

INEFFECTIVE PARENTING AND JUVENILE DELIQUENCY

Dr. SHAFAYAT ALI

Assistant Professor, Journalism, Higher Education Department, Government of Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan

Email: malikshafayat@gmail.com

MS. KUBRA ILYAS

MPhil Scholar at University of Okara

Email: kubrailyas92@gmail.com

MR. NOMAN AHMAD

MPhil Scholar at University of Okara

Email: nomanjameel391@gmail.com

MR. SAMIULLAH

BS Scholar at University of Okara

Email: samiullahrana5555@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Parenting a mentally and physically disabled child is associated with unique challenges and stressors that can significantly impact parental well-being. This abstract provides an overview of the parental stress experienced by caregivers of children with disabilities. The journey of raising a disabled child often involves navigating complex medical, educational, and social systems, as well as managing the child's specific needs and limitations. The demands placed on parents can be overwhelming, leading to heightened levels of stress. Several factors contribute to parental stress in this context, including the child's diagnosis, severity of disability, prognosis, and the availability and effectiveness of support services. Parental stress associated with caring for a disabled child can manifest in various ways. Emotional distress, such as feelings of sadness, guilt, and helplessness, is common among parents. Physical and mental exhaustion due to constant care giving responsibilities can also contribute to elevated stress levels. Financial strains resulting from medical expenses and the need for specialized equipment or therapy further compound the stress experienced by parents. The impact of parental stress extends beyond the individual well-being of caregivers. It can affect the overall family dynamics and relationships. Siblings may experience emotional neglect as parental attention and resources are disproportionately directed towards the disabled child. Marital strain is also observed, as the additional responsibilities and challenges can create tension and communication difficulties between partners. Recognizing and addressing parental stress is crucial for the well-being of both parents and the disabled child. Support systems that provide information, respite care, counseling, and peer support can help alleviate stress levels. Empowering parents through education about their child's condition and available resources is vital. Additionally, promoting self-care practices and fostering resilience in parents can enhance their ability to cope with the stressors associated with raising a disabled child. In conclusion, parenting a mentally and physically disabled child can significantly impact parental stress levels. Understanding the challenges faced by parents and implementing effective support strategies can mitigate stress, enhance parental well-being, and promote positive family dynamics. By providing comprehensive support, society can contribute to creating a nurturing environment for both parents and disabled children.

Keywords: Parenting, Juvenile Delinquency, Cross Tabulation.

Introduction

There is a long history of sociological inquiry on the connections between family dynamics and adolescent delinquency. Midway through the 20th century, researchers began examining the link between fatherlessness and adolescent offending. Fathers were considered to be particularly important in this study because it was hypothesized that children who lacked a father figure were more likely to engage in antisocial conduct. Subsequent studies built upon the foundation laid by these initial investigations by looking at how family dynamics (including conflict, substance abuse, and mental health issues) might affect the onset and progression of juvenile delinquency. This study also demonstrated the significance of family cohesiveness, parental engagement, and supervision in the fight against adolescent criminality.

The 1990s saw a change in emphasis away from individual risk factors and toward an ecological view that took into account the larger societal framework in which families function. As a result, programs designed specifically to aid families have emerged as a means of combating issues like poverty and crime in the community that have a profound impact on individuals inside the family unit. Parenting involves a wide variety of actions. Parenting styles—typologies of parenting behaviors—have been used to classify parenting practices. Based on Baumrind's parenting styles paradigm (Baumrind 1991), academics usually characterize parenting techniques by demandingness and responsiveness. Parental demandingness involves strict monitoring and confronting disobedient children. The amount to which parents purposefully nurture the child's independence and self-regulation via positive reinforcement and assistance that meets their needs is called responsiveness. Baumrind classifies four parenting styles: authoritarian, authoritative, permissive, and rejecting-neglecting (Baumrind 1996). She believes authoritative parenting—a blend of demandingness and responsiveness—is best for optimal growth.

