

THE ROLE OF FAMILY AND OTHER AGENCIES IN THE IMPACT OF DEVIANT BEHAVIOUR OF THE CHILDREN

Syed Basha Hussain, Research Scholar in PhD, Dept. of Sociology and Social Work, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Nagarjuna Nagar, Guntur.

Dr.M.Thrimurthy Rao, Associate Professor, Dept. of Sociology and Social Work, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Nagarjuna Nagar, Guntur.

Abstract

In spite of the fact that family plays dominating role in the development and character formation of the juvenile, the influence of the family (parents, guardian, siblings, relatives and etc) and other agencies like neighbourhood, school and peer groups, medias like i.e. television, internet, pornographic literature etc, on the behavioural pattern of the child cannot be totally ignored. Moreover, various studies have shown that neighbourhood influence, school environment, peer influence and media influence are the major determining factors of deviant behaviour among the children. Keeping all these in view in this chapter, an attempt has been made to study the role of families and other agencies which cause of juveniles who are charged with committing the offence.

Key words: Character, Juvenile, literature, environment etc.

Introduction

Generally many children may be exposed to deviant behaviour learned from their parents/guardians, the parents/guardian attitude towards their other children when compared to the respondents is an important reason for one to may be commit an offence. Further, the family environment also an important role played on the deviant behaviour of the children.

Universe and Sampling

In the Telangana state two children's homes, one special homes, one special home cum children home and three observation homes are established by the government. Among these one special home cum children are meant for girl delinquents. In all the homes 281 children are staying during the time of data collection. The sample of the study is a total of 281 respondents.

Findings of the study

Table-6.2: Any member committed crime in the Family Vs. Gender

Gender	Has any member in your family committed a crime		Total
	Yes	No	
Male	53	192	245
	18.9%	68.3%	87.2%
Female	4	32	36
	1.4%	11.4%	12.8%
Total	57	224	281
	20.3%	79.7%	100.0%

$\chi^2=0.585$, $df=1$, $P < 0.269$, Not Significant at 0.05 level

It can be seen from the table 6.2 that has any member in the family committed a crime, of the total 281 respondents, 20.3 per cent of respondents revealed that committed crime in the family and 79.7 per cent of the respondents revealed that didn't commit any crime in the family.

In the male category, of the total 245 respondents, 18.9 per cent of the respondents revealed that committed crime in the family and 68.3 per cent didn't commit any crime in the family.

In the female category, of the total 36 respondents, 1.4 per cent committed crime in the family and 11.4 per cent didn't commit any crime in the family.

The chi square table shows that has any member in the family committed a crime by their gender. There is no significant relationship in between male and female has any member in the family committed a crime.

Table-6.3: Any member in the family ever been convicted, imprisoned Vs. Age

Age	Has a member in your family ever been convicted, imprisoned		Total
	Yes	No	
< - 12	3	16	19
	1.1%	5.7%	6.8%
13 - 14	21	119	140
	7.5%	42.3%	49.8%
15 - 16	17	87	104
	6.0%	31.0%	37.0%
17 - >	3	15	18
	1.1%	5.3%	6.4%
Total	44	237	281
	15.7%	84.3%	100.0%

$\chi^2=0.041$, $df=1$, $P < 0.491$, **Not Significant at 0.05 level**

The table 6.3 portrays that any member in the family ever been convicted, imprisoned, of the total 281 respondents, 15.7 per cent of the respondents portrays that family member has been convicted and imprisoned and 84.3 per cent the large majority has not been convicted and imprisoned.

The age wise category in between 12 and below years of age group, of the total 19 respondents, 1.1 per cent of the respondents portrays that family member been convicted, imprisoned and 5.7 per cent per cent didn't convicted, imprisoned.

In the 13 -14 years age group, of the total 140 respondents, 7.5 per cent of the respondents portrays that family member been convicted, imprisoned and 42.3 per cent didn't convicted, imprisoned.

In the 15 -16 years age group, of the total 104 respondents, 6.0 per cent of the respondents portrays that family member been convicted, imprisoned and 31.0 per cent didn't convicted, imprisoned.

In the 17 and above years age group, of the total 18 respondents, 1.1 per cent of the respondents portrays that family member been convicted, imprisoned and 5.3 per cent didn't convicted, imprisoned.

The chi-square table indicates that the relationship between age and family member been convicted, imprisoned. There is no difference in age wise categories by family member been convicted, imprisoned ($P=0.491$) at 0.01 levels.

