

# Juvenile Delinquency and Family Environment In Jordan

Faisal I.M. AL-Matalka

Assistant Prof. Department of Social Sciences, Ajloun University College. Al- Balqa  
Applied University

Mohammad M. Hussainat

Associate Prof. Department of social sciences, Ajloun University College. Al- Balqa  
Applied University

Accepted: November 02, 2012    Published: December 21, 2012

Doi:10.5296/jsr.v3i2.2750

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/jsr.v3i2.2750>

## Abstract

The present study aimed to examine some family environmental factors that influence delinquency in adolescents. The semi- structured type of interview schedule was used. The total sample of the present study was 300 in number divided in to two group; The first one is 150 male delinquent adolescents were selected. The second group is 150 non – delinquents. Their age - ranging from 12-17 years. The frequency table, percentage and chi -square ( $X^2$ ) were derived and utilized in statistical analysis to assess differences between the two groups of delinquents and non - delinquents on different family environmental variables . The findings indicate that environmental variables like size of the family , economic deprivation , parental deprivation , family discipline , inter parental relationship , child – parent relationship and parental acceptance – rejection play an important and effective role in the developmental growth of personality as well as social behavior of the delinquents . we suggest that family counseling will be an effective way to guide the public to the important of healthy family environment. Also further studies are suggested to have deep analysis for the affect of family environment on causing juvenile delinquency.

**Keywords:** Juvenile Delinquency, Family Environment Jordan.

## Introduction

The problem of juvenile delinquency and the crime they commit is consider to be the most important and complicated social problems that faces developed as well as underdeveloped countries, because it put the life of the generation in danger. In Jordan despite the social awareness, juvenile delinquency is on rise and becoming a serious problem facing the society and the problem is being widely discussed. However the discussions concentrate on the fact itself and less discussions given to the factors that determine the situation. The problem has

received some good attention so far. To have better understanding to the problem of juvenile delinquency in Jordan it is important to know the family environment and factors that determine juvenile Delinquency.

The family is considered to be the first and most essential unit of social organization. It is the first institution of children's socialization and it is considered to be the most influential environmental determining the formation of personality development of the child. Family influence delinquency through child rearing and parent-child interaction (Stormshak, et al, 2000). Family structure was one of the most controversial factors that was singled out for analysis and reanalysis of delinquency literature (cao, and zhao, 2004). Relationships between child delinquency and family environment have been empirically investigated. These researches laid much emphasis on the influential role of family functioning in determining child behavior ( Nye , 1958 , Shaw & Mckay , 1932 ; Peterson & zill , 1986; Bryant & Wells , 1973;Lennard&Bernstein,1967;McCord,1982;Hirsch,1995;Amato,2000).

Studies and investigations has also shown that the family environment is an important and influential factors in the development of child delinquency ( Cashwell & Vacc , 1996 ; Wright & Wright 1994 ; Shields & Clark , 1995 ; Matherne & Thomas 2001 ; Hagan & Foster , 2001 ; Mack et al , 2007 ; Eitle , 2006 ) .

Contemporary Social control theories ( Hirschi , 1969 ; Nye , 1958 ) , personality theories (Sears, et al, 1957 ; Peterson , et al , 1959 , Bryant & Wells,1973;Lennard&Bernstein , 1969 ) , Social disorganization theories ( Shaw & Mckay ,1932 ; Sampson , 1993 ) have devoted great deal of attention to the family as major factor in the explanation of delinquent behavior as well as the influence of the role of family functioning in encouraging conformity & disconformities of delinquents .

The Majority of the studies carried out concerning the relationship between the family and child delinquency have reported the effect of family factors. Family variables have been investigated so that to have better understanding to the phenomenon of Juvenile delinquency. Kierkus &Hewitt ( 2009 ) study on the contextual nature of family structure \ delinquency relationship , found that there is significant interaction , in respect to age and family size ,also living in a nontraditional family is more criminogenic for older adolescents , and for those from larger families . Single - parent family was considering as a main element in causing delinquency among children.( Hirschi , 1995 , Rankin & Kern , 1994; Nye , 1958; some other studies found poor single parent were more criminogenic .(Goldstein , 1984 ; Rosen , 1985; Bachman & Peralta , 2002 ) .

Eitle ( 2006 ) investigated parental gender , single - parent families ,results shows that living with a single fathers may be at an increased risk of being involved in diligent behavior . Rosenbaum, (1989) in a study of family dysfunction and delinquency found that young children who have strong bond with their parents are less likely to be involved in deviant act. Matalka (1994a) in his study of juvenile delinquency in Jordan found that children who live with single parents home and who belonged to a large family and those who have weak bond

with their parents are more likely to be delinquents. Flannery, et al.(1999) studies on delinquent behavior, found that young adolescents who live without parental supervision are more likely to involve in delinquent behavior. Matalaka ( 1994, b,c ) found that parental hostility , rejection , inconsistency and bad relation between father and Mother and between one parent and the child , all contribute to juvenile delinquency.

