

Effect of Fathering Methods and Child Environmental Factors on Adolescents Vulnerability to Delinquency in Mushin Area of Lagos, Nigeria

Prof. Osarenren, Ngozi.

*Department of Educational Foundations,
University of Lagos, Nigeria.*

Dr. Nwadinigwe, Peter.

*Department of Educational Foundations,
University of Lagos, Nigeria.*

Awazie, Emmanuel .

*Department of Educational Foundations,
University of Lagos, Nigeria.*

Abstract

The study investigated the relative effectiveness of fathering methods and child environmental factors on adolescents' vulnerability to delinquency. The participants were 150 secondary school students, consisting of 75 males and 75 females and randomly selected in Mushin Area of Lagos State. Four research hypotheses formulated to guide the study were tested using Independent t-test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The findings show that fathering methods significantly affected adolescents' vulnerability to delinquency; their perception of the environment impacts on adolescents' susceptibility to delinquency; cultural affiliations of parents significantly affects fathering method and adolescents differ significantly in their vulnerability to delinquency on the basis of the type of school attended. These findings were adequately discussed and some recommendations were made.

Keywords: Fathering Methods, Child Environment; Adolescents Vulnerability; Delinquency

Introduction

The process by which individuals construct their lives is a core issue for developmental researchers. Individuals shape their development by selected environment and by interacting with significant others in habitual ways. At the same time, their actions are influenced by demands and opportunities afforded by the social context. The family is the primary and foremost socialization setting which plays key role in the overall development of a child. According to Wright and Wright (1994), the family is the foundation of human society. The family is, therefore, the most natural environment for human development (Ngale, 2009). Family behaviours, particularly parental monitoring and disciplining, influence association with deviant peers throughout the adolescent stage (Cashwell & Vacc, 1996).

Omoegun (2004) explained that the effects of what happens during prenatal period and the earliest months and years of a child's life can last a life time. The responsibility of raising up a child to become a socially and psychologically well adjusted adult is mainly that of the parents (Maccoby and Martins, 1983), in the family setting, the family being a group of at least two people in a household based on marriage, cohabitation, blood relationships or adopting.

The essence of the family structure is the parent-child relationship, its outlines vary widely among cultures. One prominent familial form is the nuclear family, consisting of the marital pair of father and mother living with their child{ren} in a separate dwelling.

The family structure provides the organizational framework that determines family membership and the functions and hierarchical position of family members. A child from the home where the father and the mother are present will be well taken care of and socialized in the best way possible (Ortese, 1998). In this family model the father acts as the economic support and sometimes disciplinarian. If parental efforts affect children directly, then the ways in which they try to manage their children's behaviour should have an immediate impact on children's adjustment especially among young adolescents (e.g. Gritthin, Birvubm Scheier, Diaz and Miller, 2002). A complete family structure with both parents playing prospective roles in everyday socialization would bring optimal development to a child (Pittman, 1993).

Lewis (1996) asserts that a man's fathering method is influenced by his enthusiasm to be a father, his occupation, temperament, family dynamics, cultural milieu and the number of offsprings. A consensus is emerging that responsible fathering means establishing paternity, being present in the child's life (even if divorced or unmarried), sharing economic support, and being personally involved in the child's life in collaboration with the mother (Doherty, Koyneski and Erickson, 1996). The principal finding of their report agree that fathering is influenced by contextual forces in the family and the community. Parenting is one of the most relevant perspectives in the study of relationships between parents and children; its performance and effect has always affected children's developmental outcomes (Maccoby and Martin, 1983; Gray and Steinberg, 1999). Authoritative fathers are high both on demandingness and responsiveness, indulgent fathers are low on demandingness and high on responsiveness, authoritarian fathers are high on demandingness and low on responsiveness while neglectful fathers are both low on demandigness and responsiveness. These socialization processes start early in life and continue through out the life of the child (Omoegun, 2004); a child with faulty socialization process at an early stage is more likely to be delinquent in later years.

Delinquency is any behaviour which does not conform to the rules, regulations, norms and values of a given time (Osarenren, 2002). Environmental contingencies have causative factors on juvenile delinquencies (Olusakin, 2001), these could result in abnormal behavioural patterns.

