

Impact of Family Economic Status upon Juvenile Delinquency at Reformation Schools in Baghdad City: a case control study

Siham Abdullah Hamoo*, Asst. Prof. Dr. Ali Kareem Al-Juboori**, Asst. Prof. Dr. Nsaif Jasim Al- Hemiary***

*Ministry of health, Al-Rusafa Directorate

**University of Karbala, College of Nursing.

** University of Baghdad, College of Medicine .

Abstract

Objectives: To assess the family economic status of juvenile delinquents, to assess the family economic status of non-delinquents juvenile, to Identify the differences between cases and controls, and to find out the relationship between family economic status and some of delinquents' variables. And used to determining the relationship between family economic status and juvenile parents' variables.

Methodology: The study carried out on a purposive “non probability” sample of (100) delinquents' juveniles were selected from a Reformation schools for boys in Baghdad City and 100 of non-delinquents juveniles who were matched with them from general population. A questionnaire is constructed for the purpose of the present study which is distributed across 2 main parts. Part one included the demographic characteristics of juvenile and their parents, and part two included sections of family economic status. The overall items which were included in the questionnaire are 42 items regarding juvenile delinquency, and 38 regarding non – delinquents juveniles. Validity and reliability of the questionnaire were determined through the review of a panel of experts and the pilot study. Data were collected through the period from September 2sd 2011 to October 2sd 2011. It was analyzed through the descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, and mean of score) and inferential statistics.

Results: The results revealed that were a significant difference was found in juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their age at delinquent acts, duration of punishment, and mother occupational status. Also there were highly significant differences between case and control with regard to their family economic status.

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

الخلاصة

الاهداف: لتقييم الحالة الاقتصادية لاسر الاحداث الجانحين , تقييم الحالة الاقتصادية للاحداث غير الجانحين. التعرف على الاختلاف بين الاحداث الجانحين وغير الجانحين. وايجاد العلاقة بين الحالة الاقتصادية وبعض المواصفات الديموغرافية للحدث الجانح. وكذلك ايجاد العلاقة بين الحالة الاقتصادية وبعض المواصفات الديموغرافية للابوين.

طريقة اجراء الدراسة: اجريت الدراسة على عينة مستهدفة (غير احتمالية) مكونة من (100) من الاحداث الجانحين الذكور في (100) من الاحداث غير الجانحين ممن كانوا متطابقين معهم من عامة المجتمع. صممت مدارس الاصلاحية في محافظة بغداد والوالدين والجزء الثاني تتضمن الاستبانة لتحقيق هدف الدراسة من جزئين: الجزء الاول يتضمن المواصفات الديموغرافية للحدث فقرات الحالة الاقتصادية. بلغ عدد فقرات الاستبانة 42 فقرة للاحداث الجانحين و38 فقرة للاحداث غير الجانحين. حدد صدق وثبات الاستبانة عن طريق مجموعة الخبراء والدراسة الاستطلاعية. جمعت المعلومات خلال المدة من 2 ايلول 2011 الى 2 تشرين الاول 2011 . حلت المعلومات عن طريق الاحصاء الوصفي كالتكرارات والنسب المئوية والوسط الحسابي والاحصاء الاستنتاجي.

النتائج: اظهرت النتائج ان هناك علاقة ذات دلالة احصائية بين الحالة الاقتصادية وجنوح الاحداث فيما يتعلق بالعمر عند ارتكاب مدة العقوبة, وكذلك مهنة الأم. كما اظهرت النتائج بان الاحداث الجانحين قد تأثروا بالحالة الاقتصادية اكثر من المجموعة , الجنحة الضابطة.

الاستنتاج: استنتجت الدراسة بأن جنوح الأحداث هي مشكلة هامة وخطيرة تواجه أسر الأطفال. حيث تلعب الحالة الاقتصادية للأسرة والمجتمع دورا هاما في حدوث هذه المشكلة والتي تضع الأحداث في مشكلة مع القانون بسبب سلوكهم. كما أثبتت هذه الدراسة، بأن عدم استقرار العائلة اقتصاديا والمشاكل الأسرية المترتبة من جراء ذلك تلعب دورا هاما في حدوث هذه المشكلة.