Empirical researches reported a significant impact of family disruptions and juvenile delinquency,( wells and Rankin's (1991) ; Matalaka, (1994a); Matsueda and Heimer (1987) in their studies found that children's belong to broken homes and single - parent homes has a consistent and reliable association with deviant act . Other studies which carried and researching the interaction between age and family structure has reported that disruptions that take place early in the life of adolescent tended to be more deviant than those which occurred later in life ( JubY and Farrington (2001);Wadsworth (1976).

Other studies demonstrated that strong attachment to two parents had a more significant inhibiting effect against delinquency than attachment to one parent, also these studies showed that what important in determining delinquent behavior was the quality of the parent-child relationship (Demuth & Brown (2004); Hirschi (1969) Cernkovich & Giordano (1987); Rankin & kern (1994);Briar and Piliavin (1965).

Mack, et al, (2007) examining non serious and serious delinquent behavior across youth from different type of households, using data from the add health study, the results shows that type of household was not a significant predictor of non serious or serious delinquency. The results also showed that, maternal attachment emerged as the most important determination of delinquent behavior among youth from all family type. Negative relationship with parents where the adolescents feel used for the selfish needs or ambitions by their parents may lead to retaliation through delinquency (Elkind1967).

Gorman&Tolan (1998) in their study on "Relation of family problems to patterns of delinquent involvement among urban youth, found conflict and aggressive among parents and towards children's predicted violent offending. They also found that harsh parental discipline and family conflict have been among the most consistently linked. Gorman, et al (2001) in another study found that children resort to violence when there is violence within relationship between them and their parents.

Klein and Forehand (1997) in their study, family life, delinquency and crime mention that, to predicting juvenile delinquency in early childhood one should know the type of maternal parenting skills that are used with adolescent during early childhood. Justin, et al (2011) in their study of harsh and permissive discipline with child disruptive behaviors, found that higher levels of harsh discipline were related to more intense disruptive behavior of both boys and girls, finding also revealed that higher level of permissive discipline were related to more intense disruptive behavior of only boys. Results also show that harsh and permissive discipline did not interact to predict child disruptive behavior problems. (Dove, 2001) stated

that parents are responsible for children being out of home , and conflict among family members, poor parenting , and parental behavior such as criminal activity increase adolescents delinquent behaviors .

Studies on family structure and age interaction with delinquency have shown that family structure effect the attachment between the child and his parents and relationship with deviant peers and also shown that the important of these factors change according to the age where it bad influence on the delinquents come more when it occurs is an early childhood (Kierkus&Bear, 2002; Rebellon, 2002).

## ***Method***

### **The sample**

The present study was confined to family environment and juvenile delinquency in Jordan. The sampling design is based on purposive convenient method. The total sample of the present study was 300 in number divided in to two group; The first one is 150 male delinquent adolescents who were found in the only three reformative institution in Jordan, (i.e. in Irbid, Zarqa and Ma'an) were selected. Their age - ranging from 12-17 years. The second group is 150 non - delinquents who are normal adolescents and school student within the same age -range and were drawn from schools scattered in the three regions in Jordan that is the northern, the middle and the southern regions in Jordan. The normal adolescent who were found with a record of deviant behavior were expted from the sample with the help of interview - schedule. Both groups were matched on age, sex, education, socio - economic status and residence.

### **Tools Of Data Collection**

In this study the personal interview technique was opted for data collection. The semi-structured type of interview schedule was used in which the nature of the question were standardized, definite as well as concrete , and open and closed questions were framed which helped the researcher in going deeper in to the psyche of the respondents and to secure their opinion . The closed included both fixed alternative question and multiple choice questions.

Analysis of data: The interview schedule was administered individually at first. After collecting the data from the respondents, the entire data base was processed by the researcher himself. After the data was systematized, classified and tabulated, the researcher proceeded to analyze and interpret it. The present study reports about the interview - schedule. The frequency table, percentage and chi -square ( $X^2$ ) were derived and utilized in statistical analysis to assess differences between the two groups of delinquents and non - delinquents on different family environmental variables .

## Results and Discussion

The family is considered as one of the most important environmental factor that influences the personality development of the child. Families of delinquents, regardless of Scio-economic status, usually have certain characteristics that are different from those families of non-delinquents. They generally have disruptive home with great deal of tension and rejection, and infected method of parental control and parental emotional instability (Matalka, 2009).

The present study deal with some environmental family factors which tend to be dysfunctioning and lead adolescents to delinquency. The most influential factors related to family and it's interaction to delinquency have been studied. The results of present study have been presented in table 1 -9. Chi- square ( $X^2$ ) has been worked out so that to show the differences between delinquent and non-delinquent adolescents.