Conversely the interplay of essential predictor factors: good parenting, particularly a positive father figure, a culture that recognizes and promotes the rights of the child and a child support school system, have the potentials of instigating proneness to criminality. Marginal father involvement in the child's upbringing is a determinant factor in adolescent delinquent tendencies. Lamb, Pleck, Charnov and Levine (1985) introduced the content free dimensions of paternal engagement (direct caregiving, leisure or play), paternal accessibility (availability) to the child, and paternal responsibility (knowing what the child needs and making valuable and positive decisions about how to respond. Research has identified essential model of the determinants of father involvement as motivation, skills, social support and institutional practices (Lamb, 1987a; Lamb et al, 1985). Father role identification, skills and commitments are important influences in fathering (Baruch and Barnett, 1986; Thinger Tallam, et al, 1995). It must, however, be acknowledged that the individual child factors, such as gender, age, temperament and developmental status, are included in the model for completeness (Marsiglio, 1991; Larson, 1993 and Larson and Richards, 1994).

The developmental stage of the child possesses certain unique characteristics that influence the behavioural patterns. Developmental psychologists and researchers have identified adolescence as a period of significant changes to the body, self-concept, identity and social relationship structure. Makinde (2007) maintain that the stage of adolescence is quite enigmatic when compared to the other stages of life. This age grade which is chronologically referred to as a period between puberty and adulthood (Osarenren, 2000) is referred to as "the crisis period" in view of its attendant stress and conflicts, because it marks the transition between dependent childhood and independent adulthood (Makinde, 2004). It puts an enormous strain in the family relationships sometimes resulting in frustration for parents. This state of affairs requires responsible fathering (a set of desired norms for evaluating father's behaviour) and responsive fathering (Doherty, Kounesk and Erickson, 1996). Fathering style is a predictor factor on the social and behavioural orientation of the adolescent (Nwadinigwe, 2004).

Adolescent vulnerability to delinquent behaviours is predicated on both the external and personal factors in the life of the individuals. Fathers have a direct impact on the well-being of their children (Rosenberg and Wilcox, 2006). The way fathers relate with their children, impact on a child's emotional and social development. Studies, however, reveal that the low socio-economic status of the father can influence the fathering style. Lamb (1997), remarks that these fathers care about their children, but may not show their love in conventional ways and sometimes a lack of a job, poor communication with the mother, or even their own childhood experiences can prevent them from getting involved. This research therefore, investigated the relative effectiveness of fathering methods and the child's environmental factors on vulnerability to delinquency.

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested in the study.

1. Fathering method does not significantly affect adolescent's vulnerability to delinquency.
2. Child perception of environment do not significantly affect his vulnerability to delinquency.
3. Society attitude towards child environment does not significantly affect adolescent's vulnerability to delinquency
4. Type of school attended does not significantly affect adolescent's vulnerability to delinquency.

The Research Design

The research design used for the study was descriptive research design. This design requires that the variables of interest had finished interacting among themselves before the research, making it possible for the researcher to consciously manipulate the variables (Nwadinigwe, 2000). It seeks to ascertain how some dimensions, variables or characteristics of a given population change with time and data is collected to enable the researcher describe systematically the characteristic features about the population (Ilogu, 2005). As a survey research, a fifty item questionnaire was used to collect data from the respondents.

Area of study

The area for this study is Mushin area of Lagos, a largely congested residential suburb with inadequate sanitation and low quality housing. It has a population of 633,009 according to 2006 census. It is situated in Lagos, Lagos State. It is one of the sprawling squatter settlements that have blighted the urban centre of Lagos State (Aluko, 2012).

Population of the Study

The population comprised all senior secondary class 2 students in both public and private secondary schools in Mushin Area, during the 2011/2012 academic session. The population sample was selected using the stratified random method in the type of school and location. A group of seventy five students, each from the private and public schools were used.

Research Instruments

The research instrument was a fifty item questionnaire designed by the researchers which was used to elicit responses from the participants. The questionnaire consists of two parts: A and B.

Part A measured the Bio-Data of respondents which included gender, type of school attended and ethnic group.

Part B was a fifty item, likert-type questionnaire grouped into five sections.

Administration of the Instruments

The researchers administered the instrument on all the participants. All the respondents were given sufficient time to respond to the items; assistance was readily available, to ensure that they understood what was required.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Hypotheses Testing

Hypothesis 1: Fathering method does not significantly affect adolescent vulnerability to delinquency.