Two important criminological theories predict delinquency using the two variables of parenting styles. Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) offered a universal theory of crime. This hypothesis states that poor self-control, a desire to commit crime, and other similar traits create delinquency and crime. Low self-control develops early in life, mostly through childrearing. Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990: 97) state that successful parenting to build self-control requires “Someone must (1) monitor the child’s behavior; (2) recognize deviant behavior when it occurs; (3) punish such behavior.” Thus, parental monitoring and supervision promote self-control that prevents delinquency and crime.

The general strain hypothesis, which argues that crime and delinquency are coping reactions to pressures faced by a person, also gives parenting practices a key role in the genesis of delinquency (Agnew 1992). If you believe Agnew, "stains" are "relationships in which others are not treating the individual as he or she would like to be treated" (p. 48). If a person feels that their stain is particularly unfair or severe, they may turn to crime as a means of coping. Agnew (2001) links the stresses of delinquency and criminality to a lack of parenting responsiveness, such as parental rejection, highly rigorous and excessive supervision/discipline, and child neglect and abuse. Ineffective parenting is considered a risk factor for delinquency not just by these two separate theories, but also by integrated theoretical approaches such the developmental theories of crime. For instance, Sampson and Laub (2005) contend that a lack of supervision and uneven punishment are two of the primary causes of juvenile delinquency.

Prior research, including from Cleveland et al. (2012), Li et al. (2020), and Machteld et al. (2011), has shown substantial support for the thesis that parenting practices, particularly demandingness and responsiveness, are connected to juvenile delinquency. Longitudinal research, such as that carried out by Simons and Conger 2 S. D. LI ET AL. (2007) and Bronte-Tinkew, Moore, and Carrano (2006), revealed, for instance, that children who were raised by parents who were both demanding and supportive were much less likely to get engaged in criminal activity. In a similar vein, Cheung and McBride-Chang (2008) conducted a study of the data obtained from the Pittsburgh Youth Study and discovered that low levels of demandingness and responsiveness were connected to higher levels of delinquent participation and persistent delinquency. These findings were based on the fact that low levels of demandingness and responsiveness were associated with less consequences for delinquent behavior.

A number of research reviews came to the same conclusion: there is a substantial connection between parenting styles and juvenile criminality. Machteld et al. (2009) conducted a meta-analysis of 161 empirical research and came to the conclusion that ineffective parenting approaches, particularly the absence of parental supervision and support, were positively connected to delinquency. This was shown to be the case. Sangawi, Adams, and Reissland (2015) showed that aspects of authoritative parenting, such as monitoring and caring, reduce childhood problem behaviors after reviewing 21 research that investigated the impact of parenting styles on behavioral problems among kids in primary schools. The studies were conducted to investigate the relationship between parenting styles and behavioral issues. Pinquart and Kauser (2018) conducted a meta-analysis of 428 studies on the associations of parenting

styles with behavior programs and academic achievement. They found strong evidence of a negative relationship between authoritative parenting and internalized and externalizing problems, including delinquency. The authors focused on the associations of parenting styles with behavior programs and academic achievement. Both a cross-sectional study involving 615 middle- and high-school students from rural and urban areas in mainland China (Bao, Haas, and Tao 2017) and a longitudinal study of secondary school students in Hong Kong over the course of 6 years (Shek and Zhu 2019) found a correlation between parenting practices and juvenile delinquency.

Global Perspective

Juvenile delinquency is a worldwide issue that affects society. Any society's future is its children. The society's growth is at jeopardy if these assets commit crimes. Juvenile delinquency involves minors breaking the law. Juvenile delinquency, delinquents, and delinquent activities must be understood. Juvenile delinquency is any criminal behavior by a child or teenager under 18 (Shoemaker, 2010). Many academics in the field of family studies agree that Chinese parents are better at encouraging social conformity in their children through practices of close monitoring and stricter control, while American parents are better at encouraging individual autonomy in their children through providing them with more love and encouragement.

Several studies have found that single-parent children are more likely to commit crimes than those from two-parent households. The Centre for Social Justice revealed in 2017 that 53% of UK juvenile offenders are from single-parent families, despite just 22% of the population being so. In 2017, the Indian Council of Medical Research discovered that family structure, specifically fatherlessness, predicted adolescent criminality. The research also indicated that children from low-income homes were more likely to be delinquent. Another 2019 University of Delhi study indicated that parental supervision and monitoring prevented adolescent misbehavior in India. Positive family interactions and communication reduce delinquency risk, the research found (ICMR 2017).