### AGE

The age is explicitly stated in table 1. Three age categories have been considered as an important variable. Groups commence from those who are 9-11 years, 12-14, and 15 - 17 years .

Table 1: Age Distribution of the Respondents.

Age group	Delinquent		Non _ delinquent	
	f	%	f	%
9-11	25	16,66	30	20
12-14	40	26,66	38	25,33
15-17	85	56,66	82	54,66
Total	150	100	150	100

$X^2 = 0.560$ ;  $df = 2$ ; P-Value = 0.756;  $P > 0.01$ ; Not significant)(

Table (1) reveals that the majority of delinquents (56, 66 %)of the delinquent and (54, 66 %) of the non –delinquents are in the age group of 15-17 years, followed by (26,66%) of the delinquents and (25,33 % ) of the non-delinquents belongs to the age group 12-14 years . A similar studies on juvenile delinquents in Jordan has been carried out by Rebeihat (1987) showed that (87,4%) of delinquents are in the age group of 16-18 years . Another studies carried by Matalka (1994a, 2009) reveals that 73, 52% of the delinquents are in the age group 15-17 years. Wilson (1987) study showed that the peak years of offences are in the age group 15-16 years. Table (1) reveals that there was no significant differences between delinquents and non-delinquents, ( $X^2 = 0.560$ ;  $df = 2$ ; P-Value = 0.756;  $P > 0.01$ ; Not significant).

**Table 2 : Birth order of the Respondents.**

Birth order	Delinquents		Non-delinquents	
	f	%	f	%
First child	56	37,33	25	16,66
Second child	44	29,33	33	22
In the middle	38	25,33	47	31,33
Last child	12	8	45	30
The only child	--		--	
Total	150	100	150	100

$X^2 = 33.494$ ;  $df = 3$  ; P-Value = 0.000; p-value<0.01 so it is significant)

### Birth order

Table 2 present the birth order for the delinquents and non – delinquents. It shows that majority of the delinquents 37,33% revealed that they are the first child in the family followed by 29,33% spoke about being the second child in the family . Where as it is clear from the table the majority of the non–delinquents (31, 33 %) revealed that they were in the middle in birth order, followed by 30% said that they were the last child in birth order in the family. As it is clear from the table it is noticeable that most of the delinquents were placed in first and second order in the family which gives us an idea that these children took up responsibility at an early stage of their life but could not cope with this responsibilities and have been driven to the local market where they got the chance to involve in deviant activity .Similar results were observed by other studies carried out by (wadsworth, 1976& Murrell, 1974). Based on this table we observe that, there is significant differences between the two groups regarding birth order in the family ( $x^2=33,494$ ;  $df=3$ ;  $p<0.01$ ).

**Table 3 : Size of the Respondent's family**

Family size	Delinquents		Non-delinquents	
	f	%	f	%
1-4	12	8	123	82
5-8	53	35,33	18	12
9-12	76	50,66	9	6
13 and more	9	6	-	-
Total	150	100	150	100

( $X^2 = 170.332$ ;  $df = 3$ ; P-Value = 0.000; p-value<0.01 so it is significant).

## Family size

Family size by no means is a simple factor however, and may be related more closely to other facts than to delinquency. A large family effects the economic condition at home. The size of the family seems to effect the family income and also to contribute to delinquency; that is delinquents come mostly from large families (Matalaka, 2009). The results of this study as stated in table 3 Shows that majority of the delinquents 50,66% belong to large families which consist of 9-12 persons , followed by 35,33% their families size is 5-8 persons . Where as it is clear from table 3 we found that most of the non-delinquents 82% are belonging to families that consist of 1-4 persons. The differences between delinquents and non- delinquents was found significant at0 .01 level, ( $X^2 = 170.332$ ;  $df = 3$ ;  $P\text{-Value} = 0.000$ ;  $p\text{-value} < 0.01$ ). "A large numbers of children in the family make it difficult for the parents to bring up their children with the same care. The children never get their material needs satisfied in such families. The youngster tries to satisfy his material needs in other ways like stealing, begging, leaving school and involve himself in labor market (Matalaka, 2009).

It is expected that juvenile delinquent usually come from large – size family. The result of this study is similar to other studies which shown that family size influence delinquency. There is a lot of literature presented the effect of large family size one delinquency. Matalaka,(1994, 2009); Werner & smith (1982) ; Farmington , 1992; Heck and Walsh (2000), have reported a similar finding in which adolescents with deviant behavior have been found to have come from large family . "The family size is related directly to the socioeconomic status. Delinquents may be created not because of the size of the family only, but also because of the crowding, poor housing condition and early cessation of education, beginning and early employment that accompanies the living conditions of such families"(Matalaka,2009).The researcher feel also that the delinquents are force by other member of the family to put an efforts to share in the household which lead them to leave education and move to the market for job, but they usually get low salary which hardly enough for their own expenditure and this force them to be involved in deviant activities.

