

**OPINION SURVEY ON PARENTAL AND PEER GROUP FACTORS OF JUVENILE
DELINQUENCY IN KETU- ADIE OWE COMMUNITY IN OGUN STATE**

OJO, MATTHIAS OLUFEMI DADA (PhD)

**Department of Sociology
Crawford University of the Apostolic Faith Mission,
P.M.B. 2001 Igbesa, Ogun State.**

**[E-mail:femfemty@gmail.com](mailto:femfemty@gmail.com); Matthiasojo@crawforduniversity.edu.ng
+2347037951643**

&

AKINLOTAN, RAYMOND ADENIYI

**Department of Sociology
Crawford University of the Apostolic Faith Mission,
Igbesa, Ogun State.**

&

EDEGBAI, MARTHA ABUA

**Department of Sociology
Crawford University of the Apostolic Faith Mission,
Igbesa, Ogun State.
Igbesa, Ogun State.**

&

ABISOYE, AMOS OLUTUNDE (PhD)

**Department of Sociology
Crawford University of the Apostolic Faith Mission,
Igbesa, Ogun State.**

**E-mail: tunabisoye@yahoo.com
Phone: +2348029296946**

&

OLANIYI, MARY IKEOLA

**Department of Sociology
University of Ibadan,
Ibadan.
Oyo State.
E-mail: niyi-oladele@yahoo.com**

Abstract

Parental and peer group factors are very cogent in consideration of causes of juvenile delinquency in every society. This paper, therefore, surveyed the opinions of Ketu – Adie Owe Community in Ado/Odo/Ota local government of Ogun State on the parental and peer group factors that cause the engagement of juveniles in anti – social behaviour.

Descriptive survey design was adopted in the study. Data were collected through quantitative method. This involved seventy – three copies of questionnaire administered among community residents that were conveniently sampled for the study. The quantitative data were analysed using tables of frequency and percentage distribution.

Fifty – nine percent of the respondents were female; 49.3% of them were married and 39.7% of them had 2 or 3 persons in their families. The analyses in the study show that all the respondents (100%) opined that divorce parents encourage juvenile delinquency; lack of parental supervision was affirmed by 89.9% of the

respondents as a cause; lack or poor parental skills was signified by 62.5% of the respondents; 74.3% was of the opinion that pampering leads to deviant behaviours among juveniles; a total of 89.1% of the respondents agreed that rejection of children (lack of love, care and affection) will cause juvenile delinquency in children.

Data analyses on peer group influences show that 83.1% of the respondents affirmed that if juveniles associate with cult members they will become delinquent; 79.0% of the respondents identified association with group involved in examination malpractice as a factor that will cause delinquency; 84.4% of them chose association with drug users as a cause; 55.0% of the respondents opined that associating with bullies will make juveniles to be delinquent; 85.4% of them identified association with group that engages in theft as a cause and finally, 68.3% affirmed that when juveniles associate with group that plays truancy, they will become delinquent.

The study recommends that parents need to teach their children the norms of the society. It further calls for control and prevention of drug abuse. Alleviation of poverty; avoidance of bad peer groups; good parental skills; avoidance of divorce; acceptance of children in love; good parental supervision and avoidance of pampering were also recommended in the study.

Keywords: Children, juveniles, delinquency, anti – social behavior and parents.

Introduction

Juvenile delinquency is an anti – social behaviour committed by children under the age of 18 years. The Nigerian society views juvenile delinquency as a major problem at home, school and in the larger society. This is because the punishments for crime committed by both adults and juveniles are not often the same (Moffitt, 2006). The criminal acts committed by juveniles hurt both the teenagers and other members of the society but the juveniles involved received little or no punishment for their actions.

Youth crime is a serious problem. No society wants deviant behaviours in juveniles which will invariably pose major threats to the social environment (Adegoke, 2015). Common anti – social behaviours in the country include vices as: drug abuse; kidnapping; examination malpractices, cultism, alcohol abuse; bullying and truancy. Deviant behaviours that graduated to delinquency started to become a significant factor in the Nigerian society after the Nigerian civil war and the current economic recession (Regoli and John, 2006). Researches on delinquency have shown that individual, social, economic and community conditions are factors that influence behaviours (Dantiye and Haruna, 2004; Regoli and John 2006 and Adegoke 2015).

Socio – economic factors play a part in explaining juvenile delinquency and crime. The occupation of the parents determines the socio – economic status of the family, thereby having an influence on the behaviours and values held by the teenagers in school (Ekpo and Ajanaku, 2013).

In the opinion of Leiber and Featherstone, (2009), the social status of the parents determines whether the child will be delinquent or not i.e. teenagers from lower strata of the economy deviate into delinquent acts than the middle or upper strata in the society. Socio – economic factors are global factors, which affect every family and society (Adegoke 2015). This study, therefore, examined the parental influence on deviant behaviours, and the influence of the peer groups on juvenile delinquency was also examined.

The study posed the following questions:

What are the opinions of the respondents on the influence of parental factors and peer groups on delinquent behaviours among school teenagers in Ketu Adie – Owe Community of Ado – Odo Local Government?

What are the opinions of the respondents on solutions to the problem of juvenile delinquency in Ketu – Adie Owe Community of Ado – Odo Local Government?

The objectives of the study were:

To investigate the opinions of the respondents on the influence of parental factors and peer groups on deviant behaviours among school teenagers in the stated study area.

To find out the opinions of the respondents on solutions to the problem of juvenile delinquency in the mentioned study area.

Literature Review

Introduction

The literature review deals with studies related to socio-economic factors contributing to juvenile delinquency and theories of juvenile delinquency.

Juvenile delinquency in Nigeria society

Juvenile delinquency refers to the violation of the criminal codes regulating the behaviour of young persons in the society. The concept of Juveniles is sometimes used interchangeably with other concepts like a child, an adolescent and a youth (Adegoke, 2015). There is no universal definition of delinquency. The definition of delinquency and the scope of behaviour covered by the term vary across societies. Delinquency and crime are morally, economically and socially constructed (Dantiye and Haruna, 2004). The society selectively attributes equal as well as diminished responsibility to young persons in different areas of life.

Juvenile delinquency has elicited many images of the child. Delinquency has been variously portrayed and defined as a condition of drift, maladjustments, pathology, disturbance, moral depravity and unruly behaviour. What actually constitutes 'young offending is in a constant process of re-invention and re-definition. In the early nineteenth century, the Juvenile delinquent was created in the midst of wider concerns about unemployment, lack of discipline and moral degeneration.

Resulting in confusion over appropriate behaviour expected by young people, there are conducts which constitute delinquency for Juvenile which the societies see as delinquency. When the Juveniles commit deviant behaviours, such behaviours are prohibited in the school; behaviours like running away from home, stealing, bullying, drinking alcohol etc. (Dantiye and Haruna, 2004).

Juvenile delinquency is increasing in the Nigeria societies. Juvenile commits criminal attitudes which affect them in schools; they tend to have short attention span, low intelligence and performance in school because they are influenced into the act through learning (Bartol and Bartol, 2009). Juveniles learn behaviour from other people in the society. Man cannot live in isolation, and we interact with one another every-day. The people we interact with determine our behaviour in the society (Bartol and Bartol, 2009).