Table I: One-Way Analysis of Variance on the Influence of Fathering Methods of Adolescents Vulnerability to Delinquency

Fathering	N	X̄	SD
Authoritarian	32	27.22	9.22
Democratic	63	33.57	3.90
Laissez-Faire	55	36.07	3.02
Total	150		

Sources of Variance	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-Ratio
Between Groups	1606.72	2	803.36	34.06
Within Groups	3466.33	147	23.58	
Total	5073.05	149		

Significant at 0.05; Df = 2 and 147; F-ratio = 3.05

The results in table I indicate that laissez-faire fathering method at a calculated F value of 43.06 is greater than the critical F value of 3.05 at 0.05 level of significance. We reject H_0 and accept H_1 . This implies that fathering methods significantly affects adolescents' vulnerability to delinquency.

A pair-wise comparison of group means (X) was done to determine which group differ from the other on vulnerability to delinquency and the trend of the difference. The result of the analysis is presented in table 2

Table 2: Protected t-test Analysis of Difference in vulnerability to delinquency due to Fathering Methods

Fathering	Authoritarian	Democratic	Laissez-faire
Authoritarian	27.21 ^a	- 6.10*	- 8.20*
Democratic		33.57	- 2.81 *
Laissez-faire			36.07

* Significant at 0.05; Group means are in the diagonal while protected t-values are above the diagonal

Table 11 shows that adolescents from authoritarian fathering style significantly exhibited less vulnerability to delinquency than either those from democratic fathering background ($t=6.10$; $df=93$; critical $t=2.00$; $p<0.05$) or those from laissez-faire fathering style { $t=8.20$; $df=85$; critical $t= 2.00$; $p<0.05$ }. Similarly adolescents from democratic fathering style significantly exhibit lower vulnerability to delinquency than those from laissez-faire fathering style ($t=2.82$; $df=116$; critical $t=2.00$; $p<0.05$).

Hypothesis 2: Child environmental does not significantly affect adolescent vulnerability to delinquency.

In analyzing this hypothesis, three levels of influence were considered: warm; indifference & cold. One-Way Analysis of Variance Statistics (ANOVA) was used at 0.05 significance level.

Table 3: One-Way Analysis of Variance on the Effect of Childs Perception of Environment on Adolescents Vulnerability to Delinquency

Level of effect of child perception of environment	N	\bar{X}	SD	
Warm	45	35.73	3.04	
Indifference	72	34.14	5.33	
Cold	33	27.52	11.98	
Sources of Variance	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-Ratio
Between Groups	1418.50	2	709.25	21.26
Within Groups	4904.16	147	33.36	
Total	6322.46	149		

Significant at 0.05; df = 2 and 147; F-ratio = 3.05

F-cal = 21.26 > F-critical = 3.05 at 0.05 significant level. Consequently, we reject H_0 and accept H_1 . This implies that the child environment significantly affects the adolescent's vulnerability to delinquency.

Again the protected t-test is used to determine the trend of the difference in the level of effect as follows:

Table 4: Protected t-test Analysis of Difference in vulnerability to delinquency on perception of Child Environment

Levels of Environmenta/Society Acceptance	Warmth	Indifference	Cold
High	35.72 ^a	1.17	4.89*
Moderate		34.14	4.33*
Low			27.52

* Significant at 0.05; Group means are in the diagonal and protected t-values are above the diagonal

Table 4 shows that adolescents who perceived their environment to be cold significantly are more vulnerable to delinquent behavior than either those who have high perception of their environment (t=4.89; df= 76; critical t=2.01; p<0.05) or those with moderate perception of their environment (t= 4.33; df= 103; critical t= 2.00; p<0.05). The

comparison between those who have high perception of their environment and those with moderate perception of their environment was not significant ($t=1.17$; $df=115$; critical $t= 2.00$; $p>0.05$).

Hypothesis 3: Society attitude towards child environment does not significantly affect adolescent's vulnerability to delinquency.

Table 5: One-Way Analysis of Variance on the Society attitude towards child environment does not significantly affect adolescents vulnerability to delinquency

Level of societal attitude to child's environment	N	\bar{X}	SD	
Warmth	38	35.00	6.69	
Indifference	61	34.14	3.84	
Cold	51	29.72	3.12	
Sources of Variance	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-Ratio
Between Groups	819.87	2	409.94	7.70
Within Groups	7816.83	147	53.18	
Total	8636.80	149		

Significant at 0.05; $df = 2$ and 147 ; F-ratio = 3.05

From the above table, $F_{cal} = 7.70 > F_{crit} = 3.05$ at 0.05 level of significance level, consequently we reject the H_0 and accept the H_1 , indicating that society's attitude towards child environment significantly affects the adolescent's vulnerability to delinquency.