Table 4 – Economic background of the respondents (Family Monthly Income).

Income (JD*)	Delinquents		Non-delinquents	
	f	%	f	%
100-200 JD	93	62	2	1,33
201-400 JD	35	23,33	8	5,33
401-600 JD	13	8,66	22	14,66
601-800 JD	9	6	40	66 .61
801- and more	0	0	57	38
Total	150	100	150	100

( $X^2 = 202.065$ ;  $df = 4$  ; P-Value = 0.000; p-value<0.01 so it is significant)

\* 100, US Dollar = JD71

### Economic Background Of The Respondents

Table 4, shows the monthly income of the respondents family, it reveals that majority of the delinquents (62%) family monthly income is 100-200 JD , followed by 23,33 % revealed that their family monthly income is 201-400 JD . Whereas the results also shows that majority of the non-delinquents (40,66 %) their family monthly income is between 601-800 JD , followed by (38%) revealed that their family monthly income is 801 and more . The results presented in this study also shows a significant difference between the families of the two groups in regards of monthly income ( $X^2 = 202.065$ ;  $df = 4$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ).

As stated in table, 4, most of the delinquents belong to low monthly income families. The researcher feels that the income of the delinquent's families is less than the minimum which family can live an decedent life. With low income these families find it difficult to adjust to day need especially when we come to know that most of the delinquents belong to large families. "Economic difficult tend to create uneasiness among adult family members which can affect the quality of the family life. Social incompetence may result in a sense of insecurity which produces certain psychological reaction in the minds of some children which find expressions in delinquency "(Matalka, 2009). Similar finding has been reported by Matalka,( 2009 );Biblarz & Roftery , (1999) ; Amato & Keith , (1991). Actually the emphasis is that low family income compels the children to share the burden and neglect their education. Children of low family groups remain unsatisfied and their desires remain unfulfilled. They learn to commit deviant act so that to fulfill their daily requirements and needs. The researcher feel that such children's lack everything even basic necessities.



Table5. Parent presence during early childhood (up to 12 years)

parents	Delinquents		Non-delinquents	
	f	%	f	%
Both present	35	23,33	113	75,33
Both dead	5	3,33	-	-
Fathers dead	44	29,33	5	3,33
Mothers dead	10	6,66	14	9,33
Father outside the country	4	2,66	18	12
Separated from parents	4	2,66	-	-
Mothers divorce	48	32	-	--
Total	150	100	150	100

( $X^2 = 138.725$ ;  $df = 6$ ;  $P\text{-Value} = 0.000$ ;  $p\text{-value} < 0.01$  so it is significant).

### Parent Presence

Table 5, reveals that majority of the non – delinquents' parents were present during their formative period. In contrast the study showed that majority of the delinquents 61, 33% of their fathers were absent either because their mothers were divorce or their fathers were dead. From the table we can say that most of the delinquents were brought up with the absence of their fathers, which means that the responsibility of bringing up the children's and the householder was kept on the mothers. Based on the results, there is a significant differences between the delinquents and non delinquents in regards of presents of their parents during their formative stage ( $x^2=138,725$ ;  $df=6$ ;  $p<0.01$ ). Single parenting may be just as effective in producing positive child out comes as dual – parenting (Gottfredson&Hirsch, 1999). The results of this study is somehow similar to other studies carried out by scholars partially within the social control perspective (Rebellion , 2002 ; Sampson & laub , 1993 ; Amato , 1987 ; McLonahan & Sandefur , 1994 ) . These scholars studies showed that" many single – parent households are, by nature, a social setting that hampers the establishment of bonds to conformity because half of the parental unit is absent and unable to provide proper control , supervision , and socialization of the child . This suggest that children in one – parent families may have more motivation and opportunity to engage in unconventional activities, including delinquency, than those from two – parent households ( Rebellion , 2000 ) . Accordingly the parental absence model maintains that the lack of a parent, regardless of the reason, is a significant predictor of delinquent behavior"(Mack,etal., 2007).

Table 6: Family Discipline

Nature of Discipline	Delinquents		Non-delinquents	
	f	%	f	%
Authoritarian	80	53,33	10	6,66
Permissive	55	36,66	19	12,66
Authoritative	5	3,33	70	46,66
Moderate	10	6,66	34	51
Total	150	100	150	100

( $X^2 = 140.869$ ;  $df = 3$  ; P-Value = 0.000;  $p\text{-value} < 0.01$  so it is significant)

### Family Discipline

From table 6, it has been found that 53,33 % of the delinquents against 6,66% of the non – delinquents were experienced authoritarian discipline practice , followed by 36,66 % of the delinquents their rearing practice were permissive against 12,66 % of the non – delinquents experienced this type of discipline practices. Based on this results, we found that there is a significant differences between the Parents of the two groups regarding child – discipline atmospheres and practices ( $X^2 = 140.869$ ;  $df = 3$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ) . Parents of the delinquents were more authoritarian and permissive in rearing their children's than the parents of the non – delinquents. Discipline is another interrelated part of the family relationship that affects delinquency.

