

**OPINION SURVEY ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN
KETU – ADIE OWE COMMUNITY IN OGUN STATE**

AKINLOTAN, RAYMOND ADENIYI

**Department of Sociology
Crawford University
Igbesa, Ogun State.**

&

OJO, MATTHIAS OLUFEMI DADA (Ph.D)

**Department of Sociology
Crawford University, Igbesa, Ogun State.**

[E-mail:femfemty@gmail.com](mailto:femfemty@gmail.com)

Phone: 07037951643

&

ABISOYE, AMOS OLUTUNDE (Ph.D)

**Department of Sociology
Crawford University
Igbesa, Ogun State.**

E-mail – tunabisoye@yahoo.com

Phone: 08029296946

&

AINA, OLUWASOLA ABIODUN

**General Studies Unit
Crawford University
Igbesa, Ogun State**

E-mail- solar_ai2003@yahoo.co.uk

Phone: 08034249183

&

EDEGBAI, MARTHA ABUA

**Department of Sociology
Crawford University
Igbesa, Ogun State**

Abstract

Socio – economic factors play prominent roles in determining the behaviours of children in the society. This study, therefore, investigated the opinions of Ketu – Adie – Owe community in Ado – Odo / Ota Local government of Ogun State, on the socio – economic factors that cause juvenile delinquency. The study adopted descriptive survey design. Data were collected through quantitative method. This involved seventy – three copies of questionnaire administered among community residents conveniently sampled for the study. Quantitative data were analysed using table of frequency and percentage distributions. Fifty – nine percent of the respondents were female; 49.3% of them were married and 39.7% of them had family size of 2 to 3 persons. The analyses in the study show that 97.2% of the respondents affirmed poverty as a cause of delinquency; 89.0% of them opined broken homes, 83.3% concurred on low family income as a cause, 84.5% of the respondents signified lack of parental control as a cause of delinquent behaviours; 82.2% affirmed that delinquency in juveniles is caused by pressure from bad peer groups and 77.8% of the respondents affirmed lack of moral / religious instructions from parents as a factor leading children to delinquent behaviour. The study recommends speedy economy recovery; discouragement of broken homes;

adequate parental control and sound moral / religious instructions to children as panaceas to the problem of juvenile delinquency in our society.

Keywords: Children; juveniles; delinquency; parents and deviant behaviours.

Introduction

Juvenile delinquency is a criminal or deviant act committed by children under the age of 18 years in Nigeria. It is not limited to any particular society or country. It is a global responsibility. However, the age of responsibility that individuals may be held responsible for their behaviours varies from country to country.

Differences in culture, family norms, relationships among members of a family and their values may drive different types of behavior. In Nigeria society, delinquency is attributed to the following: separated families where teenagers reside with single fathers (Adegoke, 2015); inadequate parental involvement in the teenagers' life (Dantiye and Haruna, 2004); poor housing, feeding and inability to shoulder financial burden (Dunapo, 2002) and forceful push out of home to seek for family needs (Dantiye and Haruna, 2004).

Troublesome and delinquent children are more likely to come from troubled families and neighbourhoods. Regoli and John (2006) argued that many of the studies that have been made to determine the causes of Juvenile delinquency focused mainly on family relationships. Comparing delinquent youth and non – delinquent youth showed that over ninety percent of the delinquent had unhappy homes and felt discontented with life circumstances (Regolis and John, 2006).

This study postulated some socio – economic factors that may possibly lead to juvenile delinquency and requested the respondents who participated in the study to give their opinions on whether they actually caused delinquency or otherwise.

The study posed the following research question:

What are the opinions of the respondents on socio – economic factors that contributed to delinquent behaviours among school teenagers in Ketu – Adie Owe Community in Ado – Odo Local Government?

The objective of the study was to examine the opinions of the respondents who participated in the study on socio – economic factors that contributed to delinquency behaviours among school teenagers in Ketu – Adie Owe Community in Ado – Odo Local Government.

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.