The protected t-test was done to determine the difference in the levels.

Table: 6 Protected t-test Analysis of Difference in adolescents vulnerability to delinquency due to Levels of Societal Attitude towards Child's Environment

Levels of Society Attitude	Warmth	Indifference	Cold
Warmth	35.00 ^a	0.40	3.44*
Indifference		34.14	4.33*
Cold			27.52

* Significant at 0.05; Group means are in the diagonal while protected t-values are above the diagonal

Table 6 shows that the child who views societal attitude towards his environment as cold significantly has higher vulnerability to delinquent behavior than either those who have high societal attitude to the environment ($t=3.44$; $df=87$; critical $t=2.00$; $p<0.05$) or those whose societal view of the environment is indifferent (4.33 ; $df=110$; critical $t= 2.00$; $p<0.05$).

Hypothesis 4: Type of school attended does not significantly affect adolescent's vulnerability to delinquency.

The means and standard deviation for students in both private and public secondary schools were calculated. The independent t-test was used to test the presence of and the level of difference as shown below.

Table 7: An Independent t-test Analysis of Difference in Adolescents' Vulnerability to Delinquency in Public and Private Senior Secondary Schools

Type of School	N	\bar{X}	SD	T-cal	T-crit
Public	75	31.18	7.87	3.36	1.98
Private	75	34.89	4.36		

Significant at 0.05; $df = 148$; $t\text{-crit} = 1.98$

Table 7 shows that a calculated t-value of 3.36 resulted as the difference in adolescents' vulnerability to delinquency due to type of school they attend. This calculated t-value of 3.44 is significant since it is greater than the critical t-value of 1.98 given 148 degrees of freedom at 0.05 level of significance. This means that adolescents from private senior secondary schools significantly have less vulnerability to delinquent behavior than those from public senior secondary schools.

Discussions

A large number of studies have documented the fact that for certain groups of children, conduct problems in childhood tend to continue across development as well as predict later delinquency in adolescence and adulthood (Broidy et al., 2003; Loeber and Dishion, 1983). Understanding the etiology and development of conduct and antisocial problems is therefore crucial for preventing of these behaviour problems.

The result of testing hypothesis one revealed that adolescents who are raised under the laissez-faire fathering method have significant tendencies toward delinquency than either those raised in authoritarian fathering style or those raised in democratic fathering style. Many parents note and believe that they can help mould their children into well-adjusted adults who can control their impulses with regards to drugs crime and violence and such other antisocial and destructive behaviours (Finkenauer, Engels and Baymeister, 2005). These hope and belief ought to be such as to either directly or indirectly promote self-control and self-esteem in their children. The child also grows up in an overly permissive home and with a laissez-faire father, is most likely to throw caution to the wind while relating with others.

Studies also indicate that parents of anxious children were found to be authoritarian, more controlling, and restrictive and over involved as well as less accepting and granting psychological autonomy to their children (Dumas, Lafreniere and Sarketich, 1995; Hirshfeld, Biederman, Brody, Faraone and Rosenbaum, 1997b, Krohne and Hock, 1991; Sigueland, Kendll and Steinberg, 1996). Studies have also demonstrated that a combination of high warmth, acceptance and involvement (which characterizes both authoritarian and laissez-

faire) together with high structures, could foster optimal adjustment in a child's character (Martinez, Garcia and Yubero, 2007).

Fathering methods affect adolescents' social orientation, Villalobos, Cruz and Sanchez (2004) found that adolescents from authoritative and laissez-faire families indicated high propensity towards rebelliousness than those from democratic families. These discrepancies in the associations between parenting and adolescents' adjustments, suggest that parenting practices have different meanings and implications for children, depending on the socio-cultural context in which they occur (Chao, 1994; Tan and Lam, 2003; Musity and Garcia, 2004; Villalobos, et al, 2004).

The analysis of hypothesis two showed that there is a significant difference in a child's perception of his environment on vulnerability to delinquency. Smets and Hartup (1988) maintain that family functioning has an influence on the development of self-esteem, self-esteem being a predictive factor in adolescent social context (Osarenren, Ubangha and Oke, 2008). One of the well-investigated environmental familial risk factors for antisocial behaviour is parenting practices (Narusyte, 2009). Therefore, given the importance of family in development and specifically the child's awareness of social milieu, Ha, Marsh, Martin and Halse (2012) contend that positive development, identity formation and self-concept can be directly and indirectly linked to the family and family environment.