The quality of the parent-child bond and parental monitoring also reduce delinquency, according to study. Positive parent-child ties reduced teenage delinquency, according to a 2019 Cambridge research. Previous studies (Dwairy 2010; Keller et al. 2004) have provided compelling evidence that cultural factors have a role in the way in which parents bring up their children. According to Kroeber and Parsons (1958: 583), the definition of culture is the "transmitted and created content and patterns of values, ideas, and other symbolic-meaning systems as factors in the shaping of human behavior and the artifacts produced through behavior."

According to Crippen and Brew (2007) and Dwairy and Achoui (2006), educational ideals, role expectations, age-appropriate behavior, communication patterns, and problem-solving approaches are all determined or influenced by culture in relation to parenting practices. According to Gabrenya, Wang, and Latane (1985) and Hui and Villareal (1989), the two major nations in East and West, China and the United States, are seen to have separate cultural traditions that are defined by collectiveness or group-orientedness in China and individualism in the United States.

China is the largest country in East and the United States is the largest country in West. Collective cultures place an emphasis on the oneness of the group, the pursuit of shared objectives, interdependence, and collaboration. Individualism, on the other hand, promotes the autonomy of the individual, the pursuit of personal objectives, independence, equality, and competitiveness (Schwarz, Schafermeier, and Trommsdorff 2005). Although there is some evidence of cultural shifts as a result of the unprecedented level of globalization that has occurred in the past few decades (Lu and Chang 2013; Quoss and Zhao 1995; Wang 2014), a significant portion of the East-West divide that was created as a result of cultural adaptation to the local environment in the course of the evolutionary process over the course of thousands of years has persisted (Abbott, Fu Ming, and Meredith 1992; Chang, Chen, and Ji 2011). Comparative research has focused on how parenting practices differ in East and West cultures, as well as how the impacts of parenting styles on child development outcomes change depending on the cultural setting of the study. This is in accordance with the belief that there is a cultural split between the East and the West.

Pakistani Perspective

A delinquent is someone who breaks the law. Only after the rule breaker commits a series of delinquent activities is he called a delinquent. Murder, rape, theft, robbery, arson, and other major crimes are the Pakistani court system's main focus, and efforts have been taken to address them. In Pakistan, juvenile delinquency is caused by societal prejudice, social class gaps, rural-urban development differences, unemployment, illiteracy, incorrect family and school roles, and more. Delinquency may be caused by several social and psychological reasons. Children's delinquency is linked to family (Talpur et al., 2011). A 2016 University of Karachi study indicated that family structure predicted adolescent misbehavior in Pakistan. The research indicated that broken or dysfunctional households put children at risk of delinquency. Parental supervision and monitoring reduce adolescent delinquency risk, according to the research. Family factors and crime have been studied extensively. The factors studied may include having criminal parents, too much strictness for the sake of discipline, negligence from parents, abuse from parents, lack of appropriate parental supervision, violence at an early age, parental early age marriages, parental behavior, drug use by parents, mental illness by parents, birth order, family size,

family structure, family education, and family economic status. The family is a major cause of deviance, according to social scientists, experts, and policymakers (Loeber and Stouthammer, 1986). Other familial traits including antisocial parenting, drug abuse, and parental psychopathology might influence children to deviate. If parents are antisocial, children are more likely to deviate. Additionally, children whose parents abused drugs are more likely to commit crimes. Child delinquency is also linked to parental psychiatric disturbance (Lahey et al., 1988).

Aggressive and violent conduct is exposed and learned via several social processes. Social and intellectual failure frustrates in many ways. Due to tremendous hostility, parents, teachers, and friends are often irritated. As a result, youngsters spend much of their time with other nonconformists who are more hostile. These indicators include low economic circumstances, unorganized region, criminal peers, lack of competent and safe supervision, exposure to violent programs, criminal parents, and insufficient social support. Their animosity and violence have also been noted (Anderson, 2000). Criminality also stems from inequality. The poor felt deprived and longed to live like the affluent. Since low-income families can't lawfully afford all the amenities of life, they resort to illicit means. Education and greater salaries reduce crime. Education may increase a person's standard through legalizing income earning and skill use (Gumus, 2004).