Causes of juvenile delinquency

Adolescence is a time of expanding vulnerabilities and opportunities that accompany the widening social and geographic exposure to life beyond school or family, but it starts with family. Researches indicate that various exposures to violence within the family or outside the family are important sources of delinquencies which means that not only can Juvenile witness violence within the family but on the outside as well (Hagan and Holly, 2001). If violence encompasses all emotionally environmental aspect of the Juvenile's life, he or she is more likely to engage in delinquency activities (Hagan and Holly, 2001).

A long history of research has further linked family functions with future criminal offending in part because parents monitor and provide nurturance to children, the loosening of bonds among family members may result in more criminal involvement (Bartol and Anne, 2009). In other words, when the parent does not have time for the Juvenile, they tend to cultivate more criminal attitudes than family with short bonds (Adegoke, 2015). Family behaviours, particularly parental monitoring and disciplining seem to influence association with deviant peers throughout the Juvenile period. The issue of a lack of monitoring is reflected in the parents not knowing where and what the child is doing and whom the child is with. Monitoring increases as the child moves to adolescence.

Adolescence is the stage when the child learns behaviour and they spend less time under direct supervision of their parents and more time with their peers at schools and at home (Adegoke, 2015). Previous research found that juvenile who engaged in more criminal are Juvenile that lack parental monitoring and as a result of this they associate with deviant peers (Bartol and Bartol, 2009).

Family description and delinquency, the composition of families is one aspect of family life that is consistently associated with delinquency. It has been viewed that juvenile comes from less intact families. A number of studies have been undertaken which shows a very real connection between delinquent, criminal behaviour and less intact families. Research shows that Juvenile from single parenting and in particular mother only, produces more Juvenile delinquent than two parenting. The absence of intact families makes gang membership more appalling (Muehlenberg, 2002). The lack of supervision and the absence of those relationships between the Juveniles are important factors that influence delinquency when the Juvenile lacks supervision they do whatever they feel is right by following their peers who commit criminal attitudes. Social learning theory argues that aggressive behaviour is learned as parents or peers

display aggressive behaviour. Juvenile learns to imitate as an acceptable means of living (Matherme and Adrian, 2001).

Ojo (2012) lists broken homes and low education attainment as some of the causes of delinquency, which were revealed at Youth imprisoned at Kamiti Youth Corrective Training Centre since most of the boys were from dysfunctional families. Some boys had been orphans without guardians before their arrests, others had single or divorced parents, and some had parents with major differences, others' parents or guardians were alcoholics who could not offer good parenthood.

Social- economic factors of juvenile delinquency

Delinquency is caused by socio-economic factors; the family socio-economic status is based on family income, parental occupation and societal values in the community. The seeming undependability of our families to curb the menace of delinquency is not uncommented with the unprecedented global inflation that has had alarming influence on families resulting in breakdown of social bonds in the family (Ekpo and Ajake, 2013). This is generally seen in the negative effect this has on the adolescent members of families. Juvenile parents of the lower socio-economic status do not have enough income to further the Juvenile school necessities and this has negative impact on the Juvenile performance in school.

Education has been described as one of the sources of social stratification and social mobility. (Ekpo and Ajake, 2013). Juveniles from rich parents with adequate income, good occupation and high status are likely provided with huge quality private education from nursery up to university level. As a result of this opportunity, juvenile from high socio-economic status will be less delinquent than Juvenile from lower socio-economic background (Eshiet, 2002). If Juvenile has poor academic performance, poor attendance, and drop out of school, the probability of their being delinquent is magnified. Leaving school early reduces the chance that Juvenile will develop the social skills that are gained in school.

Ajake, Isangedighi and Bisong (2008) Children style is a function of family socio-economic status. Significant difference exists between children from autocratically reared family who are more vulnerable to delinquency. Again, a significant difference exist between children reared under democratic child rearing style and their counterpart reared under Laissez-Faire rearing style in lying, stealing and truancy. In each case, those who are brought under the laissez-faire families are the more vulnerable. In other words, families that shows love and care to their children, the children from that family are less likely to be delinquent than children from families with no care and love. (Ajake *et al.*, 2008).

Previous research shows that alcohol abuse in Nepal is mostly found among the youth between the age of 16 and 30 in the homes of the less educated. The research opined that Juveniles are eight times more likely to take alcohol through initiation of their own family members due to lack of knowledge, the less educated parents do not seem to associate alcoholism with internalizing and externalizing behaviours, more negative performance, lower academic achievement and more diversified effect on body organs such as liver injury, cardiac problems, damage to endocrine and reproductive system. Ryan (2002) noted that parents who are less educated have been more passively involved in the management; upbringing of their Juveniles does not seem to give them the desired respect since they are more likely to guide them academically. Ryan (2002) therefore maintains that these Juveniles are more involved in antisocial activities and are more delinquent than their counterparts from well-educated homes.

Another social factor that causes delinquent behaviour among Juveniles in school is aggressive behaviours, the parents and families influence their children attitude at schools. Families constitute training ground for aggression. Educated parents are less aggressive because they know the harm aggressive behaviours cause in the Juvenile learning, and they avoid them. These aggressive behaviours lead the Juvenile into bullying others in the schools.

Family structure and delinquency

Juvenile Delinquency is an intractable problem worldwide and has been increasing phenomenally by as much as 30 percent since 1990's (Sheryl, 2008). Anti -social behaviours of Juvenile have caused many problems in the society. The society has perceived Juvenile Delinquency as a major problem in Nigeria. The origin of Juvenile delinquency in Nigeria dates back to 1920's when youth crimes such as pick pocketing and prostitution became predominant issues in Nigerian at the period. This led to the establishment of judicial administrative process by the colonial administration to deal with Juvenile delinquents (Fourchard, 2006).

Juvenile delinquency is rooted in the kind of home the juvenile is brought up (Muhammed, Salawu, Adekeye, Ayinla, and Adeoye, 2009) have observed that family instability is on the increase in Nigeria and that the increasing crime trends among the youths may be attributed to this. Broken Homes have been

mostly associated with Juvenile delinquency; there are other factors such as lack of parental control and ineffective parental behaviour which have contributed to the rise of juvenile delinquency (Ugwuoke and Duruji, 2015). The family is the foundation of human society; juveniles who are rejected by their parents, who grow up in homes with considerable conflict are at the greatest risk of becoming delinquent.

Mullens (2004) has it that Juveniles from broken homes are more likely to run away from their family than Juvenile living in stable families. The core assumption is that a broken home is unstable, and as a result, is detrimental to a child's socialization and personality adjustment. Juveniles from stable families are not strongly influenced by peer pressures because there is balance structure of man and woman who act as goal role for the juvenile, whereas juveniles from single parenthood are strongly influenced by delinquent peers because of the imbalance structure of the family. The father and mother cannot perform the role of each other; the socialization of the juvenile is dependable on family structure (Ugwuoke and Duruji, 2015).