Introduction

Families are one of the strongest socializing forces in life. They teach children to control unacceptable behavior, to delay gratification, and to respect the rights of others. Conversely, families can teach children aggressive, antisocial, and violent behavior (25). Juvenile delinquency is one of the biggest problems in any society. Today, the rising divorce rate, increase in teen pregnancy, and Prevalence of single-parent households has caused the definition of family to take on several new meanings. Obviously something is going on in today's society if more and more children are committing delinquent crime (25). Unfortunately, family risk factors often tend to cluster. For example, children of poverty typically contend with multiple problems. Multiple problems are compounded by parental absence because parents must work or because fathers unable to support their family have left; irritable and depressed parents or caretakers; lack of money for social or educational opportunities; and in severe cases, lack of adequate food and clothing, and even homelessness (23). The present study attempts to assess the impact of family economic status upon juvenile delinquency. Such an assessment may provide baseline information about the problem and find out the solutions to decrease the prevalence of this problem in our society to protect the health, safety, and quality of life for all, especially children and adolescents.

Methodology

A descriptive analytical study was conducted at (2) Reformatory schools distributed throughout Baghdad City. One Reformatory school in Al- Shaljea for juveniles and pre-adolescents from age 9-

15 years old and another Reformatory school in Al- Gaiffer for adolescents from age 16- 18 years old. Both schools are located in Al- Karkh Sector of Baghdad. These schools may be the most appropriate setting in which subjects of the study can be found. A purposive "non probability" sample of (100) delinquents' juveniles were selected from a Reformation schools, and 100 of non - delinquents juveniles who were matched with them from general population. A questionnaire is constructed for the purpose of the present study through:

1. Review of relevant literature and studies.
2. Previous studies scales which are:
 - a. Effect of family structure on juvenile delinquency scale (4).
 - b. A study of Socio- Economic Background of Juvenile delinquency (15).
 - c. Family functioning subscales (2).
 - d. Family assessment device (7).

And it was compromised of (5) positive and negative items, the positive item is (77) and the negative items are: (76, 78, 79, and 80) which are concerned with the measurement of impact of family economic status upon juvenile delinquency. Issue rated on 4 levels type likert scale for the positive items, 4 for "strongly agree", 3 for "agree", 2 for "don't agree", and 1 for "strongly don't agree". So far the negative items were scored and rated on the same scale, 4 for "strongly don't agree", 3 for "don't agree", 2 for "agree", and 1 for "strongly agree". In order to test the validity of the questionnaires, instruments were forwarded to the panel of experts (20 experts) in different fields for their opinion and suggestions to investigate the clarity and adequacy of items, Then the questionnaire was considered valid after

taking into consideration their suggestions and recommendation for modification. A pilot study was carried out for the period of August 8th 2011 to August 30th 2011 and conducted on 10 delinquents'

juveniles who were selected from the Reformatory school in Baghdad City for the purpose of the questionnaire reliability determination.

Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of the sample

Variables		F. case	%	F. ctrl	%
Age (year)	12-13	22	22.0	22	22.0
	14-15	51	51.0	52	52.0
	16-17	27	27.0	26	26.0
Education	Can't read & write	14	14.0	14	14.0
	Read & write	16	16.0	16	16.0
	Primary	59	59.0	59	59.0
	Intermediate	11	11.0	11	11.0
Residence	Urban	71	71.0	71	71.0
	Rural	29	29.0	29	29.0
Ownership Of residence	Private	28	28.0	47	47.0
	Renting	58	58.0	32	32.0
	Share with another	11	11.0	21	21.0
	Illegal	3	3.0	0	0
Marital status	Single	92	92.0	100	100
	Married	3	3.0	0	0
	Widower	0	0	0	0
	Divorce	2	2.0	0	0
	Separate	3	3.0	0	0
Numbers of family Member	1-3	7	7.0	17	17.0
	4-6	16	16.0	30	30.0
	7-9	40	40.0	23	23.0
	10-12	23	23.0	20	20.0
	13≤	14	14.0	10	10.0
Living with	Both parents	38	38.0	41	41.0
	Mother	22	22.0	26	26.0
	Father	17	17.0	10	10.0
	Biological mother and stepfather	13	13.0	15	15.0
	Biological father and stepmother	8	8.0	6	6.0
	Other guardian(s)	2	2.0	2	2.0

Estimates of The reliability were determined through the use of split – half technique. The result revealed that the split- half technique for the section of family economic status internal scale was $r = 0.88$. A semi-structured interview techniques was used for data collection through the period from September 2^{sd} 2011 to October 2^{sd} 2011. Data were collected through the use of the

constructed questionnaire; delinquents' juveniles filled the Questionnaire as semi- structured interview after receiving the information and Instructions required from the investigator to filling the questionnaire and the investigator stay with juvenile in the room during process of data collection. The investigator gathered the juveniles' responses through the employment of the

application of the semi-structured as mean of data collection.