Problem of the Statement

Family Structure and Juvenile Crime in Pakistan" is not a problem; rather, it is a subject or issue of interest for research and study that needs to be investigated. The high rate of juvenile delinquency in Pakistan, which has been linked to a number of factors including broken or dysfunctional family structures, poverty, a lack of access to mental health and counseling services, and cultural and social barriers that make it difficult to seek help, is a problem that is associated with this topic. It will take a multifaceted approach to address these underlying issues, including social and economic policies to reduce poverty, interventions to support families and improve access to mental health and counseling services, and reforms to the criminal justice system to ensure a more equitable approach to addressing juvenile delinquency.

Objectives of the study

To find out the association between juvenile crime and family structure

To find other major factors which caused juvenile crime?

To suggest some policy measures to overcome juvenile delinquency.

Research Methodology

The study used a descriptive and correlational approach. Because it allowed for the collection of data from a large sample, the illustrative method was chosen appropriate for the research. This method entails collecting data about static attitudes or events. Another advantage of the correlation design was that it made it possible to gather data for two or more variables on the same group of people and utilize that information to determine a correlation coefficient. The sample was selected using a basic random sampling method.

Location of the study

District Lahore in the province of Punjab, Pakistan was the site of this research. Male and female parents living in Lahore city were the subjects of this research. Whether they've moved here for employment or to live permanently, the parents are considered permanent residents of Lahore.

Sample size and sampling process

The sample size of the current study was 104 parents from district Okara. The probability sampling method was adopted in this study. This study adopts the face-to-face interview schedule technique of the field survey method for data collection.

Analysis of the data

After the information was gathered, the questionnaire was coded and the data was uploaded to a computer. Data was managed and analysed using SPSS 20.0 from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Following this, the data was cleaned, edited, and summarised in light of the new concerns, factors, and research aims. The data collected from the respondents is both qualitative and quantitative in nature. Qualitative information was utilised to describe the many aspects of the research, as well as to provide conclusions and suggestions. However, descriptive and inferential statistics were used to investigate the quantitative data. Calculating frequencies, means, and percentages are all examples of descriptive statistics. This was done so that the researcher may use a small number of indicators or statistics to establish the range of possible measurement values. The goal of using inferential statistics is to generalise findings from a study's sample to the population as a whole. Pearson's Product Moment was used as an inferential statistic in this study. In order to meet the goals of the research and to investigate all variables, percentages were used.

Findings and results

All gathered data entered in special packages for social sciences software and analyze in the form of table and graph and made all percentage, frequencies, mean score by applying statistical formulas.

TABLE NO. 1 AGE AND EDUCATION AND EDUCATION OF RESPONDENTS

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
25-30	34	30.6
35-40	66	59.5
41 or above	11	9.9
Gender		
Male	68	65.4
Female	32	30.8
Residence		
Urban	37	33.3
Rural	73	65.8
Education		
Illiterate	2	1.8
Secondary	2	1.8
Higher	107	96.4

Table 1 comprised the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents' demographic variables. The table showed that the highest percentage of the respondents (59.5%) belong to the age groups of 20-24 years.

The lowest percentage of the respondents (9.9%) belongs to the age group of 25-29 years. The table showed that the highest percentage of the respondents (54.1%) Female. The male percentage of the respondents (45.9%). The table showed that the highest percentage of the respondents belongs to rural area (65.8%) (45.9%) belongs to Urban Area.