"Authoritarian parents attempt to shape, control, and evaluate the behaviors and attitude of their children and do not encourage negotiation by their children. In contrast, authoritative parents monitor their children closely but are loving, supportive. Permissive parents are warm and autonomy – granting, but monitor their children very little "(Abdi, Jalali & Mirmehdy, 2010). General restrictiveness may also lead and enforce delinquents to be involved in deviant act. The results of this study is found to be in agreement with other studies carried out by ( Winder & Rau , 1962 ; Rosenthal , 1962; Abdi, Jalali & Mirmehdy , 2010 ; craig & Glick , 1963 ; Glueck & Glueck , 1950 ) . Family behaviors, particularly parental monitoring and disciplining seem to influence association with deviant peers throughout the adolescent period (Cashwell & Vacc, 1994).

**Table 7: Parents Relationship**

Relationship	Delinquents		Non-delinquents	
	f	%	f	%
Excellent	18	12	73	48,66
Good	20	13,33	46	30,66
Satisfactory	15	10	16	10,66
Bad	57	38	10	6,66
Worse	40	26,66	5	3,33
Total	150	100	150	100

( $X^2 = 103.709$ ;  $df = 4$  ; P-Value = 0.000;  $p\text{-value} < 0.01$  so it is significant)

### Parents Relationship

As stated in table 7, we found that 64, 66 % of the parents of delinquents as against nearly 10 % of the non – delinquents have bad or worse relationship. The significant difference between the delinquents and non – delinquents existed at 0.01 level ( $X^2 = 103.709$ ;  $df = 4$  ;  $p < 0.01$ ) .

"The presence of the parents and their involvement in the activities of their children is very important. Both parents can participate in the upbringing and activities of their children only if they are staying with them and have good relationship as family members. But if the parents are having a strained relationship with each other it will be difficult for them to participate fully in the upbringing of their children. Strained relationship between parents have direct effect on children" (Matalka, 1994). The present study shows that most of the delinquent's parents have bad and even worse relationships which give as a clear idea that the homes were relationship among parents is not healthy is a healthy home to produce juvenile delinquents .

"Sometimes families have a tendency to contribute to delinquent behavior. Conflict between parents who are demonstrating opposing idea or a parental pattern of "Don't do as I do; but do as I say, " may indirectly teach lessons that were completely opposite those intended. This form of indirect learning by observing negative parental role models is a factor that causes delinquency "(Wickliffe, 200). Similar findings were found in researches done by (Singh & Agrawal, 1986; Matalka, 1994; Wickliffe, 2000).

Table 8: Parents-Child Relationship

Relationship	Delinquents		Non-delinquents	
	f	%	f	%
Excellent	10	6,66	65	43,33
Good	11	7,33	55	36,66
Satisfactory	32	21,33	13	8,66
Bad	83	55,33	8	12
Worse	14	9,33	5	3,33
Total	150	100	150	100

( $X^2 = 135.015$ ;  $df = 4$ ;  $P\text{-Value} = 0.000$ ;  $p\text{-value} < 0.01$  so it is significant).

### Parents-Child Relationship

Table 8 shows that majority 64, 66 % of the delinquents as against only 11, 33 % of the non – delinquents had poor and worse relation with their parents. Based on this table, there is a significant differences between the two groups regarding their relation with their parents ( $X^2 = 135.015$ ;  $df = 4$ ;  $p < 0.01$  ) . Delinquents showed higher average in having bad and worse relation with parents than the non – delinquents.

"The child has the inherent right to have a home with parents living together harmoniously; a home which has reasonable comforts, enough wholesome food for nourishment and growth, and surrounded by opportunities for the healthy development of the physical body, loving but not over – indulgent parents have much to do in making a family stable . A child who fails to experience the warmth of love and sympathy or who has his efforts toward self – expressions constantly checked is likely to produce behavior problems. Many cases show that where these legitimate satisfaction are not met in the home the child is prematurely driven to the streets or other outlets are resorted to , such as excessive day dreaming , timidity, temper tantrums , lying , stealing , running away , setting fires and the like " ( Sullenger ,1931 ) . Functionally, a normal home meets the basic need of individual members. It likewise contributes to the development of healthy, well – adjusted and useful functioning personalities, such home encourage growth, confidence, frankness, and respect for personal worth and on ability to face reality. It provides an emotionally healthy atmosphere. The warm continuous relationship between the child and his parents is very important during a child's early years. Children deprived of parents, May be retarded in the growth of personality and in their social and adoptive behavior. Affectionless children often suffer personality disturbances and disorder that are not overcome by later family experience, "(Matalka, 1994). The findings of this study were found to be similar to the finding of other studies carried out by (Matalka, 1994; Singh &Agrawal, 1986; Coleman&Broen, 1972).