Broken homes have been mostly associated with juvenile delinquency. Although some other factors such as lack of parental control and ineffective parental behaviour have been attributed to the rise in juvenile delinquency, most of the literature on juvenile delinquency point to the ultimate breakdown of the family as the main causative factor (Fry, 2010).

Alemika and Chukwuma (2001), in their study of juvenile administration in Nigeria averred that there is no significant relation between broken homes and juvenile delinquency. This assertion contradicts Kimani's (2010) findings from a study of family influence on juvenile delinquency. Kimani found a positive relationship between broken homes and juvenile delinquency. This contrast may be as a result of differential focus of research and the methodologies adopted in the research.

Azoro (2010) has asserted that children from broken homes have a higher risk of indulging in delinquent acts than children from stable families. As a result of that, children from broken homes suffer from what he called attachment disorder. According to Azoro (2010), this implies a weakened bond with their parents. He argued that this lack of attachment to their parents exposes the children to anti-social behaviours. Hence, children from broken homes suffer from emotional pains and this propel them to engage in vicious crimes such as assault, rape, stealing, truancy etc.

Adolescence is a time of expanding vulnerabilities and opportunities that accompany the widening social and geographic exposure to life beyond school or family, but it starts with the family. A substantial number of juvenile engages in delinquency. Anti-social behaviour may begin at preschool or in the first few grades of elementary school, such childhood misconduct tends to be resistant to change. Family behaviours, particularly parental monitoring, and disciplining, seem to influence association with deviant peers throughout the adolescent period. The family performs a vital function in the social order when it is broken in any way or rendered insufficient by estrangement, it cannot properly perform its function. Homes are broken in many ways, the most tragic of which are the death of one parent or both, desertion or separation and divorce. Two of the main factors influencing Juvenile delinquency are the family structure that a child is exposed to (Apel and Kaukien, 2008) and the relationships the adolescents have with parents. (Leiber and Featherstone, 2009).

Inadequate supervision arising from family instability seems to be associated with juvenile delinquency (Alfrey, 2010). Alfrey further explained that those children in single-parent families tend to receive lower levels of supervision. According to him, this inadequate parental supervision has a tendency to increase the likelihood of juvenile delinquency. Dogget (2004) has it that when there is one parent living in the home as opposed to two, it is more difficult to supervise children all the time. According to Dogget, every day activities like errands and work must be completed by the single parent, which leaves no parent in the home. Because of this, children in single-parent homes tend to receive lower levels of supervision (Sanni, Udoh, Okediji, Modo, and Ezeh, 2010). Lack of parental monitoring contributes not only directly to children's anti-social behaviours, but also indirectly as it contributes to exposing them to association with deviant peers, which is predictive of higher levels of deviant acts (Okorodudu, 2010). From observation, it seems that parents and care givers are not doing much in the supervision of their children in Ketu Adie Owe Community, because of their numerous economic and social engagements. This scenario tends to give impetus to juvenile delinquency in Ketu Adie Owe community, Ogun state. Children from broken homes are more likely to run away from their family than children who come from more stable families (Uwaoma and Udeagha, 2007). According to them a broken home is unstable and as a result, is detrimental to a child's socialization and personality adjustment. The resultant effect is that a child may be more vulnerable to negative peer pressure and may ultimately commit delinquent acts not committed by children from stable families, where there is a balanced structure of two parents who act as good role models in the child's acquisition of proper roles (Odebunmi,

2007). Children growing up in unstable families are at a greater risk of experiencing a variety of behavioural and educational problems, including; smoking, drug abuse, vandalism, violence and criminal acts than children from stable families (Sheryln, 2008).

Adolescents of all ages are living in many various types of homes, such as with single, married, and cohabiting parents. The families that children grow up in and the social environment in which they live have major effects on their well-being (Wallman, 2010). There is evidence that there is a great degree of variability within “broken homes” families (Apel and Kaukien, 2008). One third of children are born to unmarried mothers and over one half of children will spend some time in a single parent family. Family structure are extremely varied today not only due to the high rate of divorce and the proliferation of complex step families, but also to increasing rates of non- marital child bearing and co-habitation(Demuth and Brown, 2004).

Poverty and delinquency

The concept of poverty have assumed not only local but global trend resulting in many countries administering numerous policies in a bid to curb this menace. Poverty can be described as a living condition in which individuals fail to achieve a minimum standard of living. Haralambos and Holborn (2000) assert that poverty is a situation where a person is unable to acquire the minimum necessities that make for well-being.

Poverty is marked by the inability to get good livelihood, have good house to live in, support oneself without depending on others, inability to acquire good healthcare, good educational training etc. Haralambos and Holborn (2000) identify three kinds of poverty. These are absolute, relative and subjective poverty. They describe absolute poverty as a state where the living condition is really critical and there is difficult in survival. According to them, to determine absolute poverty a yardstick is established against which to measure poverty. Poverty is in this context measured by pricing the basic necessities of life, mapping out the poverty line in terms of the price. The relative poverty, according to them, is in terms of adjustment from people of a particular society of what is taken as a reasonable and acceptable standard of living and way of life due to the conditions of the day. (Effiom, Archibong and Ojua, 2014).

Giddens Anthony (2006) says that subjective poverty has to do with whether or not an individual or groups of persons feel they are poor. They explain however that this has a close relationship with relative poverty.

According to Carr and Sloan (2003) these hereditary plagues could include: non availability of school or education, child labour, lack of basic needs, easy transmission of diseases, unemployment and very low income. Danziger and Haveman (2011) added, other plagues associated with poverty to include: a self-destructing habit of alcohol and drug abuse, taken as a means to cope with stress or forget despairs; poor housing and living conditions paving way for different kinds of diseases (water and food – related diseases).

One of the impact of urban poverty is juvenile involvement in criminality, this involvement has profound negative effect on a society's quality of life via the imposition of additional social costs. (Ekpenyoung, Raimi, and Ekpenyoung, 2012).

Alemika and Chukwuma's (2005) study of juvenile justice system in Nigeria, which draws form selected samples of inmates in remand homes and borstal homes provided with an understanding of the current State of juvenile justice administration on Nigeria, which is very poor.

Olotuah and Adesiji (2009) view that poor housing tends to generate slums which in turn provide the impetus for deviant behaviour largely involving juvenile in urban areas

Various observations indicate that most of the youth are in crime because of poverty, which drove them into criminal acts for survival (prior and Paris 2005).

Delinquency areas are the slums of our large cities they are drab districts with bad housing. They are often of overcrowded, and deficient in recreational facilities. At youth prison at Kamiti Youth Corrective Training Centre, the study revealed that over 70%; more than 40 out of 55 of the inmates were poor or came from poor family backgrounds based on where they lived, property ownership and the types of offences committed. For instance, some boys indicate that they ran from home to beg for survival in the streets because they lacked basic survival. (Omoboto, Ondiek, Odera and Agusi, 2013).