Table No.2 Socioeconomic status

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low-income	65	62.5	65.0	65.0
	Middle-income	35	33.7	35.0	100.0
	Total	100	96.2	100.0	
	System	4	3.8		
Total		104	100.0		

This table provides information about the frequency and distribution of socioeconomic status within a certain population. Here's an interpretation of the table: The total number of respondents surveyed is 104. The socioeconomic status categories in the table are "Low-income" and "Middle-income." Out of the 104 respondents, 65 (62.5%) are classified as low-income, while 35 (33.7%) fall into the middle-income category. The valid percent represents the percentage of respondents within each socioeconomic status category, based on the total valid responses. In this case, the valid percent for the low-income category is 65.0%, and for the middle-income category, it is 35.0%. The cumulative percent shows the running total of valid percentages up to a particular point. For example, the cumulative percent for the low-income category is 65.0%, indicating that 65% of the respondents are classified as low-income. The table provides an overview of the socioeconomic status distribution within the surveyed population, with the majority (62.5%) falling into the low-income category and the remaining (33.7%) falling into the middle-income category.

TABLE NO.3 WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT FAMILY STRUCTURE? (SELECT ONE)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Two-parent household (both biological/adoptive parents)	11	10.6	11.0	11.0
	Single-parent household (mother/father only)	50	48.1	50.0	61.0
	Blended family (step-parent and step-siblings)	17	16.3	17.0	78.0
	Extended family (living with grandparents or other relatives)	12	11.5	12.0	90.0
	Foster care system	7	6.7	7.0	97.0
	Other	2	1.9	2.0	99.0
	22	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	100	96.2	100.0	
	System	4	3.8		
Total		104	100.0		

This table provides information about the frequency and distribution of different family structures within a certain population. Here's an interpretation of the table: The total number of Out of the 104 respondents, the distribution of family structures is as follows: Two-parent household: 11 respondents (10.6%) Single-parent household: 50 respondents (48.1%) Blended family: 17 respondents (16.3%) Extended family: 12 respondents (11.5%) Foster care system: 7 respondents (6.7%) Other: 2 respondents (1.9%) Unspecified (missing or invalid data): 1 respondent (1.0%) The valid percent represents the percentage of respondents within each family structure category, based on the total valid responses. The cumulative percent shows the running total of valid percentages up to a particular point.

The table provides an overview of the distribution of family structures within the surveyed population. The most common family structure is a single-parent household, comprising 50% of the respondents. Other significant family structures include blended families (16.3%) and extended families (11.5%).

TABLE NO.4 WHAT IS YOUR FAMILY'S MONTHLY HOUSEHOLD INCOME?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 10000	58	55.8	64.4	64.4
	15000 - 20000	32	30.8	35.6	100.0
	Total	90	86.5	100.0	
Missing	System	14	13.5		
Total		104	100.0		

In this table the monthly household income of the respondents' families. Here is an analysis and breakdown of the results: Less than 10,000: Out of the respondents, 58 individuals (55.8% of the total) reported a monthly household income of less than 10,000 15,000 - 20,000: There were 32 respondents (30.8% of the total) who reported a monthly household income within the range of 15,000 to 20,000 The total number of respondents in the survey or data is 90, and the percentages provided are based on this total. It's important to note that there are 14 missing responses categorized as "System," which might require further investigation or clarification. Based on the available data, it suggests that a majority of the respondents (approximately 55.8%) have a monthly household income of less than 10,000. Additionally, a significant portion of respondents (approximately 30.8%) falls within the income range of 15,000 to 20,000.

Table No.5 Cross tabulation of quality of relationship with parents and Involvement in Juvenile Crime

		Have you ever been involved in any form of juvenile crime or delinquent behavior?		
		Yes	No	Total
Quality of your Relationship Good with Parents	Count	21	12	33
	Expected Count	26.3%	6.7%	33.0%
Bad	Count%	62	9	71
	Expected Count	56.7%	14.3%	71.0%
Total	Count%	83	21	104
	Expected Count	83.0	21.0	104.0

Chi-value = 7.844, $p < .007$

Table 1 comprised the results of the cross tabulation between quality of relationship with parents and Involvement in Juvenile Crime. The table showed that majority of the parents participants (71.0%) were of the view that the child whose has bad Quality of relationship with parents have involved in juvenile crime On the contrary, some of the Parents (33.0%) reported that they have good relationship with their parents and no involved in juvenile crime . Overall, the table showed that most of the respondents (71.0%) reported that the quality of relationship with parents positively related with juvenile crime. The table also showed that results of the hypothesis test. The chi square and p value showed that there is an association between parenting and juvenile crime , $\chi^2(1)=7.844, p < .007$.