Children with involved, caring and warm-hearted fathers have better developmental outcomes. Pruett (2000) maintain that fathers who are involved, nurturing and playful with their children; who are more patient and can handle stresses better and are more likely to provide a stable psychological and emotional support. Furthermore, a father who has a good relationship with the mother of their children is more likely to be involved and to spend time with their children; they are more responsive, affectionate and confident with defiant toddlers and better confidants for teenagers seeking advice and emotional support (Lamb, 1997).

Osarenren (2002), underscores the immense influence exerted by heredity and environment in the development of the individual. There is, therefore the need to recognize and detect early behaviour problems and find strategies to intervene and prevent the development of behavioural and emotional problems in children and adolescents (Gutman and Eccles, 2007).

The findings of hypothesis three indicate that the prevailing social environment of the child impact upon behavioural development. The society provides the socio-cultural climate in which the child develops and by implication affects the behavioural patterns of the individual. Narusyte (2009) opined that valuable insights in the origins of the development of adjustment problems have been gained through the study of the role heritable and environmental factors.

Onyekwere (2001), refers to the environment as the sum total of all the external influence or forces which shape the development and behaviour of a person in life. This study supports Lerner's (1986) work on developmental contextualization which has added to the understanding of community context in its articulation of the ecologies that inform development and how adolescents are influenced by their social contexts. Children in rural areas are known to skip classes on market days or during farming season to help parents. This tends towards truancy and the attendant maladaptive behaviours.

The analysis of hypothesis four showed that there is a significant difference in adolescents' vulnerability to delinquency that can be attributed to the type of school environment. Nature and environment are essential predictors for human development. The National Academy of Science (2000) indicate that research over the past few decades on normal child development and on development of delinquent behaviour has shown that individual, social and community conditions as well as their interaction influence behaviour.

This analysis is given credence by the contextual effect suggesting that living in areas of concentrated poverty, restricts the opportunities to residents and aggravates individual disadvantage, fostering subcultural orientations and problem behaviours especially among children and adolescents (Booth and Crouter 2001; Friedrichs, 1998; Friedrichs et al., 2003; Jencks and Mayer, 1990; Leventhal and Brooks-Gunn, 2000; Murie and Mustard, 2004; Sampson et al., 2002; Wilson, 1987). Duncan and Raundebust (2001) illustrates contextual effect as that of a child whose parents are unemployed but lives in an affluent neighbourhood who has better prospects than that of a similar child whose parents are unemployed and lives in a deprived neighbourhood.

This is even true for the selection of adolescents into schools, while there may be a host of other determinant factors; the school constitutes an overlapping but independent ecological context for the younger age groups. The family environment and the school environment have regularly been linked in the literature to psychosocial and behavioural adjustment problems in the adolescent period (Esterez, Musitu and Herrero, 2005; Murray and Murray, 2004; Stevens, De Bourdeaudhuij and Van Oost, 2002). The quality of adolescent-parent, adolescent-peer and adolescent-teacher interactions influence and may determine the way adolescents perceive themselves in relation to others, their attitudes and their behaviours (Jessor, 1991; Lila, Buelga, and Musitu, 2006; Werner, 2004).

In the school environment, being academically successful, perceiving peers in the classroom as friends or colleagues, and having positive interactions with teacher have all been identified as important for the adolescent's psychosocial adjustment (Andreou, 2000; Balnkemeyer, Flannery, and Vazsenyi, 2002; Reinke and Herman, 2002). Students sharing these characteristics are likely to perceive the school as a useful learning context the purpose of which is to help them construct a successful future for themselves. Such students will not normally, therefore exhibit behavioural problems (Jack et al, 1996; Molpeceres, Lucas and Pons, 2000; Samdal, 1998). A negative school environment in contrast, damages children's and adolescents' potential (Moote and Wodarski, 1997).