In the U.S, crime is often perceived as a problem amid areas with high levels of poverty (Urdang 2012), however, many other factors such as population density, minority population, locality, unemployment are correlated with poverty and affect crime as well. In countries where social discrimination factor is high, scholars have opined that less education meant more criminal activities ranging from casual theft to drug related offenses. There are huge consequences of this

kind of situation for public policy which needs to be fine-tuned to have a positive impact of keeping children in school in a bid to reduce poverty. Statistically, countries with higher poverty level especially poorer areas and ghettos have usually much higher crime rates than other areas made up of middle or high class individuals. (Danziger and Haveman, 2001). Adding to this point, Ludwig (2000) opined that people resort to crime only if they perceive that potential benefits outweigh the cost of committing a particular crime. As Ludwig (2000) puts it “if legal ways of obtaining finances cannot support one, then illegal ways are resorted to in order to survive”. Crime offers a way in which impoverished people can obtain goods and services that they cannot get to or achieve through legitimate means. The degree of unemployment also correlates with poverty. Higher unemployment level would increase poverty and at the same time engender crime activities due to depression associated with being unemployed. In their perspective, Chukwuezi (2009) and Oruh (2004) attributed poverty to individual behavioural characteristics and choices such as alcohol and substance abuse, rape, theft etc. they suggest that the problem of poverty is within the control of the poor themselves and therefore policies and programs need to influence those choices through incentives and prohibitions.

Peer group and delinquency

Some teenagers get into crime due to peer pressure and rebellion against parental authority (Maseko, 2009). Criminal behaviour often times represents a collective response that is directed by sub cultural values and norms of distinct collectives such as peer groups within the larger group. Individuals in society will usually make friends or have their closest associates from among their peer groups. Therefore, peer associates have a great influence on the lifestyle of their members. In fact peer group association, as an agent of socialization, determines to a large extent, what social codes an individual learns (Nsofor, 2013). This implies that individuals whose core group members believe and act criminal within norms will learn and internalize more of criminal codes than those that conform with the norms of the society. As a result, they conclude that individuals become delinquent through association with people who are the carriers of criminal norms and that criminal behaviour is learned within primary groups in particular, peer groups. (Esiri, 2016). That is, Criminal behaviour in adolescents is as a result of social influence. It is important to note here, that primary groups are the smallest units of interactions in society, and a small group within the society is more likely to have a stronger control over an individual's action or behaviour (Allen, Donohue, Griffin, Ryan and Turner, 2003). For example, there might be a strong pressure on a member of a university cult group to prove himself by raping a girl or even killing a student. So also there may be pressure on someone in a position of affluence among the peer clique to engage in embezzling and tax evasion or to take or give bribe so as to be approved of or accepted. Peer groups or associations have their own cultures, sanctions or rituals into which members are socialized and accordingly, members (especially new members) who do not comply with any of these may be ostracized (Carlson, 2010). Peer pressure extends to all groups. A peer group refers to persons that belong to the same age (or about the same age) and or status. Examples of peer groups include, age peer group, school or educational peer group, social peer group, professional peer group and work peer group. (Esiri, 2016).

Modern society consists of several groups including peer groups. Peer groups, especially teenage and adolescent peer groups, present to members models of behaviour. These models are not merely presentations but are actually rewarded sometimes and punished at other times. These groups sometimes do not only have standards that differ from those of the larger society but which also, sometimes, are in opposition. Yet because members desire to be accepted, they act like the „meaningful others“ (other members of the in-group). Ogbemor, (2012) identified that man learns by imitation and observed that in Nigeria, youths, through this means, learn the act of crime. According to him, observation indicates that most violent crimes in Nigeria, are committed by youths. When children are unable to gain acceptance in their peer groups, they often experience a lifelong pattern of social rejection and failure.

Peer pressure becomes a disturbing and worrisome social problem as growing children take on their peer group as their role models. This is because they begin to act and develop the copycat syndrome. (Esiri, 2016). As a result of this syndrome, a child would desire the same kind of toys, wear the same kind of clothes, eat the same kind of food, share eating habits, share favourite television programmes' share likes and dislikes, and even share bed times with peers. At this point, the parents start having difficulties exercising social control on the child because the values

and opinions of their peers (age or friendship cliques) as far as he/she is concerned supersedes those of the parents. Also because they want to look and act like the others. Imitation and experimentation have been identified as ways by which teens and adolescents learn anti-social and criminal behaviour (Ogbebor, 2012).

Dilemma of delinquency

Juvenile delinquents are minors usually defined as being between the ages of 10 and 18 years who have committed some act that violates the law of conduct. These acts aren't called "crimes" as they would for adults. Instead of a trial; the juvenile has an "adjudication" after which the juvenile receives a "disposition" and a sentence. (Agbowuro, Umeh and Solomon, 2016).

The success of socialization process is said to be the determinant of juvenile behaviour. This means that if the agents of socialization are used positively, juvenile will come up with positive behaviours that are relevant to the family, school, and the society. If parents, teachers and friends can show profound affections, provide profound securities which are fundamental to human beings, juvenile will have positive orientation (Bhatia and Singhai, 2001).

In Nigeria, school teenagers in the past were characterized by respect for parents and teachers, while stealing, truancy, examination malpractices, smoking were not common practices among school students. These were referred to as antisocial behaviour. Chaba (2002) believed that school teenagers get involved in anti-social behaviours because they feel that they are old fashioned among their peer groups.

Several theoretical models emphasized the relationship between education and delinquency, an association between academic achievement and delinquent behaviour has been proposed by various hypothetical and theoretical approaches in literature. The school of failure hypothesis suggest that the failure experienced in school by Juveniles with learning disabilities is the first of many negative experiences that will result in delinquency because of the development of a negative self- image (Denyanira, 2005).

The continuing patterns of delinquency include a long list of status offences. Juvenile's crime is a perennial public concern, it includes theft, smoking, bullying in school, consumption of alcohol, running away from home and school etc. (Agbowuro et al, 2016).

Yosi (2015) blames the federal government for the increase in Juvenile Delinquency by taking over missionary schools. Since then there had been a steady increase in Juvenile delinquency. This indicates that the tiers of government pay little attention on the aspect of morality.

Research methodology

The study utilized survey design and adopted quantitative approach. The study area was Ketu – Adie Owe community in Ado – Odo Local Government of Ogun State which lies on latitude 641N and longitude 3.41E. Ado – Odo/Ota Local Government has a population of 526,565 according to 2006 census.

The study utilized non – probability approach and convenience sampling method was adopted to select the study area and the respondents who participated in the study. The study used questionnaire as a research instrument to gather the primary data analysed for the study. Data analysis involved simple percentage tables after the data gathered have been analysed using statistical package for social sciences.