Table 2: Socio-demographic characteristics of juvenile parents

Demographic variables of parents		F. Case	%	F. Ctrl	%
Both parents living	Yes	66	66.0	72	72.0
	No	34	34.0	28	28.0
Father age	30-39	25	25.0	26	26.0
	40-49	55	55.0	53	53.0
	50-59	20	20.0	21	21.0
Father education	Unable to read and write	21	21.0	18	18.0
	read and write	38	38.0	25	25.0
	Primary	22	22.0	33	33.0
	Secondary	16	16.0	9	9.0
	Institute/College graduate	3	3.0	10	10.0
	Advance graduate	0	0	5	5.0
Father occupation	Governmental employee	19	19.0	22	22.0
	Retirement	20	20.0	16	16.0
	Private work	31	31.0	32	32.0
	Unemployed	22	22.0	20	20.0
	Dead	8	8.0	10	10.0
Mother age	20-29	1	1.0	41	41.0
	30-39	36	36.0	48	48.0
	40-49	52	52.0	11	11.0
	50-59	11	11.0	0	0
Mother education	Unable to read and write	62	62.0	20	20.0
	read and write	21	21.0	25	25.0
	Primary	13	13.0	28	28.0
	Secondary	4	4.0	15	15.0
	Institute/College graduate	0	0	8	8.0
	Advance graduate	0	0	4	4.0
Mother occupation	House wife	50	50.0	41	41.0
	Governmental employee	19	19.0	28	28.0
	Retirement	22	22.0	5	5.0
	Private work	5	5.0	20	20.0
	Dead	4	4.0	6	6.0
Parent marital relationship	Normal	32	32.0	31	31.0
	Marital disharmony	23	23.0	22	22.0
	Single parent	33	33.0	38	38.0
	Divorced	11	11.0	8	8.0
	Separated	1	1.0	1	1.0

Results

The results reveal that nearly half (51%) of case and control were age 14-15 years old, while (59%) of them have primary school educational level, whereas most of

them (71%) were live in urban area, 58% of their families were renting houses to be residence for them, (92%) were single, 40% have 7-9 family member, 38% were live with their two parents together.

Regarding to control group, nearly half of them have private residence and all were single, 30% of them have 4-6 family members and 41% live with their two parents together.

The result show that more than two third of the cases and controls were their parents a live and more than half of cases fathers and mothers age were between 40-49 years old, the same results for fathers of controls whereas nearly half of mothers age for controls were between 30-39 years old, 38% of cases fathers and 33% of controls fathers have not even primary educational level, the percentage more serious for mothers, 62% of cases mothers unable to read and write, and 28% of controls

mothers have not even primary level of education and the highest percentage of those mothers were housewives but only one third of cases and controls parents have normal social relationships. The result reveals that the majority (71%) of the delinquents was from the age group of 14-15, 56% of them have delinquency of stealing, 58% have one delinquent act, 49% with 2 years duration of punishment, while 82% of them were never use any type substances, and only 18% were substance abusers. The result reveals that there were no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their age groups at $p \leq 0.05$.

Table 3: Juvenile delinquency related variables

Variables		F.	%
Age of delinquency	12-13	12	12.0
	14-15	71	71.0
	16-17	17	17.0
Type of delinquency	Stealing	56	56.0
	Sexual	21	21.0
	Homicide	2	2.0
	Vagrancy	15	15.0
	Terrorism	6	6.0
Numbers of delinquency	1	58	58.0
	2	22	22.0
	3 or more	20	20.0
Duration of punishment	1 year	26	26.0
	2 years	49	49.0
	3 years	25	25.0
Substance abuse	Yes	18	18.0
	No	82	82.0
Times of abuse	Occasionally	12	12.0
	Continuously	6	6.0

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

Scale	Source of variance	Sum Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic status	Between Groups	11.331	2	5.666	.849	.431 N.S
	Within Groups	647.509	97	6.675		

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

Scale	Source of variance	Sum Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic status	Between Groups	22.358	3	7.453	1.124	.343 N.S
	Within Groups	636.482	96	6.630		

The results show that there were no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their educational level at $p \leq 0.05$.

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

Scale	Source of variance	Sum Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic status	Between Groups	.134	1	.134	.020	.888 N.S
	Within Groups	658.706	98	6.721		

The results indicate that there were no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their residence at $p \leq 0.05$.