Conclusion and Recommendation

The current research contributes to our understanding of the role of family and particularly, the fathering method and the school environment in forging adolescent behaviour. These variables, from the study, form predictive factors towards behaviour outcomes. A negative climate in the family and school contexts may lead to maladaptive behaviour patterns, but also an adolescent's delinquent behaviour may itself worsen the environment in these contexts (Esterez, et al, 2005). It is, therefore recommended that:

1. Parents design the environment that will demonstrate warmth, acceptance, emotional support and involvement in the upbringing of their children.
2. The cultural and socioeconomic milieu are important factors that affect behaviour pattern of the individual. These contextual factors shape major domains of responsible fathering and adolescent's development of self-esteem. Care must be taken towards developing friendly institutional practices and economic factors for future generation.
3. The choice of school and its environment is pivotal for the adolescents mental and social well-being. The goal of the education of children is not only to teach them, more or less intellectual knowledge, nor only to teach them virtues in the sense of honesty, courage etc. It remains the process whereby the younger members of the society are made to develop the potentials within them to the fullest.

References

- Aluko, O. (2012). Impact of poverty on housing condition in Nigeria: A case study of Mushin Local Government Area of Lagos State. *Journal of African Studies and Development*, 4(3), 81 – 89.
- Andreou, E. (2000). Bully/Victim problems and their association with psychological constructs in 8 – 12 years old Greek School Children. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 26, 49 – 56.
- Baruch, G. K. and Barnett, R. C. (1986). Consequences of fathers' participation in family work: Parent's role strain and wellbeing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 983 – 992.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11, 56 – 95.
- Blankemeyer, M., Flannery, D. J. and Vazsonyi, A. T. (2002). The role of aggression and social competence in children's perceptions of the child-teacher relationship. *Psychology in the Schools*, 39(3), 293 – 304.
- Booth, A. and Crouter, A. C. (Eds) (2001). *Does it Take a Village? Community Effects on Children, Adolescents and Families* (Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum).
- Broidy, L. M., Nagin, D. S., Tremblay, R. E., Bates, J. E., Brame, B., Dodge, K. A. et al. (2003). Developmental trajectories of childhood disruptive behaviours and adolescent delinquency: a six-site, cross-national study. *Developmental Psychology*, 39 (2), 222 – 245.
- Cashwell, C. S and Vacc, N. A. (1996). Family Functioning and Risk Behaviours: Influence on adolescent delinquency. *School Counsellor*. 44: 105-15.
- Cowan, C. P. and Cowan, P. A. (1987). Men's involvement in parenthood: Identifying the antecedents and understanding the barriers. In P. W. Berman and F. A. Pedersen (Eds.) *Men's transitions to parenthood: Longitudinal studies of early family experience*, (pp. 145 – 174). Hillsdale NJ:
- Daly, K. J. (1995). Reshaping fatherhood: Finding the models. In W. Masiglio (Ed.), *Fatherhood: Contemporary theory, research and social policy* (pp. 21 – 40). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Doherty, W. J., Kouneski, E. and Erickson, M. F. (1996). Responsible fathering: An overview and conceptual framework. <http://fatherhood.hhs.gov/concept.htm>.
- Dumas, J. E., Lafreniere, P. J. and Serketich, W. J. (1995). "Balance of power": a transactional analysis of control in mother-child dyads involving socially competent, aggressive and anxious children. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 104(1), 104 – 113.
- Duncan, G. J. and Raudenbush, S. W. (2001). Neighbourhoods and adolescent development: how can we determine the link?