Socio –bio data of the respondents

Socio bio data on the respondents are presented below in tables

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SEX

Table 1: Percentage Distribution of Respondents by sex

Sex	Frequency	Percent (%)
Male	30	41.0
Female	43	59.0
Total	73	100.0

Source: Researcher Analysis, 2017

The data in the table above show that 41% of the respondents were male; while 59% of the respondents were female. This indicates that we had more female respondents who participated in the study than male.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY AGE

Table 2: Respondents distribution on age

	Age	Frequency	Percent (%)
	18-25	17	23.3
valid	26-35	25	34.2
	36 & above	31	42.5
	Total	73	100.0

Source: Researcher Analysis, 2017

Table above table contains the analyses on the age of the respondents who participated in the study. The analyses show that 23.3% of the respondents were within the age bracket of 18-25 years; 34.2% of them were within the age bracket of 26 – 35 years and 42.5% were 36 years and above.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY MARITAL STATUS

Table 3: Respondents distribution on marital status

	Marital Status	Frequency	Percent (%)
	Single	10	13.7
	Married	36	49.3
valid	Divorced	21	28.8
	Widowed	6	8.2
	Total	73	100.0

Source: Researcher Analysis, 2017

The marital statuses of the respondents were also taken into consideration in the study. The analyses from the table 3 above show that 13.7% of the respondent who participated in the study were single. 49.3% were married; 28.8% were divorcees and 8.2% were widows/widowers. In summary, majority of the respondents were married. Marriage adds experiences to the people's lives, especially in area of responsibilities to spouses and children. Child rearing in most cases is a responsibility of the married people. It is a parental responsibility that is expected of the people involved, which should be done dedicatedly. The attempt to deviate from this will encourage the problem of delinquency. Juvenile who engaged in criminal behavior lack parental monitoring and as a result they associate with deviant peers (Bartol and Bartol, 2009). Moreover, when family is less intact, juveniles see gang membership more appealing (Muchlenbarg, 2012).

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY RELIGION

Table 4: Respondents distribution on religion

	Religion	Frequency	Percent (%)
	Christianity	36	49.3
Valid	Islam	33	45.2
	Traditionalist	4	5.5
	Others	0	0
	Total	73	100

Source: Researcher Analysis, 2017

Religions of the respondents were also considered in the study. The analyses show that 49.3% of the respondents were Christians; 45.2% were Muslims and 5.5% were adherents of traditional religion. We can conclude from the study that many more Christians participated in the study than any of the other religion adherents. Religious families in most cases do not have problem with their children's behaviours because of religious and moral instructions such families tend to give to the children. Religious and moral instruction do prevent deviant behaviours in children and reform the lives of those that were already in them. Hence, enough religious and moral instructions in area of supervision are needed. Inadequate supervision from parents can be associated with juvenile delinquency (Alfrey, 2010).

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

Table 5: Respondents distribution on educational qualification

	Education	Frequency	Percent (%)
	SSCE	37	50.7
	OND	24	32.9
Valid	HND/B.Sc	12	16.4
	M.Sc/ M.A/ M.B.A	0	0
	Total	73	100.0

Source: Researcher Analysis, 2017

The educational qualifications of the respondents were also considered in the study. The analyses in table 5 show that 50.7% of the respondents were Senior Secondary Certificate holders; 32.9% were holders of National Diplomas; while 16.4% were Higher National Diploma/Bachelor degree certificate holders.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Table 6: Respondents distribution on work experience

	Employment Status	Frequency	Percent (%)
	Unemployed	18	24.7
	Self-employed	36	49.3
Valid	Civil servant	16	21.9
	Private Est	3	4.10
	Others	0	0
	Total	73	100

Source: Researcher Analysis, 2017

Employment Statuses of the respondents also featured in the questions under respondent’s bio data. Table 6 contains the analyses on these. The analyses show that 24.7% were not gainfully employed; 49.3% were self-employed; 21.9% were civil servants; while 4.1% were working with private establishment.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF REPENDENTS BY FAMILY SIZE

Table 7: Respondents distribution on family size

	Family Size	Frequency	Percent (%)
	0-3	29	39.7
valid	4-6	28	38.4
	6& above	16	21.9
	Total	73	100.0

Source: Researcher Analysis, 2017

Table 7 shows the data analyses on family size of the respondents. The analyses show that 39.7% of the respondents had the family size of 2 or 3 people; 38.4% had between 4 – 6 people, while 21.9% had 6 people and above. It can be concluded that respondents with family size of 2 or 3 people had the highest percentage.

Parental and peer group influential factors of delinquency

Below is the table of respondents' opinions on parental and peer group factors that influence delinquency.

Table 8: Parental and peer group influence on delinquency

Respondents Opinions	Parental and peer group influences: respondent views (%)										
	Divorce	No supervision	No parental skills	Pampering	Rejection	Cultism	Exam Malpractice	Drug abuse	Bullying	Stealing	Truancy
SA	67.1	29.0	29.7	21.2	36.4	26.2	21.1	39.1	18.3	30.6	12.7
A	24.3	52.2	17.2	27.3	29.1	41.5	21.1	28.1	11.7	7.1	27.0
SH	8.6	8.7	15.6	25.8	23.6	15.4	36.8	17.2	25.0	17.7	28.6
D	0	10.1	18.8	15.2	9.1	10.8	7.0	9.4	26.7	9.7	23.8
SD	0	0	18.8	10.6	1.8	6.1	14.0	6.3	18.3	4.8	7.9
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Researchers Analysis, 2017

SA = Strongly Agree; A=Agree; SH= Somehow Agree; D=Disagree; and SD= Strongly Disagree

The table above shows the opinions of respondents on parental and peer group factors that influence delinquency. A cursory look at the table shows that divorce is the first parental factor. Divorce between parents can affect the social behaviours of their children.

The analyses from the table shows that 67.4% of the respondents strongly agreed that divorce as a parental factor can cause anti – social behaviours of their children; 24.3% of the respondents also agreed and 8.3% somehow agreed. Divorce usually leads to single parenthood. Alfrey (2010) explained that those children in single – parent families tend to receive lower level of supervision, and inadequate parental supervision has a tendency to increase the likelihood of juvenile delinquency.

Lack of parental supervision was another factor considered in the study. The analyses show that 29.0% of the respondents strongly agreed that lack of supervision can lead to delinquent behaviours of the children; 52.2% of the respondents agreed with the same statement and 8.7% somehow agreed. Supervision of children has a lot to do in controlling deviant behaviours of the children. When parents do not have time for monitoring of the juvenile they tend to commit more anti-social behaviours than family with strong bonds and supervision. (Adegoke, 2015). Inadequate supervision arising from family instability is associated with juvenile delinquency (Fry, 2010). Lack of parental skills also plays important role. The analyses show that 29.7% of the respondent strongly agreed that lack of parental skills will lead to deviant behaviours in children; 17.2% of the respondents agreed with the same and 15.6% somehow agreed with the same statement. Fry (2010) opined that ineffective parental behaviour (lack of parental skills) have been attributed to the rise in juvenile delinquency. Hence, parental skills are quite important in child rearing.

Pampering of the children was another factor examined in the study. Pampering of the children itself is a sign of poor parental skills. The analyses show that 21.2% of the respondents strongly agreed that pampering of the children may eventually cause delinquency in those children. Another percentage of the respondents (27.3%) also agreed; while 25.8% somehow agreed with the same belief. Pampering of the children is negates proper upbringing of children in moral and religious values. Many deviant children are over pampered and spoilt children at homes.