Table 9 – Parental Rejection - Acceptance

Which parent most affectionate/ rejected	Delinquent		Non-delinquents	
	f	%	f	%
Mother loving	17	11,33	16	10,66
Father loving	12	8	12	8
Both loving	15	10	117	78
Neither	48	32	2	3
Rejection	58	38,66	2	1,33
Total	150	100	150	100

( $X^2 = 170.821$ ;  $df = 4$ ;  $P\text{-Value} = 0.000$ ;  $p\text{-value} < 0.01$  so it is significant).

### Parental Rejection – Acceptance

Table 9 shows that 10% of the delinquents received affection from both parents which means acceptance by their parents against 78% of the non – delinquents , It shows that delinquents were deprived of the basic needs for their normal development , that is they were lacking and even deprived of the affection of the parents . The data presented in the table shows a significant differences between the parents of the two groups in regard of parental acceptance and rejection ( $X^2 = 170.821$ ;  $df = 4$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). Parents of the delinquents found to be rejecting their children's more than the parents of the non – delinquents. A similar finding has been reported by ( Matalka , 1994; Singh & Agrawal , 1986 ; Frey & Rothlisberger , 1996; Mc Intyre , & Dusek , 1995 ; Clark & Shields , 1997 . In fact children who are rejected by parents tend to have various personality as well as adjustment problems. We found them tend to be, aggressive, anxious, insecure, lack of confidence, hostile. "The most crucial and pervasive of all the influences exerted in the home were love and warmth imparted by the parents (Sears, et al, 1957).

"More the attention the parents give to their children less they are likely to commit deviant behavior. A child living without affection develops a sense of hatred toward his parents and other people around him. Growing up without the parental hood feelings makes him frustrated when he look around at other parents and children's who share bond of parent – child relation .

### Conclusion

From the forgoing discussion and data, we may conclude that the family environment is very important for a healthy development of the child. We found that size of the family , economic deprivation , parental deprivation , family discipline , inter parental relationship , child – parent relationship and parental acceptance – rejection play an important and effective role in the developmental growth of personality as well as social behavior of the delinquents . Most of the delinquents were found to be deprived of their parents, parents love and affection during the socialization process. These deprivations tend to weaken the psycho, social and behavioral development of the delinquents and the delinquents fails to develop enough and adequate confidence.

Proper social organization depends upon proper organization of families. If the families disintegrate in some society, then the society cannot be safe. One major cause of social disorganization is family disorganization. Family is an enduring association of parents and children. Its primary functions are the satisfaction of the members and the socialization of the child. It is in the family that the child acquires such important qualities as sincerity, sympathy, self – submission and consciousness of responsibility. Therefore, as its clear in this study, the physically, emotionally and psychologically broken homes contribute much to the increasing rate of delinquency in Jordan .

In view of the findings it is worth to suggest that family counseling will be an effective way to guide the public to the important of healthy family environment, for the personality as well as social development of the child. Also further studies are suggested to have deep analysis for the affect of family environment on causing juvenile delinquency.

### References

- 1-Abdi , M , Jalali , A. & Mirmehdy . (2010). An investigation and comparison of personality traits and the study of parenting rearing of 12-18 delinquency and non – delinquency youth. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5, 2089 – 2092.
- 2- Amato, P.R. (2000) . The consequences of divorce for adults and children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 62. 1269-1287.
- 3- Amato, R., Keith, B. (1991) . Parental divorce and the well being of children : Ameta – analysis , *Psychological Bulletin* , 110 , 26 – 46 .
- 4- Amato , R.(1987 ) . Family process in one – parent, Stepparent, and intact families: The child's point of view. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*.49, 327-337.
- 5- Bachman, R., & Peralta, R. (2002). The relationship between drinking and violence in an adolescent population: Does gender Matter. *Deviant Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal* , 23,1-19 .
- 6- Biblarz,T.,& Raftery, A. (1999). Family structure, educational attainment, and socioeconomic success: Rethinking the "Pathology of Matriarchy." *American Journal of Sociology*, 105, 321-365.
- 7- Briar, S., & Piliavin, I. (1965). Delinquency, Situational inducements, and commitments to conformity. *Social problems* , 13,35-45 .
- 8- Cashwell, Craig S. and Niccholas A. Vacc. (1996). Family functioning and Risk Behaviors: Influences on adolescent delinquency . "School counselor, 44: 105-115.