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

Juvenile delinquency is increasing in 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 the 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 Foster, 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 Foster, 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 Bartol, 2009). In other words, when the parent does not have time for the Juvenile they tend to commit 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 that the child learns behaviour and they spend less time under direct supervision with 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 acts are juveniles 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 and 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 (Muehlenbarg, 2002). The lack of supervision and the absence of those relationships between the juveniles are important factors that influence delinquency. When the juveniles lack supervision they do whatever they feel is right by following their peers who commit criminal acts. Social learning theory argues that aggressive behaviour is learned as parents or peers display aggressive behaviour (Matherme and Adrian, 2001).

Ojo (2012) lists broken homes and low education attainment as some of the causes of delinquency, which was revealed at Youth imprisoned at Kamiti Youth corrective Training centre since most of the boys were dysfunctional families. Some boys had been orphans without guardians before their arrests, others had single or divorced parents, and some had parents in 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 unconnected 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's parents of the lower socio-economic status do not have enough income to further the juvenile school necessities. These have 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 high level 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 very high. 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 exist between respondents from autocratically reared subjects are more vulnerable to delinquency. Again, a significant

difference exists between subjects 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, in families that show love and care to their children, the children are less likely to be as delinquent as 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 bracket 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. Rayan (2002) noted that parents who are less educated have been more passively involved in the management and upbringing of their juveniles, do not seem to give them the desired respect since they are more likely to guide them academically, Rayan (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 to be 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 (Sheryln, 2008). Anti -social behaviours of juvenile have cause 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 News at that 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 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 has been attributed 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 has an imbalance 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 acts 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 the 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 returns 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 relationship 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 juveniles engage 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, but 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 that adolescents have with parents. (Leiber, Mack 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 associating with deviant peers, which is predictive of higher levels of deviant acts (Okorodudu, 2010). 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 has an imbalance, 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 (Odeunmi, 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 (Sheryl, 2008).

Adolescents of all ages are living in 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 difficulty 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: absence 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 which are drab districts with bad housing. They are often overcrowded and deficient in recreational facilities. 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 they 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 offences. 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 levels 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 collectivises 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 *et.al.*, 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). Ogbebor, (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, and 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 (Deyanira, 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; for 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 to 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 above table 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 (%)
valid	18-25	17	23.3
	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 ages of 18-25 years; 34.2% of them were within the ages 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 (%)
valid	Single	10	13.7
	Married	36	49.3
	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 with dedication. The attempt to deviate from this will encourage the problem of delinquency. Juvenile who engaged in criminal behaviour 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 as more appalling (Muchlenbarg, 2012).

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY RELIGION

Table 4: Respondents distribution on religion

Religion	Frequency	Percent (%)
Christian	36	49.3
Valid Muslim	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 than any other offer religious adherents participated in the study. Religious families in most cases do not have problem with their children's behaviours because of religious and moral instructions such families 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

Educational Qualification	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 School 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 establishments.

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.

Socio-economic factors that generate delinquency

Below is the table of analysis of the socio- economic factors that generate delinquency

Table: 8 Socio-Economic factors that generate delinquency

Respondent Opinions	Socio-Economic factors: respondent views (%)					
	Poverty	Broken Home	Family Income	No Parental Control	Peer pressure	No Moral Instructions
SA	45.2	42.5	35.6	33.8	41.1	25.0
A	43.8	24.7	27.4	26.8	24.7	26.4
SH	8.2	21.8	20.5	23.9	16.4	26.4
D	1.4	11.0	16.5	9.9	9.6	15.3
SD	1.4	0	0	5.6	8.2	6.9
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Researchers Analysis, 2017

The table above shows the analyses of the opinions of respondents to some socio – economic factors that may cause juvenile delinquency. Five different factors were presented in the study: poverty, broken homes family income, lack of parental control, peer group pressure and lack of moral instructions. The responses were measure on five Linkert scale: SA = Strongly agree; A = Agree; SH = Somehow agree; D = Disagree and SD = Strongly disagree.