Rejection of children also leads to juvenile delinquency. A total percentage of 36.4% of the respondents strongly agreed that rejected children are usually deviant children; 29.1% of the respondents agreed with the same and 23.6% somehow agreed with the same statement. Juveniles who are rejected by their parents, who grow up in homes with considerable conflict are at the greatest risk of becoming delinquent (Ugwuoke and Duruji, 2015). Children from such parents run from home to beg for survival in the streets because they lack basic survival (Omoboto, Ondieke, Odera and Agusi, 2013).

As stated earlier on, peer group influences also constitute reason for deviant behaviours among juveniles. Some peer group influences from cultism; exam malpractice; drug abuse; bullying, stealing and truancy were considered in the study.

Cultism came first on the list. A cursory look at the table above shows that 26.2% of the respondents strongly agreed that juveniles may become deviant as a result of their associations with other juveniles that are into cultism. From the table, 41.5% of the respondents also agreed; while 15.4% of the respondents somehow agreed.

Cultism has become a worrisome problem among juveniles in Nigeria of recent. The problem was associated with university students in the past but it is now a common phenomenon among secondary school students and in some instances, among primary school pupils.

Esiri (2016) opined that individuals become delinquent through association with people who are the carriers of criminal norms and that criminal behaviours are learned within peer groups. Pressure may come from cult group on a member to prove himself worthy of being a member by raping a girl or even killing other student. Peer groups or associations have their own culture, sanctions or rituals through which members are socialized and especially, new members who do not comply may be ostracized (Carlson, 2010).

Association of juveniles with those who engaged in examination malpractice is another way juveniles may be involved in deviant behaviours. The analyses show that 21.1% of the respondents strongly agreed with this; 21.1% of the respondents also agreed; while 36.8% somehow agreed. Examination malpractice is a serious and colossal problem within Nigerian educational system. The problem is prominent in Nigerian tertiary institutions, secondary schools and even primary schools. Problem of examination malpractice usually leads to other problems in the society i.e. forgery, cheat, corruption, perjury and many other related vices in the society.

Contact with peer group that engages in drug abuse is another factor that propels juveniles into deviant behaviours. The analyses in the above table show that 39.1% of the respondents strongly agreed that having contact with group that involves in drug abuse will lead juveniles into path of deviant behaviours. Another set of respondents (28.1%) also agreed with the same belief; while 17.2% somehow agreed. Having contacts with delinquent peer group that engages in abuse of drug is a sure way of leading such juveniles, who had contacts with such group, into deviant behaviours. Sheryln (2008) cited drug abuse as one of the serious problems affecting juveniles.

Bullying is another factor in the study of peer group influence on juvenile's misbehaviours. The association of juveniles with peer group that engages in bullying may eventually cause them behavioural defects. However, not many of our respondents considered it as a threatening factor. The analyses show that it was only 18.3% of the respondents that strongly agreed that it is a factor to reckon with; 11.7% of the respondents also agreed; while 25.0% of the respondents somehow agreed. Ryan (2002) argued that aggressive behaviours tend to lead the juvenile into bullying others in schools.

An association with peer group that indulges in stealing may also lure juveniles into the same act or other vices in the society. A total of 30.6% of the respondents strongly agreed with this belief; 37.1% agreed, while 17.7% of the respondents somehow agreed. Stealing and pilfering are two similar problems of the juveniles of today's society. Many juveniles engage in stealing and pilfering because of their parents' inability to meet their basic needs of life. The children involved run away from home to beg (and in some cases steal) for survival (Omoboto et al, 2013).

Friendliness with peer group that engages in truancy is another factor. A total of 12.7% of the respondents strongly agreed that when innocent juveniles associate with others who play truancy, they may be involved in deviant behaviour. Further analyses show that 27.0% of the respondents also agreed with this and 28.6% somehow agreed. Mullen (2004) explains that juveniles from broken homes are more likely to run away from their families. Such juveniles involved may also associate with others who play truancy and may eventually drop out of school as a result of poor academic performance. Leaving school reduces the chance that juvenile will develop the social skills needed in life and may eventually end up in deviant behaviours (Eshiet, 2002).

Ways to alleviate the problems of delinquency

Ways to alleviate the problem of delinquency was also considered in the study. The table below shows the opinion of respondents on this

Table: 9 Measures to alleviate delinquency

Measures	Measures to Alleviate Delinquency: Respondents Opinions (%)			
	Yes	No	Undecided	Total
Inculcate norms	87.3	2.8	9.9	100
Prohibit drugs	70.1	10.4	19.4	100
Reduced poverty	85.9	4.2	9.9	100
Parental supervision	53.1	17.2	29.7	100
Avoidance of bad company	63.9	13.9	22.2	100
Parental skills	31.8	28.8	39.4	100
Avoidance of divorce	81.5	10.8	7.7	100
Acceptance of children	75.8	14.5	9.7	100
Parental pampering	58.5	26.2	15.4	100
Supervision of children	50.0	16.7	33.3	100

Source: Researcher Analysis, 2017

Measures to alleviate the problem of juvenile delinquency also featured in the study. The analyses from table 9 above show that 87.3% of the respondents signified that inculcation of norms into the lives of the juvenile will solve the problem of delinquency; 70.1% of them called for prohibition of hard drugs; 85.9% suggested alleviation of poverty. Adequate parental supervision was also advised (with 53.1% of the respondents); 63.9% of the respondents counselled avoidance of bad company; 31.8% of the respondents affirmed good parental skills as the solution; while 81.5% of them opined that avoidance of divorce will prevent juvenile delinquency.

Acceptance of children in love was suggested by 75.8% of the respondents as a factor that will end delinquency in children; 58.5% of the respondents counselled parents not to pamper their children in order to prevent deviant behaviour, while 50.0% advocated for parental supervision.

Summary of the findings.

The summary of the findings clearly shows that every respondent (100%) who participated in the study opined that divorced parents will resultantly cause delinquent behaviours in their children. Divorce is one of the signs of broken home and broken homes have been mostly associated with juvenile delinquency (Ugwuroke and Duruji, 2015). Poor or lack of parental supervision was also counted as a factor of parental influence on juvenile delinquency. The study discovered that a total of 89.9% of the respondents held the belief that when parents failed to supervise their children, such children may go astray from social behaviours. Children from single parents may not be well supervised and such children might do whatever they feel is right (Matherme and Adrian, 2001).

Lack of parental skills was also counted as a factor. The analyses show that a total of 62.5% of the respondents affirmed that lack of parental skills will endanger the behaviours of children and cause them to be delinquent. Ajake et al (2008) argued that children from laissez – faire families are more vulnerable to delinquent behaviours. Democratic parental skills are preferable to laissez - faire and authoritarian parental skills. Pampering children was another factor treated in the study. A total of 74.3% of the respondents were of the opinion that pampering children is a license to their delinquent behaviours. Pampering of children especially by rich parents, will spoil them. Rejection from parents also played a critical role in deviant behaviours of juveniles. A total of 89.1% of the respondents held the belief that when parents reject their children or abandon them, such children will eventually go wayward or become delinquent. Ajake et al (2008) argued that families that show love and care to their children, children from that families are less likely to be delinquent than those from families with inadequate care and love, but rejection.