Table 7: Analysis of variance for Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their ownership

Scale	Source of variance	Sum Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic status	Between Groups	19.995	3	6.665	1.002	.396 N.S
	Within Groups	638.845	96	6.655		

The results reveal that there were no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their ownership at $p \leq 0.05$.

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

Scale	Source of variance	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic status	Between Groups	1.347	3	.449	.066	.978 N.S
	Within Groups	657.493	96	6.849		

The results indicate that there were no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their social status at $p \leq 0.05$.

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

Scale	Source of Variance	Sum Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic status	Between Groups	23.671	4	5.918	.885	.476 N.S
	Within Groups	635.169	95	6.686		

The result reveals that there were no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to number of their family members at $p \leq 0.05$.

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

Scale	Source of variance	Sum Squares	of Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic status	Between Groups	27.121	5	5.424	.807	.547 N.S
	Within Groups	631.719	94	6.720		

The results indicate that there were no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their relative they are living with at $p \leq 0.05$.

Table 11: Analysis of variance for Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their age during delinquents acts.

Scale	Source of Variance	Sum Squares	of df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic status	Between Groups	45.057	2	22.529	3.560	.032 S.
	Within Groups	613.783	97	6.328		

The results reveal that there were significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their age during delinquent's acts $p \leq 0.05$.

Table 12: Analysis of variance for Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their type of delinquents acts

Scale	Source of Variance	Sum Squares	of df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic status	Between Groups	24.621	4	6.155	.922	.455 N.S
	Within Groups	634.219	95	6.676		

The results reveal that there were no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to type of delinquent's acts at $p \leq 0.05$.

Table 13: Analysis of variance for Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to number of delinquents acts

Scale	Source of variance	Sum Squares	of Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic status	Between Groups	664.134	2	1.179	.174	.840 N.S
	Within Groups	2.357	97	6.768		

The results reveal that there were no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to number of delinquent's acts at $p \leq 0.05$.

Table 14: Analysis of variance for Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to the duration of reformation

Scale	Source variation of	Sum Squares	of Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic status	Between Groups	66.535	2	33.267	5.448	.006 S.
	Within Groups	592.305	97	6.106		

The results reveal that there were significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to the duration of reformation at $p \leq 0.05$.

Table 15: Analysis of variance for Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their fathers' age

Scale	Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic status	Between Groups	4.731	2	2.365	.351	.705 N.S
	Within Groups	654.109	97	6.743		

The results reveal that there were no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their fathers' age at $p \leq 0.05$.

Table 16: Analysis of variance for Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their fathers' educational level

Scale	Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic status	Between Groups	61.062	4	15.266	2.426	.053 N.S
	Within Groups	597.778	95	6.292		

The result reveals that there were no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their fathers' educational level at $p \leq 0.05$.

Table 17: Analysis of variance for Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their fathers' occupation

Scale	Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic status	Between Groups	4.724	4	1.181	.172	.952 N.S
	Within Groups	654.116	95	6.885		

The result reveals that there were no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their fathers' occupation at $p \leq 0.05$.

Table 18: Analysis of variance for Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their mothers' age

Scale	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic status	Between Groups	20.590	3	6.863	1.032	.382 N.S
	Within Groups	638.250	96	6.648		

The result reveals that there were significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their mothers' age at $p \leq 0.05$.

Table 19: Analysis of variance for Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their mothers' educational level

Scale	Source of variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic status	Between Groups	21.255	3	7.085	1.067	.367 N.S
	Within Groups	637.585	96	6.642		

The results reveal that there were no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their mothers' educational level at $p \leq 0.05$.

Table 20: Analysis of variance for Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their mothers' occupation

Scale	Source of variation	Sum Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic status	Between Groups	68.173	4	17.043	2.741	.033 S.
	Within Groups	590.667	95	6.218		

The result reveals that there were significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their mothers' occupation at $p \leq 0.05$.

Table 21: Analysis of variance for Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to the nature of their parents' relationship

Scale	Source of variation	Sum Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic status	Between Groups	39.336	3	13.112	2.032	.115 N.S
	Within Groups	619.504	96	6.453		

The result reveals that there were no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their parents' relationship at $p \leq 0.05$.

Table 22: The difference between cases and controls with regard to their family economic status

Paired sample	Variables	Mean	t. df.(99)	Sig. $P \leq 0.01$
Pair	Economic/ case	10.4600	-15.984-	HS.
	Economic / control	16.1600		

The result reveals that there were highly significant difference between cases and controls with regard to their family economic status at $p \leq 0.05$.

