Hewitt, 2010). Individual children of various age range, indeed, are living in various types of family environments, such as with maltreatment or child abuse and neglect family, inappropriate/ineffective parental family, parental substance abuse family, crime running of family, parental conflict family, cohabitation parents, single and married parents, mental health parents, large size children family and poverty/poor socioeconomic parents family. The families that children grow up in and its social environment in which they live can have major effects on their well-being (Wallman, 2010). In general, children living in non-traditional family environment are at a greater risk for a wide variety of negative outcomes including involvement in crime or delinquency (Price & Kunz, 2003) compared to those from married family environment-households (Demuth & Brown, 2004). Children in different family environments also experience many forms of monitoring, supervision, involvement, and attachment they receive from their parents, (Hoeve, Dubas, Eichelsheim, Van der Laan, Smeenk, & Gerris, 2009). These dynamics may also play a role in determining why individuals engage in crime or adolescents engage in juvenile delinquency. In a similar context, a research conducted by Dunifon and Kowaleski-Jones (2012), also found that individual children that

live in single-parent families or cohabitating families have a higher signs of delinquency or crime than those that live in intact families and non-cohabitating families.

### **Hypothesis**

There will be a significant relationship between family environment and crime among the inmates.

### **Research Methodology**

This study adopted a cross-sectional survey design. This research design provides information about what is happening in a current population. In this study, the cross-sectional design was adopted to uncover the influence of family environment on crime among Nigerian inmates of Anambra (Awka& Onitsha) and FCT (Kuje&Suleja) Correctional Centres.

### **Population, Sample and Sampling Techniques**

The population of inmates in Anambra Correctional Centres was 1,259 and FCT Correctional Centres was made up of 1,712 inmates as at the time of data collection. This gave a total population of 2,971 inmates in the Nigerian Correctional Services Centres of interest. To get the required sample size, the study adopted an online sample size calculator ([www.surveysystem.com](http://www.surveysystem.com)). Afterward, the sample size was proportionately distributed. The population was calculated at 5% margin of error, confidence interval of 95% and a predetermined response distribution of 50%. Based on the calculation, three hundred and thirty three (333) sample size was generated. Three hundred and thirty three questionnaires were administered to the participants, and at the end of data collection, one hundred and seventy (170) questionnaires were found useful as other questionnaires were incorrectly filled. The study adopted a purposive sampling technique. In purposive sampling technique, a particular case is chosen because it illustrates some features or process that is of interest for a particular study (Neuman, 2000; Strydom& Venter, 2002).

### **Instruments for Data Collection**

Two instruments were used in the study; Family Environment Scale (FES) and Psychopathic Deviant (PDS) Scale. Family environment was assessed using the Family Environment Scale (FES), a 50-item inventory developed by Moos & Moos (1981). The scale places interest on the level of relationship/difference between individual family members, like individual children and parents, in regard to current perceptions they have, ideal preferences, and expectations of their families-social environment.

The family environment measures what individuals perceive as their type of family environment, with its three principal climate dimensions of family environment: interpersonal relationships (IR)-measures with items 1, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 34,38, 40, 44, 46 & 49; system maintenance (SM)-measures items 2, 4, 5, 11, 13, 15, 16, 29, 33, 35, 37,41, 42, 43, 47,& 48; while personal growth (PG)-measures with items 3, 7, 8, 17, 18, 21, 24, 26, 36, 39, 45, & 50 respectively. Moos reported initial internal consistency coefficient estimates (Kuder-Richardson 20s) between .64 and .79 for the scale. In other words, FES intends to measure and highlights the influence of family environment on crime among Nigerian inmates of Correctional centres. Also, provided the content validity, test-retest reliability and normative score of the instrument using Nigerian samples. Using Lawshe

(1975) minimum values of content validity ratio per item at  $P < 0.5$ , a score of 0.99 and above of the judges agreement as to the relevance of an item was used as the criterion for accepting an item. The whole 50 items were included in the final version. Test-retest reliability was conducted and a coefficient of 0.77 was obtained.