Table-6.8: Communication with parents Vs. Gender

Gender	How is communication with parents		Total
	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Male	86	159	245
	30.6%	56.6%	87.2%
Female	17	19	36
	6.0%	6.8%	12.8%
Total	103	178	281
	36.7%	63.3%	100.0%

$\chi^2=1.986$, $df=1$, $P < 0.111$, **Not Significant at 0.05 level**

It can be seen from the table 6.8 that how is communication with parents, of the total 281 respondents, 36.7 per cent of respondents revealed that communication with parents is satisfactory and 63.3 per cent of the respondents revealed that unsatisfactory communication with parents.

In the male category, of the total 245 respondents, 30.6 per cent of the respondents revealed that communication with parents are satisfactory and 68.3 per cent per cent unsatisfactory communication with parents.

In the female category, of the total 36 respondents, 6.0 per cent of the respondents revealed that communication with parents are satisfactory and 6.8 per cent unsatisfactory communication with parents.

The chi square table shows that how is communication with parents by their gender. There is no significant relationship in between male and female in communicating with parents.

INFLUENCE OF NEIGHBOURHOOD AND PEER GROUP

It is necessary to know whether the children have seen anti-social acts committed by others in the surrounding their residence, because the children that have been involved in the offence may have learned it from others. The majority respondents accept that the illegal activities were occurred near from their residential areas.

This study on juveniles to be in conflict with law inquire in to the children who have seen any kind of anti-social activities committed by other children. This is important to analyze because there may be a possibility for the children to learn the deviant behaviour from those people.

Table-6.27: Have friends in neighbourhood Vs. Age

Ho: There is no statistically significant difference of having friends in neighbourhood by their age.

Age	Did you have friends in your neighbourhood		Total
	Yes	No	
< - 12	8	11	19
	2.8%	3.9%	6.8%
13 - 14	76	64	140
	27.0%	22.8%	49.8%
15 - 16	57	47	104
	20.3%	16.7%	37.0%
17 - >	8	10	18
	2.8%	3.6%	6.4%
Total	149	132	281
	53.0%	47.0%	100.0%

$\chi^2=1.664$, $df=3$, $P < 0.645$, Not Significant at 0.05 level

The table 6.27 portrays that did you have friends in your neighbourhood, of the total 281 respondents, 53.0 per cent of the respondents portrays that have friends in the neighbourhood and 47.0 per cent didn't have friends in the neighbourhood.

The age wise category in between 12 and below years of age group, of the total 19 respondents, 2.8 per cent of the respondents portrays that have friends in the neighbourhood and 3.9 per cent didn't have friends in the neighbourhood.

In the 13 -14 years age group, of the total 140 respondents, 27.0 per cent of the respondents portrays that have friends in the neighbourhood and 22.8 per cent didn't have friends in the neighbourhood.

In the 15 -16 years age group, of the total 104 respondents, 20.3 per cent of the respondents portrays that have friends in the neighbourhood and 16.7 per cent didn't have friends in the neighbourhood.

In the 17 and above years age group, of the total 18 respondents, 2.8 per cent of the respondents portrays that have friends in the neighbourhood and 3.6 per cent didn't have friends in the neighbourhood.

The chi-square table indicates that the relationship between age and did you have friends in your neighbourhood. There is no difference in age wise categories by did you have friends in your neighbourhood ($P= 0.645$) at 0.01 levels. Hence, the null hypothesis has been accepted and the research hypothesis was rejected.

Table-6.29: Physical assault quiet frequent Vs. Caste

Caste	Was physical assault quiet frequent in the area		Total
	Yes	No	
OC	6	38	44
	2.1%	13.5%	15.7%
BC	19	101	120
	6.8%	35.9%	42.7%
SC	14	78	92
	5.0%	27.8%	32.7%
ST	3	22	25
	1.1%	7.8%	8.9%
Total	42	239	281
	14.9%	85.1%	100.0%

$\chi^2=0.310$, $df=3$, $P < 0.958$, Not Significant at 0.05 level

The table 6.29 furnishes that was physical assault quiet frequent, of the total 281 respondents, 14.9 per cent of the respondents furnishes that was physical assault quiet frequent and 85.1 per cent didn't have physical assault quiet frequent.

In the other caste (Forward Caste) category, of the total 44 respondents, 2.1 per cent of the respondents furnishes that was physical assault quiet frequent and 13.5 per cent didn't have physical assault quiet frequent.

In the backward caste category, of the total 120 respondents, 6.8 per cent of the respondents furnishes that was physical assault quiet frequent and 35.9 per cent didn't have physical assault quiet frequent.

In the schedule caste category, of the total 92 respondents, 5.0 per cent of the respondents furnishes that was physical assault quiet frequent and 27.8 per cent didn't have physical assault quiet frequent.