Discussion of the results

The findings of the present study show that 51% of the cases and 52% of the controls group was age between 14 – 15 years (table 1). This result comes along with (15) that the majority 54.4% of the study sample were age between 14 – 15 years old. The reason which interprets this result is that the adolescents below 14 and above 15 years seems in lower risk; very young children may get an effective and direct family supervision while older children above the age of 15 years appreciate the risk of delinquency. Regarding educational levels, the majority of the sample 59% of both case and control group have primary school graduate (table 1). The study of (19) reported that about 51% of the sample was not student at the time of offence behavior. Also the study of (15) reported that the majority of study has

low level of education which is agreement with the present findings. And as the investigator point of view this is may be because mostly spread in the poor families who can't make their children complete their education. Also Delinquents are typically non-bookish and non-academic individuals who take studies like a burden. When they fail in exams and get scolded by their family, they tend to indulge themselves in delinquent acts. The study results show that the majority of the sample (71%) for both case and control group living in urban area (table 1). The study of (15) found the majority of the sample (91%) is living in urban residential area which is consisted with the present study findings. Regarding to the ownership of residence, the majority of the case (58%) of their families were renting houses to be residence for them and the control group 47% of their families were

private houses (table 1). This result is supported by the study of (9) which indicated that the majority of the sample has low socio-economic status of working fathers, high percentage of jobless mothers, homeless or living at rent home. Concerning with social status, the majority of the sample case (92%) are single and 100% of control group were single (table 1) and as the investigator's point of view this is not strange because as we know this age not suitable for marriage. Regarding to the number of family member, the findings of present study reveal that the most of study case (40%) came from big and extend families with 7- 9 members, and 30% of the control group come from families with 4 – 6 members (table 2). This result supported by the study of (19) that reported most of the families were crowded and had rather low economical and educational levels. Also supported by (15) which revealed that (77.2%) of the study sample came from big and extend families with 7 or more member.

Regarding with whom juvenile live, the study results show that the majority of the sample case (38%) and control group (41%) live with both parents, (table 1). This result supported by study of (21) which revealed that (3.57%) of the sample live with biological parents. Regarding parents still alive, the finding of the preset study indicated that the majority of the sample (66%) of the cases and (72%) of the control group were parents still alive. (34%) of the cases and (28%) of the control were no parent alive (Table 2). The study of (21) reported about Family Structure, Family Process and Adolescent Delinquency, Longitudinal Survey, which is a nationally representative sample of more than 20,000 adolescents from 14 schools. 2.84 of total sample about 2.57% live with biological parents, 3.28% of the subject live with single mother families, while 4.11% live with single father families, and 2.95% of subject live with mother and step father, while 3.43% live with father and step mother. In regard to

their age, the result of the present study indicated that more than half (55%) of cases fathers and (53%) of controls father were age between 40-49 years old, the results for cases mother (52%) were age between 40 – 49 years old and (48%) of controls were age between 30-39 years old (table 2) and in the investigators point of view this is not strange but may have more going through life pressure, living difficulties, and stressful situations that effect on quality of the father-child relationship. Regarding educational level of parents of juvenile, 38% of cases fathers and 33% of controls fathers have not even primary educational level, the percentage more serious for mothers, 62% of cases mothers unable to read and write, and 28% of control mothers have not even primary level of education (table 2). This result agrees with the study of (15) who found that fathers of delinquents were either illiterate or never exceeding the primary school representing(34.2%).Concerningtheoccupational status of parents of juvenile, the finding of the present study shows that (31%) of cases fathers and (32%) of control fathers have private works, the highest percentage of cases and control mothers were housewives (table 2). This result agrees with the study of (12). Who found that (73.1%) of the fathers of our respondents are employed in private jobs that generally keep them away from their children for very long periods of time, and also agrees with the study of (9) that they indicated that there is high percentage of jobless of respondents' mothers. In regard to marital relationship, the findings of study indicate that the majority of the sample cases (33%) and (38%) of control was single parent (widow, widower) (table 2). This result agrees with the study of (15) who found that the majority of the study subjects (48.6%) were single parent. This result shows that unstable family atmosphere and broken home reflecting itself as a risk factor in precipitating delinquency. Concerning the age at delinquent act, the majority of the study sample (71%) was age rang between 14 – 15 years when they committed offence (table 3). This result comes along with (19) that reported 33% were 14 years old when they committed offence. Also the study of