For the present study, the reliability analysis for the index of Family Environment obtained a Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient for the full scale as 0.752, mean of 32.16, and standard deviation of 6.447 and variance of 41.506. Thus, the results of the subscale shows that interpersonal Relationship (22-items) obtained a Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient of .582, Mean of 12.66, Standard Deviation (SD) of 3.280 and variance of 10.760; System Maintenance (16-items), obtained a Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient of 0.567, mean of 10.84, standard deviation of 2.510 and variance of 6.300 and Personal Growth (12-items), obtained a Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient of 0.531, mean of 7.64, standard deviation of 2.275 and variance of 5.174. Norms for interpretation indicates for Family Environment Scale is a mean score of 32.16 (male=31.65 and female= 38.00); for age: adolescent is 32.00 and adult is 32.36. For Crime (PD-Scale) is a mean score of 39.02 (male=39.13 and female=37.75); for age: adolescent is 40.00 and adult is 37.77.

Crime was assessed by the Psychopathic Deviant (PD) Scale, a 72-item inventory developed by (Hathaway & Mckinley, 1967). It consists of 72-items derived from 4 sub scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). It is administered as an independent test because of its multiple values in assessing different populations. Out of the 72-items, 51 are designed to obtained clinical information about client's personality while 30 of the items constitute the K scale which is one of the correct/validity scales of MMPI designed to assess the extent to which a client truthfully responded to items of the whole test.

In terms of scoring the PD Scale, 1 point for each of the following items shaded are awarded:  
True: 7,9,10,11,12,13,15,21,22,23,25,27,28,29,31,33,34,35,37,39,40,45,50,59,60,61,62,63, and 67.  
False: 1,6,8,14,18,24,26,30,32,38,43,44,49,51,52,53, 58,64,65, and 66.

K scale awarded 1 point for following items shaded: True – 5, 39, 40, and 45.  
False – 1,2,3,4,16,17,18,19,20,41,42,43,46,47,48,49,54,55,56,57, 58,68,69,70,71, and 72. Hathaway and Mckinley, (1967) provided the reliability coefficient of the instrument to be .80 for PD scale and .76 for K scale.

The present study indicated that Psychopathy Deviant Scale yielded a Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient of 0.788, mean of 39.02, standard deviation of 8.508 and variance of 72.387.

### **Data Analysis and Results**

**Test for Hypothesis:** The hypothesis stated that there will be a significant relationship between family environment and crime among inmates. This hypothesis was tested using Pearson Product-Moment Correlation in the table below:



**Relationship between Family Environment and Crime**

<b>Family environment &amp; Crime</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>IR</b>	<b>SM</b>	<b>PG</b>
Crime (C)	1			
Interpersonal Relationship (IR)	-.269**	1		
System Maintenance (SM)	-.204**	.577**	1	
Personal Growth (PG)	-.294**	.592**	.500**	1

*Dependent variable: Crime at .05 level of significance.*

The table above shows, the correlational matrix of the Pearson correlational test result of the relationship between the component of family environment and crime among inmates. The results revealed that family environment significantly correlate with crime where interpersonal relationship correlate ( $r = -0.259, p < 0.01$ ); system maintenance correlate ( $r = -0.204, p < 0.01$ ) and personal growth correlate ( $r = -0.294, p < 0.01$ ). Thus, the results show the significant inter-correlation among the variables. In other words, the hypothesis was confirmed in this study. This imply that adequate family environment discourages crime while inadequate family environment encourages crime.

**Discussion of findings**

The hypothesis stated that, there will be a significant relationship between family environment and crime among inmates. The results of the hypothesis indicated that interpersonal relationships, personal growth and system maintenance significantly influence crime among inmates. The results of the present finding is in consonance with the reports of Dunifon and Kowaleski-Jones (2012), Cassidy (2011), Sanni et al (2010), Apel and Kaukinen, (2008), and Price and Kunz, (2003) who independently established that family environment, specifically personal growth, system maintenance, and family relations (interpersonal relationship) significantly predict crime.

**Conclusion**

This present study drew its conclusion from the reviewed literature and also the research findings. The study concluded that components of family environment independently had a negative correlations with crime among inmates. This implies that the higher the interpersonal relationship in family, the lower the crime. Also, the higher the system maintenance, the lower the crime in family. Lastly, the higher the personal growth in family, the lower the crime.

**Recommendations**

Based on the findings of the study, the study recommends that:

1. Government considerations to establish family environment Management Agency in the Ministry of Humanitarian and Social Development that would provide family functional services for training, retraining and capacity building for parents or caregivers on interpersonal relations, system maintenance and children’s personal growth.
2. Government through ministry of Humanitarian and Social Development assign professional: Psychologists, Social workers, Clinical Psychologist and Forensic &

Correctional Psychologist to families for need assessment, stress coping skills, rehabilitation and care and support services.