- Estevez, E., Musitu, G. and Herrero, J. (2005). The influence of violent behaviour and victimization at school on psychological distress. The role of parents and teachers. *Adolescence*, 40, 183 – 195.
- Finkernauer, C., Engels, R. C. M. E., and Baumeister, R. F. (2005). Parenting behaviour and adolescent behavioural and emotional problems. The role of self-control. *International Journal of Behavioural Development*, 29(1), 58 – 69.
- Friedrichs, J. (1998). Do poor neighbourhoods make their residents poor? Context effects of poverty neighbourhoods on residents, in: H. J. Andree B. (Ed.) *Empirical Poverty Research in a Comparative Perspective*, pp. 77 – 78, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Friedrichs, J., Galster, G. and Musterd, S. (2003). Neighbourhood effects on social opportunities: The European and American Research and Policy Context, *Housing Studies*, 18, 797 – 806.
- Gorbett, K. and Kruckzek, T. (2008). Family Factors predicting social self-esteem in Young Adults. *The Family Journal: Counselling and Therapy for Couples and Families*, 16 (11), 58 – 65.
- Gray, M. R. and Steinberg, L. (1999). Unpacking authoritative parenting: reassessing a multidimensional construct. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 574 – 587.
- Griffin, K. W., Botvin, G. J., Scheier, L. M., Diaz, T. and Miller, N. L. (2000). Parenting practices as predictor of substance use, delinquency and aggression among urban minority youth: Moderating effects of family structure and gender. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviours*, 14, 174 – 184.
- Gutman, L. M. and Eccles, J. S. (2007). Stage-environment fit during adolescence: Trajectories of family relations and adolescent outcomes. *Developmental Psychology*, 43(2), 522 – 537.
- Ha, M. T., Marsh, H. W., Martin, A. J. and Halse, C. (2006). Perceptions of family functioning and self-concept in Adolescent Anorexia Nervosa (R). www.self.ox.ac.uk/conferences/2006/haI.pdf
- Hirshfeld, D. R., Biederman, J., Brody, L., Faraone, S. V. and Rosenbaum, J. F. (1997b). Expressed emotion toward children with behavioural inhibition: associations with maternal anxiety disorder. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 36(7), 910-917.
- Ihinger-Tallman, M., Pasley, K. and Buechler, C. (1995). Developing a middle-range theory of father involvement postdivorce. In W. Marsiglio (Ed.), *Fatherhood: Contemporary Theory, Research and Social Policy* (pp. 57 – 77). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Ilogu, G. C. (2005). *Educational Research and Evaluation: A comparison for students*. Lagos: Mandate Communications Ld.

- Jack, S. L., Shores, R. E., Denny, R. K., Gunter, P. L., Defriere, T. and DePaepe, P. (1996). An analysis of the relationships of teachers' reported use of classroom management strategies on types of classroom interactions. *Journal of Behavioural Education*, 6, 67 – 87.
- Jencks, C. and Mayer, S. e. (1990). The social consequences of growing up in a poor neighbourhood, in: L. E. Lynn and MGeary (Eds). *Inncer-City Poverty in the United States*, pp. 111 – 186. Washington DC: National Academy Press.
- Jessor, R. (1991). Risk behaviour in adolescence: A psychosocial framework for understanding and action. *Journal of Adolescence Health*, 12, 597 – 605.
- Jones, L. (1991). Unemployed fathers and their children: Implications for policy and practice. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 8, 101 – 116.
- Krohne, H. W. and Hock, M. (1991). Relationships between restrictive mother-child interactions and anxiety of the child. *Anxiety Research*, 4, 109 – 124.
- Lamb, M. E. (1987a). Introduction: The emergent American father. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The father's role Cross-cultural perspectives*, (pp. 3 – 25). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lamb, M. E. (1997). Fathers and child development: An introductory overview and guide. In M. E. Lamb (Ed), *The role of fathers in child development*. (3rd ed., pp. 1-18, 309 – 313). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lamb, M. E., Pleck, J., Charnov, E. L. and Levine, J. A. (1985). Paternal behaviour in humans. *American Zoologist*, 25, 883 – 894.
- Langenderfer, G. (1999). Karen Horney (1885 – 1952). <http://www.muskingum.edu/~psych/psycweb/history/horney.htm>
- Larson, R. W. (1993). Finding time for fatherhood: The emotional ecology of adolescent-father interactions. In S. Shulman & Collins, W. A. (Eds.), *Father-adolescent relationships* (pp. 725). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Larson, R. W. and Richards, M. H. (1994). *Divergent realities: The emotional lives of mothers, fathers and adolescents*. New York: Basic Books.
- Leventhal, T. and Brooks-Gunn, J. (2000). The neighbourhoods they live in: the effects of neighbourhood residence on child and adolescents outcomes, *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, pp. 309 – 337.
- Lewis, Y. (1996). *Nurturing Fatherhood*. Boston: Wiley Press.
- Lila, M., Buelga, S. and Musitu, G. (2006). *Relationships between parents and children in adolescence*. Madrid: Piramide.
- Loeber, R. and Dishion, T. (1983). Early predictions of male delinquency: A review, *Psychological Bulletin*, 94, 68 – 99.