(5) indicated that the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, researchers project that by the year 2010; juvenile arrest rates for violent crimes were 10 to 17 year age range. The study results also show that the majority of the sample regarding type of delinquent act, stealing represent (56%) of delinquency (table 3). This result agrees with the study of (19) that reported of a total of 165 juveniles, the most frequently committed crimes were theft (52%). Also the study (15) found that the majority of the study subjects show the nature of delinquent act, stealing represent (60%). Analysis of such information depicted that (58%) had first delinquent act (table 3) and as the investigators point of view the Juvenile in this case is an escape from a family system which is neither empowered nor empowering. The result also shows that (49%) of the delinquents in this sample were 2 years duration of punishment (table 3) and as the investigators point of view the political structures both in terms of the legal framework and the policies offering social protection and important in determinant of violence. Regarding the use of substance, the results of the present study revealed that there are (82%) were not use any type of substance and only 18% have substance abuser, of 18% (12%) occasionally, and (6%) continually (table 3). This result agrees with the study of (1) which reported that 42.3% smoked cigarettes, 50% smoked marijuana, and of the twenty-six students surveyed, 14 experienced some type of violence in the home. Out of those students, 13 drank alcohol, 13 smoked marijuana, 5 tried harder drugs. Overall 42.3% smoked cigarettes, 50% drank alcohol, and also agree with the study of (9) they indicated that (0.8%) of the study sample have drug abuse; also agree with the report of (5) who indicated that the Bureau of Justice Statistics, between 1990 and 1994, the number of juvenile drug arrests from 60,000 to over 130,000, an increase of 117%. The results of the present study illustrated that there was no

significance differences in juvenile delinquents' family economic status regarding their age groups (table 4). And as the investigators point of view is that all delinquents age less than 18 years may exposed to the same problem under risk factor. In regard to the level of education, the finding of the study indicated that there is no significant difference in juvenile delinquents' family economic status regarding their level of education (table 5). The study of (13) agrees with the present study, they found that there is no significant correlation between family environment and student level of education. Concerning the place of residence, the result of the present study revealed that there is no significant difference in juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their residence (table 6). The study of (11) agrees with the present study, he showed that there was no significant difference between urban and rural adolescents in total delinquency; and as the investigator's point of view is that all juveniles in this sample may expose to the same problem in all regional areas. In regard to the ownership, the finding of the study indicated that there is no significant difference in juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their ownership (table 7). This result agrees with the study of (24) he reported that delinquent behavior in their children are not related to family economic status. Concerning the social status, the result of the study indicates that there is no significant difference in juvenile delinquents family economic status with regard to their juvenile social status (table 8). The study of (19) agrees with the present study finding, they reported that there is no relationship between marital status and juvenile delinquency. Regarding number of family member, the results of the present study illustrated that there were no significance differences in juvenile delinquents family economic status with regard to their number of family member (table 9). The study of (12) reported that about two-thirds of the juvenile delinquents come from homes that

exposed to the risk factor. Concerning with whom juvenile lives, the result of the study indicates that there were no significant difference in family economic status with juvenile delinquency regarding with whom juvenile lives (table 10). This result agrees with the study of (21) reported that about 3.57% live with biological parents, 3.28% of the subject live with single mother families, while 4.11% live with single father families, and 2.95% of subject live with mother and step father, while 3.43% live with father and step mother, delinquency consistently not significant in which juvenile live with> Regarding age at delinquent act, the finding of the present study indicated that there is no significant variance in family economic status with juvenile delinquency regarding age at delinquent act (table 11). This study agrees with the study of (9) they indicated that there is no relationship between the juvenile delinquency and family system availability. In regard to the type of delinquent act, the result of the study found that there is no significant variance in family economic status with juvenile delinquency regarding type of delinquent act (table 12). This study agrees with the study of (16) they reported that the results of their study is statistically not significant at ($p < 0.05$) in distribution of the juveniles delinquents according to the type of the committed crime. Also (11) indicated that crime offences and arrests were not significant differences between them, and the result revealed that adolescents committed delinquent activities not only as an escape-based coping strategy from boredom but because such activities have provided the delinquent adolescents with the desired sensation of arousal as they described. In regard to the number of the delinquents' acts, the finding of the study indicated that there is no significant difference in juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their number of delinquents' acts (table 15). The study of (16) reported about Risk Factors Related to Juvenile Delinquency in Egypt during the Year 1998-1999. The sample is male juvenile delinquents from all governorates aged between (7-18 years). The total number of the juveniles in Ain-Shames Institution during the period of the study is 1 10