- 9- Bryant, c., and Wells, J (1973). Deviancy and the family. Philadelphia: F.A.Davis Company.
- 10- Cao, L., Cao, J. & Zhao, J. (2004). Family Welfare, and delinquency. Journal of criminal Justice , 32,565-576.
- 11- Cernkovich, S., Giordano , P . (1987) Family relationship and delinquency. Criminology, 25, 295-319 .
- 12- Clark,R.& Shield ,G.( 1997) . Family communication and delinquency. Adolescence, 32 (125), 81-92.
- 13- Colleman,J.,&Broen,W.,(1972).Abnormal Psychology and Modern life. D.B. Taraporevala sons and co. Ltd., Bombay, India.
- 14- Craig , M., Glick , S . (1963). Crime and delinquency. New York city board, New York, 231-232.
- 15- Demuth, S., & Brown, S. (2004) Family structure, family processes, and adolescent delinquency: The significance of parental absence versus parental gender. Journal of Research in crime and Delinquency, 41, 58-81.
- 16- Dove, M.K. (2001) . Runway, throwaway and homeless adolescents. The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin , 68 (1) , 10-15 .
- 17- Eitle , David (2006). "Parental gender, single – parent families, and delinquency: Exploring the Moderating influence of race /ethnicity . " Social Science Research. 35. 727-748 .
- 18- Elkind, David. (1967). Cognition in infancy and early childhood, in Yvonne Brackbill (ed.). Infancy and early childhood. New York ,Macmillan .
- 19- Flannery , D., Williams , L. & Vazsony , A. (1999). Who are they with and what are they doing? Delinquent behavior, Substance use, and early adolescents after school time. American Journal of orthopsychiatry , 69,247-253.
- 20- Frey, C.U., & Rothlisberger, C. (1996). Social support in healthy adolescents. Journal of youth and Adolescence, 25 (6), 787-802.
- 21- Glueck, S. & Glueck, E. ., (1950). Unraveling juvenile delinquency commonwealth fund, chapter (11), NewYork.

- 22- Goldstein, H. (1984). Parental composition, supervision and conduct problems in youths 12 to 17 years old. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry*, 23, 679-684.
- 23- Gorman, S. D., and Tolan, P.H. (1998) "Relation of family problems to patterns of delinquent involvement among urban youth." *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*. 26: 319-334.
- 24- Gorman , S. D Tolan ,H., Sheidow , A., and Henry , D (2001) "Partner violence and street violence among urban Adolescents : Do the same family factors Relate ? " *Journal of Research on Adolescence*. 11:273-295.
- 25- Gottfredson , M., & Hirschi , T. (1990). *A general theory of crime* . Stanford, CA: Stanford university press.
- 26- Hagan John and Hollyfoster, (2001). Youth violence and the end of adolescence. *American Sociological Review* , 66:874-899.
- 27- Hirschi, T. (1995). The family. In J. Q. Wilson & J. Petersila (Eds), *crime* (PP. 121-140), San Francisco: ICS press.
- 28- Hirschi , T . (1969). *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California press.
- 29- Juby , H., & Farrington ,(2001). Disentangling the link between disrupted families and delinquency . *British Journal of criminology* , 41,22-40 .
- 30- Justin , P., Forehand , R., Merchant , M., Mark , E., Burrow , N., long , N., and Jones , D. (2011) . The Relation of Harsh and permissive Discipline with child Disruptive Behaviors : Dose child Gender Make a Difference in an At-Risk Sample ? *Journal of family violence*. 26:527–533.
- 31- Kierkus , C.A.,& Hewitt , J.D. (2009) . The contextual nature of the family structure /delinquency relationship. *Journal of criminal Justice* , 37 , 123-132 .
- 32- Kierkus, C., & Baer , D. (2002) . Asocial control explanation of the relationship between family structure and delinquent behavior. *Canadian Journal of criminology*, 44,425-458.
- 33- Klein, K & Forehand, R (1997). Delinquency during the transition to early adulthood : Family and parenting predictors from early .Adolescence. 32:61-81 .
- 34- Lennard, H., & Bernstein, A. (1969) *Patterns in human interaction* . San Francisco. Jossey – Boss.