For the influence from peer group, a total of 83.1% of the respondents believed that influence from the cult groups will really cause deviant behaviours in juveniles. The analyses on examination malpractice show that a total of 79.0% of the respondents opined that associating with peer group which indulges in examination malpractice will get juveniles involved in delinquency. Analyses on drug abuse show that a total of 84.4% of the respondents affirmed that when juveniles associate with drug users, they will become delinquent; while 55.0% of the respondents were of the opinion that associating with peer group that engages in bullying will make juveniles to be deviant and break societal norms.

Stealing was another factor in the study. A total of 85.4% of the respondents opined that when juveniles associate with peer group that engages in stealing (Theft), such juveniles will also become delinquent. Finally, a total of 68.3% of the respondents affirmed that a peer group that engages in truancy will influence juveniles who associate with it to be delinquent.

The discovery on the study of peer group shows that juveniles commit the same deviant or criminal behaviours that the peer groups they associate with commit because such juveniles learn from the group behaviours.

The summary on solutions to the problem of deviant behavior shows that 87.3% of the respondents affirmed that norms of the society must be taught to the juveniles to solve the problem; while 70.1% of the respondents advocated for prohibition and control of drugs ; 85.9% of the respondents called for the alleviation of poverty before the problem of delinquency can be alleviated; while 53.1% of the respondents suggested good parental supervision to prevent and control the problem of deviant behaviour in juveniles. In the analyses, 63.9% of the respondents gave avoidance of bad company as a solution to the problem of delinquency; while 31.8% of the respondents counselled good parental skills as a major solution. In the analyses, 81.5% of the respondents advocated avoidance of divorce to prevent juvenile delinquency and 75.8% of them 'preached' acceptance of children with love and care as antidote to delinquent behaviours. A fairly large percentage of the respondent (58.5%) cautions parents not to pamper their children so that they will not become delinquent a; while 50.0% of the respondents advocated good parental supervision as a solution to delinquency.

Conclusion

The study concludes that parental and peer group influences have a lot to do in the delinquent behaviours of juveniles. As shown in the study, divorce; lack of supervision; lack of parental skills; pampering; and rejection were the parental factors mentioned by the respondents as causes of delinquent behaviours in juveniles. The study discovered that associations with peer groups that engage in cult activities, examination malpractices; drug abuse, bullying, stealing and truancy will eventually cause delinquency in juveniles who associate with them. We conclude, therefore, that parental influences and peer group influences are very crucial in causing delinquent behaviours among juveniles. The two sources of delinquent behaviours in juveniles need to be addressed adequately.

Recommendation

In area of recommendation, we advocate for inculcation of societal norms in juveniles. Juveniles should be made to imbibe the norms of our society and that the same is sacrosanct. Drug abuse should be seriously dealt with and its control should be taken so serious by the government. Drastic reduction in drug abuse will reduce the rate of delinquency. Poverty alleviation should be taken very paramount by the government. A family that can feed its members three times a day, clothe its members, educate its members and provide other needs will hardly have delinquent children. Government, therefore, need to tackle poverty. We recommend that parents should take the supervision of their children very crucial. Adequate supervision of children will dissuade such children from becoming wayward. Moreover, parents need to acquire good parental skills in order to parent their children successfully. Many parents have failed in acts and skills of parenting, therefore, pushing their children into deviant behaviours.

The study also recommends discouragement of divorce. Avoidance of divorce by all possible means will prevent broken homes and family disintegration that would tell negatively on the children. Family needs to be held stable and functional. Love, affection and care of the children are also recommended. In a family where these exist, children will feel safe and secured, and prevented from going delinquent. Moreover, parents on the other hand should not pamper their children for it can lead to delinquent behaviours. Children should be well and adequately supervised by their parents. Adequate supervision and monitoring should be considered indispensable by parents to ensure their children conform to the norms of the society. Finally, children should be counselled to avoid bad companies or peer group that may lure them into delinquent behaviours in the society, knowing well that they are the future of our society.

References

- Adegoke, N. (2015). Factors Responsible for Juvenile Delinquency in Nigeria: A Case Study of Selected Primary Schools in Ikorodu Lagos State, Nigeria. *Research on Humanities*
- Ademika, E.E.O and Chukwuma, J.C (2005). Juvenile Justice Administration in Nigeria: Philosophy and Practice. Ikeja, Lagos, CLEEN Publication.
- Agbowuro, Taiwo. O, Umeh, M and Solomon (2016). The Dilemma of Juvenile Delinquency among Government Secondary Schools in Jema's Local Government Area of Kaduna State Nigeria, (4) 91-102.
- Alfrey, C. (2010). Juvenile Delinquency and Family Structure: Implications for Marriage and Relationship Education.
- Alemika, E. and Chukwuma, I. (2001). Juvenile Justice in Nigeria: Philosophy and Practice. Lagos: Centre for Law Enforcement Education.
- Allen M, Donohuc W.A, Griffin A, Ryan and Turner M.M. (2003). Comparing the Influence of Parents and Peers on the Choice to Use Drugs, A Meta-Analytic Retrieved from: <http://www.sagepublications.com/10.1177/0093854802251002>
- Ajake, U. G. Isangedighi A. and Bisong, N. (2008). Parents Child Rearing and Students Dishonest Behaviour in *Medwell Journal of Social Sciences*. 3(7) ISON 1818-6120.
- Apel, R. and Kaukien, C. (2008). On the Relationship between Family Structure and Antisocial Behaviour: Parental Cohabitation and Blended Households *Criminology*, (46) 35-70.
- Azoro, J. (2010). Public Perception of the Effects of Broken Homes on the Family: A Case Study of Awka South L.G.A. (Unpublished B.Sc project, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka) .
- Bartol, C and Bartol, A, (2009). Juvenile Delinquency and Antisocial Behaviour: A Developmental Perspective, 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Personal Prentice Hall.
- Bhatia, A. and Singhai A. (2001) Child Upbringing: Parental Responsibilities Illinois University Press.
- Carr, S. and Sloan, T. (2003). Poverty and Psychology from Global Perspective to Local Practice. New York; Kluwer Academic.
- Carlson, A. (2010). How Parents Influence Deviant Behaviour among Adolescent: An Analysis of their Family, Life, their Community and Their Peers.
- Chaba, D. (2002) Delinquency, Child and the Community London: Constable Press.
- Chukwuezi, C. O. (2009). Poverty and Youth Restiveness in Nigeria Implications for National Development. *Journal of Social Sciences*. 2 (2)..
- Dantiye, S. and Haruna, A. (2004). Hawkins: Child Abuse for Economic Supplement for Parents. Online <http://allafrica.com/stories/200404300408.html>. April 30, 2004.
- Danziger, S. and Haveman, R (2001). Understanding Poverty. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Dogget, A. (2004). Juvenile Delinquency and Family Structure. Retrieved April 20th, 2011 from <http://facstaff.elon.edu/ajoness/Anika'spaper.htm>
- Demuth, S and Brown, S.L. (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.
- Denyanira, Z.M.S. (2005). Levels of Academic Achievement and Further Delinquency Among Detain Youth.
- Effiom, J.N, Archibong, E.P, and Ojua, T.A (2014). An Assessment of the Impact of Poverty on Criminal Behaviour among Youths: A Case of AKPABUYO Local Government Area, Nigeria. *Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(2): 24- 31.
- Ekpenyoung, N.S, Raimi, I and, Ekpenyoung, A.S. (2012). Urban Poverty and Juvenile Delinquency in Nigeria: Through the Tens of Port Harcourt Rehome Inmates. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences* 2(8): 2222- 2863.
- Ekpo, T. and Ajaku, U (2013). Family Socio-Economic Status and Delinquency among Senior Secondary School Students in Calabar South, Cross River State, Nigeria. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research* 3(4): April, 2013.
- Eshiet. P. G. (2002). Socio Economic Determinant of Students Career Preference in Calabar South, Cross River State, Nigeria. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research* 3(4)
- Esiri, O (2016). The Influence of Peer Pressure on Criminal Behaviour, *Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 21: 08-14.