($n=110$). Out of them there were 62 juveniles (56.36%) aged between 7- 12 years and 48 (43.63%) aged between 13-18 years. It was noticed that 97 juveniles (88.1 8%) committed their first crime between the age of 7-12 years while 13 juveniles committed it between the age of 13-18 years. It was shown that 71 of them (64.55%) committed more than one crime while the other 39 (35.45%) committed one crime only. Finding shows that the relationship between the age of the juveniles and the number of the committed crimes. It shows that 51 (82.25%) out of 62 juveniles aged between 7-12 years committed more than one crime while 20 (41.66%) out of 48 juveniles aged between 13-18 years committed more than one crime. The result is statistically not significant at ($p < 0.05$) shows the distribution of the juveniles delinquents according to the type of the committed crime, 59 (53.64%) committed robbery, 21 (19.09%) drug abuse and trading, 19 (17.27%) sex crimes and 11 (10%) were killers. The sex crimes were (1 1 sodomy, 8 rape), the crimes related to drugs were (18 abusers, 3 traders), while the killers were (3 manslaughter, 3 intentional killing and 5 violence lead to death). Different causative instruments were used in 73 crimes (local manufactured fire arms, knives and similar instruments, sticks and broken glasses), while 37 crimes had been committed without instruments. The results of those crimes were as follow (11 killed, 16 with permanent infirmity, 14 cases of penetrating wounds and 32 cases with superficial wounds in different parts of the body) (16). Concerning the duration of reformation, the finding of the study indicated that there is significant difference in juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their duration of reformation (table 14). The study of (20) agrees with the present study, they found that (33%) of respondents mother and father are fighting with each other so they cannot be kind to them (low level of family economic and expressiveness), they failed school because of their constant conflicts at home, As one 15 year old male

participant put it: I think poverty and a bad financial family situation will cause family problems. In regard to the father age, the finding of this study indicated that there is no significant difference in juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their father age. And as the investigators point of view is that all juveniles age less than 18 years may be exposed to the same problem under risk factor. In regard to the level of fathers' education, the finding of the study indicated that there is no significant difference in juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their level of education (table 16). The study of (13) reported that there is no significant correlation between family environment and juvenile delinquency. Concerning the occupational status, the result of the study indicated that there are no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their fathers' occupation (table 17). The study of (7) indicated that the family economic is not appraised within a juvenile delinquent. Concerning to the mother age, the finding of this study indicated that there is significant difference in juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their mothers' age (table 18). The study of (10) indicated that families in the violent delinquent group reported poorer discipline, poor economic, less cohesion, and less involvement than the other two groups. Regarding mothers' educational level the finding of this study indicated that there is no significant differences in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their mothers' educational level. And as the investigator point of view this result may be due to inconsistency of distributing the sample according to educational level and two third of them was below the university level. Concerning the occupational status, the result of this study indicated that there is no significant difference in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their mothers' occupational

status (table 20). The study of (8) agrees with the present study, they reported that there were no significant relationship between juvenile delinquency family economic and mother occupation. In regard to the nature of parents' relationship, the result of this study indicated that there is no significant difference in Juvenile delinquents' family economic status with regard to their nature of parents' relationship (table 21). The study of (19) agrees with the present study finding, he indicated that there is no relationship between marital status and juvenile delinquency family economic problems. Concerning the difference between cases and controls, the result of this study indicated that there were highly significant difference between cases and controls with regard to their family economic status (table 22). The study of (8) agrees with the present study, they reported that there were higher significant differences between the normal and delinquent adolescents in all aspects of family environment.

Recommendations

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

References

1. Anika, D.: Juvenile Delinquency and Family Structure, Research Summary, Washington DC: US, 2005, PP.1-8.
2. Bloom, B.: A factor analysis of self-report measures of family functioning.