- Maccoby, E. E. and Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen (Ed), *Handbook of Child Psychology*, Vol. 4. New York: Wiley. Pp 1 – 101.
- Marsiglio, W. (1991). Paternal engagement activities with minor children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53, 973 – 986.
- Martinez, I. and Garcia, J. F. (2007). Parenting styles and adolescents' self-esteem in Brazil. *Psychological Report*, 100, 731 – 745.
- McLoyd, V. C. (1989). Socialization and development in a changing economy: The effects of paternal job loss and income loss on children. *American Psychologist*, 44, 293 – 302.
- Molpeceres, M. A., Lucas, A. and Pons, D. (2000). School experiences and orientation towards institutional authority in adolescence. *Revista de Psicologia Social*, 15, 87 – 105.
- Moote, G. T. Jrs. and Wodarski, J. S. (1997). The acquisition of life skills through adventure-based activities and programmes: A review of the literature. *Adolescence*, 32, 143 – 167.
- Murie, A. and Musterd, S. (2004). Social exclusion and opportunity structures in European cities and neighbourhood, *Urban Studies*, 14, pp. 1441 – 1459.
- Murray, C. and Murray, K. M. (2004). Child level correlations of teacher-students relationships: An examination of demographic orientation characteristics, academia orientations, and behavioural orientations. *Psychology in the schools*, 41, 751 – 762.
- Narusyte, J. (2000). Adolescent adjustment problems: The role of heritability and family environment. Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics Karolinska Institute, Stockholm, Sweden.
- National Agency of Science (2000). Development of Delinquency. www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record-id=9747&page=66html
- Ngale, I. F. (2009). Family Structure and Juvenile Delinquency: Correctional Centre Betamba, Centre Province of Cameroon. *Internet Journal of Criminology*.
- Oberwitter, D. (2007). The Effects of Neighbourhood Poverty on Adolescent Problem Behaviours: A Multi-level Analysis Differential by Gender and Ethnicity. *Housing Studies*, 22(5), 781 – 803.
- Omoegun, M. (2004). Early Childhood Care and Education as Antidote for Maladaptive behaviours among selected Lagos State Primary School Children in Nigeria: Implications for Counselling. *Lagos Journal of Education Research* 2(1), 42 – 55.
- Onyekwere, P. E. (2001). *Child Development Psychology: Therapy and Practice*. Lagos: T-Excel Publishers.

- Ortese, P. T. (1998). Single-parenting in Nigeria: Counselling Concerns and Implications. *The Counsellor*, 16(1) 61 – 66.
- Osarenren, N. (2002). *Child Development and Personality*. Lagos: Derate Nig. Ltd.
- Pittman, J. F. (1993). Functionalism may be down, but it surely is not out. Another point of view for family therapists and policy analysis. In P. G. Boss, W. J. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. R. Schumm and S. K. Steinmetz (Eds), *Sourcebook of Family Theories and Methods. A Contextual Approach* (pp. 218 – 224). New York: Plenum Press.
- Pruett, K. (2002). *Father-need*. New York: Broadway Books.
- Reinke, W. M. and Herman, K. C. (2002). Creating school environment that deter antisocial behaviours in youth. *Psychology in the Schools*, 39, 549 – 559.
- Rosenberg, J. and Wilcox, W. B. (2006). The importance of Fathers in the health development of children. <http://www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/usermanuals/fatherhood/chaptertwo.cfm>
- Samdal, O. (1998). *The school environment as a risk or resource for students' health-related behaviours and subjective well-being*. Norway: University of Bergen.
- Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D. and Gannon-Rowley, T. (2002). Assessing neighbourhood effects: social processes and new directions in research, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28, pp. 443 – 478.
- Sigueland, L., Kendall, P. C. and Steinberg, L. (1990). Anxiety in children: Perceived family environment and observed family interaction. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 25, 225 – 237.
- Smets, A. C. and Hartup, W. W. (1988). Systems and Symptoms: Family Cohesion/adaptability and childhood behaviour problems. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 16, 233 – 246.
- Stevens, V., De Bourdeadjuj, I. and Van Oost, P. (2002). Relationship of the family environment to children's involvement in bully/victim problems at school. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 31, 419 – 428.
- Thomas, E., Hanson, T. and McLanahan, S. S. (1994). Family structure and child well-being: Economic resources versus parent socialization. *Social Forces*, 73, 221 – 242.
- Werner, N. E. (2004). Maladaptive peer relationships and the development of relational and physical aggression during middle childhood. *Social Development*, 13, 495 – 514.
- Wikipedia (2012). *Mushin, Nigeria*: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/mushin-Nigeria>.
- Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City. The Underclass and Public Policy*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Wright, K. N. and Wright, K. E. (1994). Family Life, Delinquency, and Crime: A Policymakers Guide. Research Summary. Washington DC: OJJDP. 4-21.