- 35- Mack, K. Y, Leiber , M.J., Featherston, R.A., & Monserud , M.A., (2007). "Reassessing the family – delinquency association: do family type, family processes, and economic factors Make difference ? , Journal of criminal Justice, 35, 51-67 .
- 36- Matalka, Faisal. I. (2009). Low family income and juvenile delinquency , Journal of Education , college of Education , Al-Azhar University , Cairo, 140(1) May, 414-428.
- 37- Matalka, Faisal., (1994a). A sociological study of Male juvenile delinquency in Jordan . Unpublished Ph, d. Thesis , University of Rajasthan Jaipur – India .
- 38- Matalka, Faisal. (1994b). Of discipline and delinquenc. LokmatTimes-April-4-Nagpur, India.
- 39- Matalka, Faisal., (1994c) Parental relationship and Juvenile delinquency , Nagpur Times , May , 22. Nagpur, India.
- 40- Matherne, Monique and Adrian Thomas. (2001). "Family environment as a predictor of a adolescent delinquency " . Adolescence. 36:655-665.
- 41- Matsueda, R. & Heimer, K. (1987). Race, family structure, and delinquency : A test of differential a association and social control theories. American Sociological Review, 52,826-840.
- 42- McIntyre, J. & Dusek, J. (1995). Perceived parental rearing practices and styles of coping . Journal of youth and Adolescence, 24, (4), 499-509.
- 43- McLanahan, S., & Sandefur, G. (1994). Growing up with a single parent. What hurts, what helps . Cambridge , MA: Harvard University press.
- 44- McCord, J. (1982). A longitudinal view of the relationship between parental absence and crime. In J. Gunn & D. Farrington (Eds ) , Abnormal offenders, delinquency and the Criminal justice system (pp.113-151) . New York: John Wiley and sons.
- 45- Nye , I. F. (1958). Family relationship and delinquency behavior: New York: John Wiley and Sons .
- 46- Peterson, J., & Zill, N. (1986). Marital disruption , parent-child relationships and behavior problems in children. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48,295-307.
- 47- Peterson, D., Quay , H., and Cameron, G., (1959). Personality and back ground factors in Juvenile delinquency as inferred from questionnaire responses. Journal of Consulting Psychology , 23,395-399.

- 48- Rankin , J., Kern , R.(1994) Parental attachment and delinquency. *Criminology*, 32,495-515.
- 49- Rbeihat , S.A.(1987). Explaining Male Delinquency in Jordan". Unpublished ph.d thesis, California University.
- 50- Rebellon , c. (2002) . Reconsidering the broken home and delinquency relationship and exploring its Mediating Mechanisms. *Criminology*, 40, 103-133.
- 51- Rosen,l (1985) family and delinquency : structure or function ? *Criminology* , 23,553-573.
- 52- Rosenbaum, J.(1989). Family dysfunction and delinquency. *Crime and Delinquency* ,35,31-44.
- 53- Rosenthal, M.(1962). The syndrome of the inconsistent mother. *American Journal of ortho-psychiatry*,32,637-644.
- 54-Sampson , R. (1992). Family Management and child development : Insight from Social disorganization theory . In J. McCord (ed.), *Fact , frameworks , and forecasts* (pp 63-93). New Brunswick, NH: Transaction.
- 55- Sampson, R., &Laub, J. (1993). *Crime in the Making : Pathways and turning points through life* . Cambridge , MA: Harvard University press .
- 56- Sears, R., Maccoby , E., and Levin , H., (1957). *Patterns of child rearing* , Row Peterson , Evanston, III.
- 57- Show , C., & Mckay ,H. (1932). Are broken homes a causative factor in juvenile delinquency . *Social forces* , 10,514-524 .
- 58- Shields, G., & Clark , R . (1995). Family correlates of delinquency : Cohesion and adaptability . *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* , 22(2) 93-106.
- 59- Singh , P., & Agrawal , P. (1986). Family environment and delinquency , *Indian Journal of Criminology* , 14,(2) July , 144-151.
- 60- Stormshak , A. , Bierman K.L, McMahon R.J .(2000) . The over- scheduled child : Avoiding the hyper-parenting trap . *The Brown University child and Adolescent Behavior letter*.
- 61- Sullenger , T., E., . Juvenile a product of the home. *JSTOR: Journal of criminal law and criminology*. (1931-1951) 24 (6) , March – April.

- 62- Wadsworth , M. (1976). Delinquency, pulse rate, and early emotional deprivation. *British journal of criminology*, 16,245-256.
- 63- Wells , L. & Rankin , J. (1991). Families and delinquency: A meta- analysis of the impact of broken homes . *Social problems*, 38,71-93 .
- 64- Wickliffe , J., . (2000) Why juvenile commit crimes , [http : // WWW.Yale . edu/ ynhti / curriculum / units / 2000 / 2/ 00.07.x. html](http://WWW.Yale.edu/ynhti/curriculum/units/2000/2/00.07.x.html) .
- 65- Winder , C. & Rau , L. (1962). Parental attitudes associated with social deviance in pre-adolescent boys . *Journal of Abnormal & Social psychology* , 64,418-424 .
- 66- Wright , Kevin N. & Karen E . Wright . (1994). " Family life , Delinquency , and crime : A policymakers Guide . Research Summary . Washington DC: OJJDP. 4-21.