- Giddens, Anthony (2006). *Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fourchard, L. (2006). The Making of the Juvenile Delinquent in Nigeria and South Africa, *The Journal of African History*, 43(3): 115-137.
- Fry, J. (2010). Change in Family Structure and Rates of Violent Juvenile Delinquency. Retrieved on 20th April 2011 from <http://www.scholar.librt.edu/theses/jf-fry2010.pdf>.
- Hagan, and Holly F. (2001). Youth Violence and the End of Adolescence, *American Sociological Review*, 66:874-899.
- Haralambos, M and Holborn, M (2000). *Sociology: Themes and Perspectives*. London. Harper Collins Publishers Limited.
- Kimani, A.(2010). Influence of Family Structure on Juvenile Delinquency in Nakuru Children's Remand Home. Retrieved on April 20th, 2011. From [http:// www.freeonlinepaper.com/family- structure- pdf](http://www.freeonlinepaper.com/family-structure-pdf).
- Leiber, M.J., Mack, K.Y, and Featherstone, R.A.(2009). Family Structure, Family Processes, Economic Factors and Delinquency, *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 7(2): 79-99.
- Ludwig J, Duncan GJ, Hirschfield P (2000) .Urban Poverty and Juvenile crime: Evidence from a Randomised housing-mobility experiment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 116:655 – 680
- Matherner and Adrian S. (2001). Family Environment as a Predictor of Adolescent Delinquency, *Adolescence*, 36:655 -65.
- Maseko, J.S.(2009). Socialisation of Children and Youth: Role of the Home and the School Uir.Unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/2134/02 Chapter 2.pdf
- Merton, R. K. (1938). Social Structure and Anomie. *American Sociological Review*, 54: 597- 611.
- Moffitt (2006). 'Life Course Persistent Versus Adolescent Limited Antisocial Behaviour'. In Cicchetti, D.; Cohen, D. *Developmental Psychopathy* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Muhammed, A., Salawu, B., Adekeye, D, Ayinla, S. and Adeoye, M. (2009). The Nexus between Family Instability and Youth Crime: Evidence from Nigeria. *International Journal of Human Development and Information System*, 2(2): 41-53.
- Muchlenberg, B. (2002) .The Case of Two-Parents Family Part.” *National Observer*.53:49-53.
- Mullens, A. (2004). The Relationship between Juvenile Delinquency and Family Unit Structure. Retrieved from [http:// www. Marshal. Edu/etd / Mullens- angela-2004. M.A. PDF](http://www.Marshal.Edu/etd/Mullens-angela-2004.M.A.PDF).
- Nsofor, J.U. (2013). Causes and Effects of Campus Cults on Nigerian Educational system, In *Journal of the Nigerian Sociological Society* 2(1 and 2): 139-142.
- Odebunmi, A. (2007). *Parenting: A Cross Sectional and Psychological Approach*. Abuja: Afabunmi Nigeria Limited.
- Ogbebor G. G (2012). Youth Violence in Contemporary Nigerian Society: A Psychological Approach In *Journal of the Nigerian Sociological Society*. 2(1): 53-59.
- Okorodudu, G. (2010). Influence of Parenting styles on Adult delinquency in Delta Central Senatorial District. *Edo Journal of Counselling*, 3(1): 58-86.
- Olotuah, A.O and Adesiji, O.S (2009) *Housing Poverty, Slum Formation and Deviant Behaviour*. Akure: Federal University of Technology Press.
- Ojo, M.O.D. (2012). A Sociological Review of Issues on Juvenile Delinquency. *The Journal of International Social Research* Volume: 5(21): 465-482.
- Omoboto, J., Ondiek, G, G., Odera, O., Ayugi, M. (2013) Factors Influencing Youth Crime and Juvenile Delinquency. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 1 (2): 2307-227.
- Oruh, N. (2004): The Nigerian Youths and the Survival Game <http://www.nigeraninamerica.com/articles/536/1/the-Nigerian-youth>. Retrieved October 27, 2014
- Prior, D. and Paris A. (2005) *Preventing Children's Involvement in Crime and Antisocial Behaviour: A literature Review* A Paper produced for the National Evaluation of the Children's fund institute of Applied Social Studies University of Birmingham.
- Regoli, R.M and John D.H (2006). *Delinquency in society- A child Centred Approach*. New York: McGraw.
- Ryan, T. (2002). Parental Involvement. In Leisa Abram's online research Portfolio. Retrieved

- 5th May. 2004. [Http://www.towson.edu/Ryan/2002/](http://www.towson.edu/Ryan/2002/)
- Sanni, K., Udoh, N., Okediji, A., Modo, F., and Ezeh, N (2010). Family Types and Juvenile Delinquency Issues among Secondary School Students in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria: Counselling implications. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 23 (1): 21.
- Sheryln, T. (2008). The Effects of Family on Juvenile Delinquency. Retrieved On April 20th, 2011 from [Http:// www. Marshal uniedu/essay/htm](http://www.Marshalluniedu/essay/htm). PDF.
- Uwaoma, C. and Udeagha, C. (2007). Issues in Substance use and Abuse in Nigeria. Owerri: Bill Fred (Nig) Ltd.
- Ugwuoke, C.U and Duruji, O.U.(2015). Family Instability and Juvenile Delinquency in Nigeria: A study of Owerri Municipality, *Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 20(1): 40-45.
- Urdang, E. (2012) *Human Behaviour in the Social Environment*: New York: The Haworth Social Work Practice Press.
- 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.
- Yosi, A. (2015) The Implications of Juvenile Delinquency on Guidance and Counselling: A Study of Some Selected Secondary Schools in Jema Local Government Area of Kaduna State Nigeria. A Bachelor of Education Project submitted to the Faculty of Education, University of Jos.