## References

- Akagu, A.H. (2006). The impact of Family Instability on Youth Crime: A Case Study of Ilorin Metropolis. An Unpublished B.Sc Thesis of the Department of Sociology, University of Ilorin.
- Apel, R., & Kaukinen, C. (2008). On the relationship between family structure and antisocial behaviour: Parental cohabitation and blended households. *Criminology*, 46, 35-70.
- Bhatia, H., & Chadha, N. K. (2004). *Family Environment Scale*. National Psychological Corporation, Agra.
- Cassidy, T. (2011). Family Background and Environment, Psychological Distress, and Juvenile Delinquency. *Psychology*. Vol.2, No.9, 941-947
- Demombynes, G. & Ozler, B. (2005) Crime and local inequality in South Africa, *Journal of Development Economics*, 76, 265–292.
- Demuth, S., & Brown, S. (2004). Family structure, family processes, and adolescent delinquency: The significance of parental absence versus parental gender. *Journal of Research in crime and Delinquency*, 41, 58-81.
- Dunifon, R., & Kowaleski-Jones, L. (2012). Who's in the house? Race differences in cohabitation, single parenthood, and child development. *Child Development*, 73, 1249-1264.
- Fukuyama, F. (1999). The great disruption: Human nature and the reconstitution of social order. New York: Free Press.
- Gottfredson, M., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University press.
- Haralambos, M., Holborn, M. & Robin, H. (2008). *Sociology: Themes and Perspective*. Harper Collins Publishers Limited, London.
- Hathaway, S. R., & McKinley, J. C. (1967). *The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory Manual*. New York: Psychological Corporation.
- Hoeve, M., Dubas, J.S., Eichelsheim, V.I., Van der Laan, P.H., Smeenk, W., & Gerris, J.R.M. (2009). The relationship between parenting and delinquency: A meta-analysis. *Abnormal Child Psychology*, 37, 749-775.
- Kierkus, C.A., Johnson, B.R., & Hewitt, J.D. (2010). Cohabiting, family and community stressors, selection, and juvenile delinquency. *Criminal Justice Review*, 35(4), 393-411.
- Leonard, N. (2011). Families at Risk: *The Impact of the Familial environment on Juvenile Delinquency*. Research matters, Public Safety Canada.
- Nwosuji, E., (2008). The role of Husband & Wife in contemporary Nigeria society. At: <http://nigsocioculture.blogspot.ro/2008/08/role-of-husband-wife-in-contemporary.html>
- Parsons, T. & Bales, R. F. (2002). Family: Socialization and Interaction Process (1<sup>st</sup>ed.). *International Library of Sociology*. New York: Routledge and Kogan Ltd.
- Pratt, T., Gau, J., & Franklin, T. (2011). *Key ideas in criminology and criminal justice*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Price, C., & Kunz, J. (2003). Rethinking the paradigm of juvenile delinquency as related to divorce. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 3, 109-133.
- Putnam, R. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy*, 6(1), 65–78.

- Robertson, R.P., (2010). Family is for life: Connections between childhood family experiences and wellbeing in early adulthood. *Article in Family matters, January 2010*. Melbourne, Vic.
- Sanni, K.B., Udoh N., Okediji A.A., MODO F.N. & EZE L. N. (2010). Family Types and Juvenile Delinquency Issues among Secondary School Students in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria: Counseling Implications. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 23(1): 21-28
- Shaffer, D.R., 2000. *Social and personality development* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Strydom, H. & Venter, L. (2002). Sampling and Sampling Methods. In De Vos, A.S., (Ed.), *Research at Grass Roots: For the Social Sciences and Human Service Profession*, Van Schaik, Pretoria, 197-211.
- Thornberry, T. P. (1987). Toward an interactional theory of delinquency. *Criminology* 25, 863–891.
- Wallman, K.K. (2010). Federal statistics: Understanding a crucial resource. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 631(1), 22-24.
- Whitley, R., & McKenzie, K. (2005). Social capital and psychiatry: Review of the literature. *Harvard Review of Psychiatry*, 13(2), 71–84.
- World Bank. (2001). The World Bank Annual Report 2001: Volume 1. Year in Review. WashingtonDC.WorldBank.<https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/139> License:CC BY 3.0 IGO.
- Ziehl, S.C., (2003). Forging the links: Globalization and family patterns. *Society in Transition*, 34(2), pp.320-337.