The analyses from table 8 above show that 45.2% of the respondents strongly agreed that poverty can lead to juvenile delinquency; 43.8% of the respondents agreed with the same opinion and 8.2% of them agreed with the same, somehow. The large number of the respondents, who agreed one way or the other, clearly shows that poverty can cause juvenile delinquency. Poor economy of the country in form of unprecedented inflation has alarming influence on families, resulting in breakdown of social bonds in the family (Ekpo and Ajake, 2013). This breakdown consequently leads to high rate of juvenile delinquency in the society.

Broken home constituted another factor, the analyses of the responses show that 42.5% of the respondents strongly agreed that the broken home is a factor to be considered as one that causes juvenile delinquency. Similarly, 24.7% of the respondents also agreed; while 21.8% somehow agreed. The total analyses show that large number of the respondents were of the opinion that broken home will cause juvenile delinquency. Muhammed, Salawu, Adekeye, Ayinla and Adeoye (2009) observed that family instability i.e broken home has been mostly associated with juvenile delinquency. Ugwuoke and Duruji (2015) share similar opinion on this.

Family income was another determining factor. The analyses from above table show that 35.6% of the respondents strongly agreed that family income has a lot of impact on the delinquent behaviours of children. Furthermore, 27.4% of the respondents also agreed; while 20.5% of them somehow agreed. Majority of the respondents, in summary, were of the view that income of the family has impact on the delinquent behaviours of children.

Families who have sufficient income to take care of their children may not experience juvenile delinquency, unlike low income families. The low income families may not be economically capable to meet the needs of their children and this may lead to waywardness of such children. This is in consonant with the argument of Ajake, Isangedighi and Bisong (2008) that children’s life style is a function of family socio- economic status.

Lack of parental control was another factor. The analyses show that 33.8% of the respondents strongly opined that lack of parental control will lead to juvenile delinquency; 26.8% of the respondents also agreed with the same and 23.9% somehow agreed.

Parental control is a strong factor to consider in issue of juvenile delinquency. Children who enjoy good parental control are hardly involved in delinquent behavior. Ugwuoke and Duruji (2015) cited parental control and ineffective parental behavior as cogent factors in delinquent behaviours of children. Moreover, Okorodudu (2010) opined that lack of parental monitoring contributes not only to children's anti- social behaviours, but in the same way expose them to association with deviant peers.

Pressure from peer group was another factor considered in the study. The analyses show that 41.1% of the respondents were of the opinion that pressure from delinquent peer group does influence other juveniles. The analyses also show that 24.7% of them agreed with the same; while 16.4% somehow agreed. Studies have shown that teenagers get into crime due to peer pressure and association Maseko (2009); Nsofor (2013) and Esiri (2016).

Finally, the study examined lack of moral instructions. From the analyses, 25.0% of the respondents strongly agreed that lack of moral instruction will endanger the good behaviours of the juvenile. The analyses show that 26.4% of the respondents agreed with the same opinion and another 26.4% also somehow agreed. A very large number, we can conclude, opined that lack of moral instructions (which also include religious instructions) will cause juvenile delinquency in children.

Summary of the findings

The opinions of the respondents on the socio-economic factors responsible for juvenile delinquency are summarized here.

The analyses from the study showed that a total of 97.2% of the respondents opined that poverty is a strong factor which causes juvenile delinquency. Ekpenyoung, Raimi and Ekpenyoung (2012) argued that one of the impacts of urban poverty is juvenile delinquency and this, according to them have negative effect on a society's quality of life through imposition of additional social costs. Olotuah and Adesiji (2009) observed that poor housing tends to generate slum which in turn provide catalyst for deviant behaviour among juvenile in urban areas. Hence, poverty plays critical role in causing juvenile delinquency.

Broken home also plays important role in juvenile delinquency. A total of 89.0% of the respondents affirmed that broken homes do cause juvenile delinquency. Muhammed, Salawu, Adekeye, Ayinla and Adeoye (2009) observed that juvenile is rooted in the type of home the juvenile is brought up and that family instability or break up increases the tendency of youth misbehaviour. Ugwuoke and Duruji (2015) argued in a similar way that broken homes are associated with juvenile delinquency.