- Family process, Download as PDF file, 1985, 24: pp. 225-239.
3. Church, W., Wharton, T., and Taylor, J.: An examination of differential association and social control theory: Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, Vol. 7, No.(1), 2009, pp. 3–15.
 4. Doggett, A.: Juvenile Delinquency and Family Structure. Crime: Research Summary. Washington DC: US, 2005, PP. 1-8.
 5. Elliott, S.: Youth Violence: An overview. Philadelphia: Center for the Study and Prevention, 1994, pp. 1-7.
 6. Epstein, N., Baldwin, L., and Bishop, D.: The Mc Master Family Assessment Device, Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 9, 1983, pp.171- 180.
 7. Esposito, C., and Clum, G.: Social support and problem-solving as moderators of the relationship between childhood abuse and suicidality. Journal Traum Stress, Vol. 15, 2012, pp. 137–146.
 8. Gary, P., Sandra, M., Martha, L.: Family environments of adolescent sex offenders and other juvenile delinquents. Washington, D.C. metropolitan, 1995, pp.1-11 Available at www.taasa.org/library/pdfs/TAASALibrary64.pdf.
 9. Gorman, S., Deborah, P., Tolan, A., and Sheidow, B: Parenter Violence and Street Violence among Urban Adolescents. Journal of Research on Adolescence ,Vol. 11, No. (23), 2001, p. 14.
 10. Gorman, S., Deborah, T., Patrick H., Zelli, A., Huesmann, L.: The relation of family functioning to violence among inner-city minority youths, Journal of Family Psychology, Vol. 10, No.(2), 2012, pp. 115-129. ©2012 American Psychological Association.
 11. Homoud, M. Al Anazi: Sensation Seeking and Delinquency among Saudi Adolescents, Northern Border University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, European Journal of Social Sciences, Vol. 21, No.(2), 2011, pp. 265.
 12. ILongo, F.: Family Structure and Juvenile Delinquency: Correctional Center Betamba, Institute of Education, National University of Lesotho, Southern Africa. Internet Journal of Criminology, 2009, pp. 1-15.
 13. Kudirat, S., Nsisong, U., Abayomi, O., Felicia, M., and Leonard, E.: Family Types and Juvenile Delinquency Issues among Secondary School Students in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria: Counseling, Faculty of Education, University of Uyo. Journal of Soc Sci, Vol. 23, No. (1), 2010 pp. 21-28.
 14. Laub, J. and Sampson, R.: Unraveling Families and Delinquency: A Reanalysis of the Gluecks' Data, Criminology 26, P.355-380. National University of Lesotho - Southern Africa, 2009. Available by WWW. Internet journal of criminology. Com
 15. Mohammad, A.: A study of Socio-Economic Background of Juvenile delinquency, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, College of Medicine.
 16. Nahed, M., Mohamed, H., Salah, K., and Abeer H.: Risk Factors Related to Juvenile Delinquency in Egypt During the Year 1998-1999. Forensic Medicine and Toxicology Unit, Suez Canal Univ Med Journal, Vol. 4, No. (1) March, 2001, Pp. 1- 14.
 17. Oltmanns, T., and Emery, R.: Abnormal Psychology, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, 2nd ed., 1998, pp. 287.
 18. Sakir, O., Aydin, E., Remzi, O., Yasar, T., Suleyman, G.: Juvenile delinquency in a developing country: A province example in Turkey, International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, Vol. 28, No(4), July–August 2005, Pp. 430–441
 19. Soroor, P., Fazlollah, A.: A qualitative study on adolescence, health and family. University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran; Journal of Mental health in family medicine, Vol.6, No. (3), 2009, pp. 163-172.
 20. Stephen, D., Susan, B.: Family Structure, Family Process and Adolescent Delinquency, USA, Carolina Population Center, 123West Franklin Street, Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 41, No. (1), February 2004, PP. 58-81.
 21. Thornberry, P.; Carolyn, S.; Craig R.; and Magda, L.: Family Disruption and Delinquency. Juvenile Justice Bulletin. Washington, DC: US Department of justice, office of justice programs, office of juvenile justice and Delinquency prevention, 2011. Available at [http:// WWW.Publicsafety.ge.ca/res/cp/res/rpf-jd](http://WWW.Publicsafety.ge.ca/res/cp/res/rpf-jd)
 22. Wasserman, G., Seracini, G. ,and Farrington, D.: Risk and Protective Factors of Child Delinquency, Child Delinquency, Bulletin Series. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 2003, pp. 3-7.E
 23. Witten born, M.: The Relations between Parenting Styles and Juvenile Delinquency in Southern Illinois, USA. Honors Theses,

- University Honors Program at Open SIUC, 2002, pp. 1-9. Available at http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/uhp_theses/266.
24. Wright, K., Wright, E.: Family Life, Delinquency, and Crime: Reseach

Summary. Washington DC, OJJDP. pp. 4-21, 2009. Available by WWW. Internet journal of criminology. Com