In the scheduled tribe caste category, of the total 25 respondents, 1.1 per cent of the respondents furnishes that was physical assault quiet frequent and 7.8 per cent didn't have physical assault quiet frequent.

The study shows the results of the Chi-square test that there is no significant difference between caste and was physical assault quiet frequent ($P= 0.958$) at 0.01 levels. The results show that there is no statistically significant difference in physical assault quiet frequent by their caste.

Table-6.35: Particular gang of boys in the Neighbourhood Vs. Caste

Caste	Was there any particular gang of boys in your Neighbourhood		Total
	Yes	No	
OC	26	18	44
	9.3%	6.4%	15.7%
BC	57	63	120
	20.3%	22.4%	42.7%
SC	45	47	92
	16.0%	16.7%	32.7%
ST	11	14	25
	3.9%	5.0%	8.9%
Total	139	142	281
	49.5%	50.5%	100.0%

$\chi^2=2.126$, $df=3$, $P < 0.547$, Not Significant at 0.05 level

The table 6.35 furnishes that was there any particular gang of boys in your Neighbourhood, of the total 281 respondents, 49.5 per cent of the respondents furnishes that particular gang of boys in the neighbourhood and 50.5 per cent didn't have the particular gang of boys in the neighbourhood.

In the other caste (Forward Caste) category, of the total 44 respondents, 9.3 per cent of the respondents furnishes that particular gang of boys in the neighbourhood and 6.4 per cent didn't have the particular gang of boys in the neighbourhood.

In the backward caste category, of the total 120 respondents, 20.3 per cent of the respondents furnishes that particular gang of boys in the neighbourhood and 22.4 per cent didn't have the particular gang of boys in the neighbourhood.

In the schedule caste category, of the total 92 respondents, 16.0 per cent of the respondents furnishes that particular gang of boys in the neighbourhood and 16.7 per cent didn't have the particular gang of boys in the neighbourhood.

In the scheduled tribe caste category, of the total 25 respondents, 3.9 per cent of the respondents furnishes that particular gang of boys in the neighbourhood and 5.0 per cent didn't have the particular gang of boys in the neighbourhood.

The study shows the results of the Chi-square test that there is no significant difference between caste and that particular gang of boys in the neighbourhood ($P= 0.547$) at 0.01 levels. The results show that there is no statistically significant difference in that particular gang of boys in the neighbourhood by their caste.

Table-6.39: How many friends Vs. Age

Age	How many friends you had		Total
	One	Two & More	
< - 12	15	4	19
	5.3%	1.4%	6.8%

13 - 14	109	31	140
	38.8%	11.0%	49.8%
15 - 16	74	30	104
	26.3%	10.7%	37.0%
17 - >	14	4	18
	5.0%	1.4%	6.4%
Total	212	69	281
	75.4%	24.6%	100.0%

$\chi^2=1.652$, $df=3$, $P < 0.648$, Not Significant at 0.05 level

The table 6.39 portrays that how many friends you had, of the total 281 respondents, 75.4 per cent of the respondents portrays that they have one friend and 24.6 per cent of the respondents has two friends and more at their locality.

The age wise category in between 12 and below years of age group, of the total 19 respondents, 5.3 per cent of the respondents portrays that they have one friend and 1.4 per cent of the respondents has two friends and more at their locality.

In the 13 -14 years age group, of the total 140 respondents, 38.8 per cent of the respondents portrays that they have one friend and 11.0 per cent of the respondents has two friends and more at their locality.

In the 15 -16 years age group, of the total 104 respondents, 26.3 per cent of the respondents portrays that they have one friend and 10.7 per cent of the respondents has two friends and more at their locality.

In the 17 and above years age group, of the total 18 respondents, 5.0 per cent of the respondents portrays that they have one friend and 1.4 per cent of the respondents has two friends and more at their locality.

The chi-square table indicates that the relationship between age and how many friends you had. There is no difference in age wise categories by how many friends you had ($P= 0.648$) at 0.01 levels.

Table-6.45: Have ever smoked Vs. Caste

Caste	Have you ever smoked		Total
	Yes	No	
OC	19	25	44
	6.8%	8.9%	15.7%
BC	57	63	120
	20.3%	22.4%	42.7%
SC	46	46	92
	16.4%	16.4%	32.7%
ST	15	10	25
	5.3%	3.6%	8.9%
Total	137	144	281
	48.8%	51.2%	100.0%

$\chi^2=1.945$, $df=3$, $P < 0.584$, Not Significant at 0.05 level

The table 6.45 furnishes that have you ever smoked, of the total 281 respondents, 48.8 per cent of the respondents furnishes that they have smoked and 51.2 per cent didn't smoked.