CONCLUSION

The results of the cross-tabulation and hypothesis test indicate a significant association between parenting and juvenile crime. The majority of the respondents reported that children with a bad quality of relationship with their parents were more likely to be involved in juvenile crime. This finding highlights the importance of parental influence and the quality of parent-child relationships in shaping a child's behavior and involvement in criminal activities. The association between parenting and juvenile crime suggests that positive and supportive parenting can serve as a protective factor against delinquent behaviors. Parents, who establish strong bonds with their children, provide emotional support, and

engage in effective communication may contribute to a lower risk of juvenile crime. On the other hand, strained or negative relationships between parents and children may increase the likelihood of engagement in delinquent activities.

These findings emphasize the need for interventions and programs aimed at promoting positive parenting practices and strengthening parent-child relationships. Such interventions could include parent education and training programs, counseling services, and community support initiatives. By addressing the underlying factors contributing to poor parent-child relationships, society can work towards reducing the incidence of juvenile crime and fostering healthier developmental outcomes for children. It is essential to acknowledge that the findings are based on the data collected and analyzed within the study's scope. Limitations, such as self-report bias and the specific characteristics of the sample, should be taken into account when interpreting the results. Further research is necessary to explore the complexity of the relationship between parenting and juvenile crime, considering other influential factors and using diverse methodologies.

REFERENCES

- Adlaf, E. M., & Ivis, F. J. (1997). Structure and relations: the influence of familial factors on adolescent's substance use and delinquency. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Substance Abuse*, 5(3), 1-20.
- Apel, R., & Kaukinen, C. (2008). On the relationship between family structure and antisocial behavior: Parental cohabitation and blended households. *Criminology*, 46(1), 35-70.
- Brown, B. B. (2004). Adolescents' relationships with peers. *Handbook of adolescent psychology*, 363-394.
- Burk, W. J., & Laursen, B. (2005). Adolescent perceptions of friendship and their associations with individual adjustment. *International journal of behavioral development*, 29(2), 156-164.
- Chamlin, M. B. (1989). A macro social analysis of the change in robbery and homicide rates: Controlling for static and dynamic effects. *Sociological Focus*, 22(4), 275-286.
- Comanor, W. S., & Phillips, L. (2002). The impact of income and family structure on delinquency. *Journal of applied economics*, 5(2), 209-232.

- Crowder, K., & Teachman, J. (2004). Do residential conditions explain the relationship between living arrangements and adolescent behavior?. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(3), 721-738.
- Demuth, S., & Brown, S. L. (2004). Family structure, family processes, and adolescent delinquency: The significance of parental absence versus parental gender. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, 41(1), 58-81.
- Demuth, S., & Brown, S. L. (2004). Family structure, family processes, and adolescent delinquency: The significance of parental absence versus parental gender. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, 41(1), 58-81.
- Demuth, S., & Brown, S. L. (2004). Family structure, family processes, and adolescent delinquency: The significance of parental absence versus parental gender. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, 41(1), 58-81.
- Demuth, S., & Brown, S. L. (2004). Family structure, family processes, and adolescent delinquency: The significance of parental absence versus parental gender. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, 41(1), 58-81.
- Dunifon, R., & Kowaleski-Jones, L. (2002). Who's in the house? Race differences in cohabitation, single parenthood, and child development. *Child development*, 73(4), 1249-1264.
- Eitle, D. (2005). The moderating effects of peer substance use on the family structure-adolescent substance use association: Quantity versus quality of parenting. *Addictive behaviors*, 30(5), 963-980.
- Free Jr, M. D. (1991). Clarifying the relationship between the broken home and juvenile delinquency: A critique of the current literature. *Deviant behavior*, 12(2), 109-167.
- Gove, W. R., & Crutchfield, R. D. (1982). The family and juvenile delinquency. *Sociological Quarterly*, 23(3), 301-319.
- Guo, G., Roettger, M. E., & Shih, J. C. (2007). Contributions of the DAT1 and DRD2 genes to serious and violent delinquency among adolescents and young adults. *Human genetics*, 121, 125-136.
- Hirschi, T., & Stark, R. (1969). Hellfire and delinquency. *Social Problems*, 17(2), 202-213.