Family income also plays significant role in escalating juvenile delinquency. Family income determines the extent which family takes care of its members, especially, the young ones in the family.

The analyses from the study show that a total of 83.3% of the respondents concurred that family income has a very significant role to play in juvenile delinquency. The unprecedented inflation has reduced the income of many families and in most cases juvenile's parents do not have enough income to take good care of their children's necessities. Juveniles from high income families are provided with quality private education from nursery up to university level. Hence, such juveniles are likely to be less delinquent than juveniles from lower socio economic background (Eshiet, 2002).

Parental control also came up as another factor. Lack of parental control usually exposes juveniles to delinquent behaviours. A total of 84.5% of the respondents affirmed that lack or poor parental control endangers the upbringing of juveniles and exposes them to delinquent behaviours. Lack of parental control or monitoring has a lot impact on the delinquent behaviours of children (Okorodudu, 2010). The children from single parents tend to receive lower levels of supervision and therefore likely to be delinquent (Sanni, Udoh, Okediji, Modo and Ezech 2010).

Pressure from peer groups is another factor to be considered. A total percentage of 82.2% of the respondents affirmed it as a factor to reckon with in juvenile delinquency. Maseko (2009) argued that some teenagers get into crime due to pressure from peer groups. Such groups have a stronger control over an individual's actions and behaviours (Allen [et.al](#), 2003). Hence, pressure from peer groups may constrain juveniles into delinquent behaviours.

Finally, lack of moral instructions is another factor. A total percentage of 77.8% of the respondents opined that lack of moral instructions from parents to children will cause delinquent behaviours in children. Moral instructions and religious instructions are very crucial for successful upbringing of children. Lack of moral and religious values may end up making children wayward. The moral values and religious values are very important for child rearing. The moral values of the society and the religious values will prevent delinquent behaviours in children. The fear for the society values and the fear of God will definitely neutralize variables that may cause delinquent behaviours in children.

Conclusion

We conclude from the opinions of the respondents that poverty; broken homes; family income; lack of parental control; peer group pressure and lack of moral instructions play and are still playing negative impact on the behaviours of juveniles in our society. Poverty debars parents from giving the best to their children, likewise is the low family income. When children are not cared for, the family is already showing them the way to delinquent behaviours.

Broken homes and lack of parental control also play roles. Poverty may lead to broken homes and cause the parents to lose control over their children's behaviours. Hence, broken homes and lack of parental control are often the architects of poverty and low family income. Low income and poverty may cause divorce and separation (broken homes) and lack of parental control i.e. when parents are unable to provide for children such parents will lose their worthy and dignities before such children. Hence, the child rebels and parental control is eventually lost.

Finally, we conclude that pressure from peer group and lack of moral instructions from parents still remains powerful causes of delinquent in children. Children from poor family can be easily influenced to take part in delinquent behaviours and children who lack moral values and religious values can be easily lured. Hence, both pressure from peer groups and lack of moral instructions are very crucial factors in delinquent behaviours.

Recommendation

Based on our findings from the opinion survey, we offer the following recommendation:

In the first place, government needs to speed up the rate of economy recovery to alleviate poverty in the country. The alleviation of poverty will increase the total income and disposable incomes of the family. Hence, the families will be able to meet the needs of their members especially, the children.

Secondly, broken homes should be discouraged. Divorce and separation in the family should be addressed. Families facing challenge of instability in marriage should be assisted by the government and non – governmental organizations that can render guidance and counselling in areas of marriage and family.

Thirdly, parents are encouraged not to lose grip of their control over their children's anti-social behaviours. Children should not be left alone to choose any behaviour they like because such may be inappropriate. Parents should not overlook their children's anti – social behaviours. Such behaviours should be corrected immediately.

Another recommendation is in the area of moral instructions. Parents should not take, with levity, moral and religious instructions to their children. When moral values and religious values are imbibed in children, they are prevented from acting delinquently because such will guide their behaviours.