In the other caste (Forward Caste) category, of the total 44 respondents, 6.8 per cent of the respondents furnishes that they have smoked and 8.9 per cent didn't smoked.

In the backward caste category, of the total 120 respondents, 20.3 per cent of the respondents furnishes that they have smoked and 22.4 per cent didn't smoked.

In the schedule caste category, of the total 92 respondents, 16.4 per cent of the respondents furnishes that they have smoked and 16.4 per cent didn't smoked.

In the scheduled tribe caste category, of the total 25 respondents, 5.3 per cent of the respondents furnishes that they have smoked and 3.6 per cent didn't smoked.

The study shows the results of the Chi-square test that there is no significant difference between caste and have you ever smoked ($P= 0.584$) at 0.01 levels. The results show that there is no statistically significant difference in having ever smoked.

Table-6.46: Have ever consumed liquor Vs. Education**Ho:** There is no statistically significant difference of consumed liquor by their education.

Education	Have you ever consumed liquor		Total
	Yes	No	
Illiterate	43	91	134
	15.3%	32.4%	47.7%
Primary	38	42	80
	13.5%	14.9%	28.5%
Secondary	28	15	43
	10.0%	5.3%	15.3%
Inter & above	11	13	24
	3.9%	4.6%	8.5%
Total	120	161	281
	42.7%	57.3%	100.0%

 $\chi^2=15.846$, $df=3$, $P < 0.001$, Significant at 0.01 level

It can be observed from the table 6.46 that have you ever consumed liquor, of the total 281 respondents, 42.7 per cent of the respondents reported that they have consumed liquor and 57.3 per cent is not consumed liquor.

In the illiterate category, of the total 134 respondents, 15.3 per cent of the respondents reported that they have consumed liquor and 32.4 per cent is not consumed liquor.

In the primary education category, of the total 80 respondents, 13.5 per cent of the respondents reported that they have consumed liquor and 14.9 per cent is not consumed liquor.

In the secondary education category, of the total 43 respondents, 10.0 per cent of the respondents reported that they have consumed liquor and 5.3 per cent is not consumed liquor.

In the inter and above category, of the total 24 respondents, 3.9 per cent of the respondents reported that they have consumed liquor and 4.6 per cent is not consumed liquor.

The chi-square table revealed the relationship between education and have you ever consumed liquor. There is relationship in between education wise categories and have you ever consumed liquor and there is statistically significant association at 0.01 level. Hence, the null hypothesis has been rejected and the research hypothesis was accepted.

Table-6.47: Have ever taken any drug Vs. Place of Residence

Place of residence	Have you ever taken any drug		Total
	Yes	No	
Urban	47	128	175
	16.7%	45.6%	62.3%
Rural	29	77	106
	10.3%	27.4%	37.7%
Total	76	205	281
	27.0%	73.0%	100.0%

 $\chi^2=0.008$, $df=1$, $P < 0.517$, Not Significant at 0.05 level

The table 6.47 represents that have you ever taken any drug, of the total 281 respondents, 27.0 per cent respondents said that they have taken drugs and 73.0 per cent respondents said that they didn't take any drugs.

In urban area, of the total 175 respondents, 16.7 per cent respondents said that they have taken drugs and 45.6 per cent respondents said that they didn't take any drugs.

In rural area, of the total 106 respondents, 10.3 per cent respondents said that they have taken drugs and 27.4 per cent respondents said that they didn't take any drugs.

The chi-square table reveals that have you ever taken any drug by their place of residence. There is no

significant relationship in between urban and rural area by taking any drug.

Conclusion:

It is discussed about the influence of family, school environment and neighbourhood and peer group effects on develop the deviant behaviour and it is clearly indicates that major cause of juveniles were charges, with involved the offence. It is understood that the drugs and alcohol play a major role for deviant behaviour among the children.

References:

1. Becker, S.P., Kerig, P.K., Lim, J.P. &Ezechukwu, R.N. (2012). Journal of Child and Adolescent Trauma. Vol.5. issue 2.pp.145-160
2. Gove, W.R. (1982). The Family and Juvenile Delinquency. The Sociological Quarterly, Vol. 23, No. 3 (Summer), pp. 301-319. (Retrieved from <http://www.Jstor.org/stable/4106072> on 10/12/2013).
3. Mitra, N.L. (1988). Juvenile Delinquency and Indian Justice System. New Delhi: Deep and Deep Publications.