Finally, parents should endeavour to monitor and control the peer groups their children associate with. It will go a long way in discouraging them from moving with bad eggs among children.

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 and Social Sciences*: 5 (5): 78-84.
- Alemika, 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, Samuel (2016) The Dilemma of Juvenile Delinquency among Government Secondary Schools in Jema's Local Government Area of Kaduna State Nigeria. *International Journal of Academic Research in Educational Review*, 4 (3) 96-102.
- Alfrey, C. (2010) Juvenile Delinquency and Family Structure: Implications for Marriage and Relationship Education. Retrieved from www.healthymarriageinfo.org on 4/4/2017
- Alemika, E. and Chukwuma, I. (2001). Juvenile Justice in Nigeria: Philosophy and Practice. Lagos: Centre for Law Enforcement Education.
- Allen M, Donohue 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 www.sagepublications.com on 4/4/2017
- Ajake, U. G. Isangedighi A. and Bisong, N. (2008) Parents' Childrearing and Students' Dishonest Behaviour. *Medwell Journal of Social Sciences*. 3(7):
- 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, Nigeria .
- Bartol, C and Bartol, A, (2009) Juvenile Delinquency and Antisocial Behaviour: A Developmental Perspective, 3rd ed. NJ: Upper Saddle River, Personal Prentice Hall.
- Bhatia, A.and Shangai I. (2001) Child Upbringing: Parental Responsibilities. Illinois: 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. Retrieved from www.cola.unh.edu
- 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) Hawking: *Child Abuse for Economic Supplement for Parents*. Retrieved from <http://allafrica.com/stories/> on 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 from <http://facstaff.elon.edu/ajoness/Anika'spaper.htm> on April 20th, 2011
- 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.
- Deyanira, Z.M.S. (2005) Levels of Academic Achievement and Further Delinquency among Detain Youth. Retrieved from www.swacj.org/swjci on 4/4/2017
- Dunapo, S. O. (2002). Causative and Sustaining Factors to Street Hawking in Nigeria: Implications to Child Development in R.U. Okonkwo and R. O. Okoye (eds). *Learning Environment of the Nigerian Child*. Awka: Education Publishers.
- 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 Akropabuyo 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 Lens of Port Harcourt Remind Home Inmates. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(8): 2222- 2863.
- Ekpo, T. and Ajake, 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): 83-88.

- 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):159-167.
- Esiri, O (2016) The Influence of Peer Pressure on Criminal Behaviour. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science* (21): 8-14.
- 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 from <http://www.scholar.librt.edu/theses/jf-fry2010.pdf>. on 20th April 2011
- Hagan, and Foster, H. (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.freeonlineresearchpapers.com/ family-structure- pdf](http://www.freeonlineresearchpapers.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
- Matherne 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
- 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](http://www.Marshall.Edu/etd/Mullens-angela-2004.M.A). PDF on 4/4/2017.
- Nsofor, J.U. (2013) Causes and Effects of Campus Cults on Nigerian Educational System. *Journal of the Nigerian Sociological Society*, 2 (1 and 2): 39-142.
- 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. *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* 5(21): 465-482.
- Omoboto, J., Ondiek, G, G., Odera, O., Agusi, 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. Retrieved from [www.nigeraninamerica.com/articles/536/1/the-](http://www.nigeraninamerica.com/articles/536/1/the-Nigerian-youth.on) Nigerian youth.on October 27, 201
- Prior, D. and Paris A. (2005) *Preventing Children's Involvement in Crime and Antisocial Behaviour: A Literature Review*. 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. Leisa Abram's online Research Portfolio. Retrieved from [. Http://www.towson.edu/Ryan/2002/5th may. 2004](http://www.towson.edu/Ryan/2002/5th_may.2004)

- Sanni, K., Udoh, N., Okediji, A., Modo, F. and Ezech, 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 from www.marshaluniedu/essay/htm. PDF On April 20th, 2011
- 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's Local Government area of Kaduna State Nigeria (B.ED project). University of Jos, Nigeria.