- Hoeve, M., Dubas, J. S., Eichelsheim, V. I., Van der Laan, P. H., Smeenk, W., & Gerris, J. R. (2009). The relationship between parenting and delinquency: A meta-analysis. *Journal of abnormal child psychology*, 37, 749-775.
- Hofferth, S. L., & Anderson, K. G. (2003). Are all dads equal? Biology versus marriage as a basis for paternal investment. *Journal of marriage and family*, 65(1), 213-232.
- Juby, H., & Farrington, D. P. (2001). Disentangling the link between disrupted families and delinquency: Sociodemography, ethnicity and risk behaviors. *British Journal of Criminology*, 41(1), 22-40.
- Keijsers, L., Branje, S. J., VanderValk, I. E., & Meeus, W. (2010). Reciprocal effects between parental solicitation, parental control, adolescent disclosure, and adolescent delinquency. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 20(1), 88-113.
- Keijsers, L., Branje, S. J., VanderValk, I. E., & Meeus, W. (2010). Reciprocal effects between parental solicitation, parental control, adolescent disclosure, and adolescent delinquency. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 20(1), 88-113.
- Kierkus, C. A., & Baer, D. (2002). A social control explanation of the relationship between family structure and delinquent behavior. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 44(4), 425-458.
- Kierkus, C. A., & Hewitt, J. D. (2009). The contextual nature of the family structure/delinquency relationship. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37(2), 123-132.
- Kierkus, C. A., & Hewitt, J. D. (2009). The contextual nature of the family structure/delinquency relationship. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37(2), 123-132.
- Kierkus, C. A., Johnson, B. R., & Hewitt, J. D. (2010). Cohabiting, family and community stressors, selection, and juvenile delinquency. *Criminal Justice Review*, 35(4), 393-411.
- Kowaleski-Jones, L., & Dunifon, R. (2006). Family structure and community context: Evaluating influences on adolescent outcomes. *Youth & Society*, 38(1), 110-130.
- Krueger, R. F., Hicks, B. M., Patrick, C. J., Carlson, S. R., Iacono, W. G., & McGue, M. (2009). Etiologic connections among substance dependence, antisocial behavior, and personality: modeling the externalizing spectrum.

- Laird, R. D., Pettit, G. S., Bates, J. E., & Dodge, K. A. (2003). Parents' monitoring- relevant knowledge and adolescents' delinquent behavior: evidence of correlated developmental changes and reciprocal influences. *Child development*, 74(3), 752-768.
- Leiber, M. J., Brubaker, S. J., & Fox, K. C. (2009). A closer look at the individual and joint effects of gender and race on juvenile justice decision making. *Feminist Criminology*, 4(4), 333-358.
- Leiber, M. J., Mack, K. Y., & Featherstone, R. A. (2009). Family structure, family processes, economic factors, and delinquency: Similarities and differences by race and ethnicity. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 7(2), 79-99.
- Loeber, R., & Dishion, T. (1983). Early predictors of male delinquency: a review. *Psychological bulletin*, 94(1), 68.
- Manning, W. D., & Lamb, K. (2003). Parental cohabitation and adolescent well-being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65, 876-893.
- Manning, W. D., & Lamb, K. A. (2003). Adolescent well- being in cohabiting, married, and single-parent families. *Journal of marriage and family*, 65(4), 876-893.
- Matsueda, R. L., & Heimer, K. (1987). Race, family structure, and delinquency: A test of differential association and social control theories. *American Sociological Review*, 826-840.
- McCord, J. (1991). Family relationships, juvenile delinquency, and adult criminality. *Criminology*, 29(3), 397-417.
- Murray, J., & Farrington, D. P. (2005). Parental imprisonment: effects on boys' antisocial behavior and delinquency through the life- course. *Journal of Child Psychology and psychiatry*, 46(12), 1269-1278.
- Petts, R. J. (2009). Family and religious characteristics' influence on delinquency trajectories from adolescence to young adulthood. *American Sociological Review*, 74(3), 465-483.
- Price, C., & Kunz, J. (2003). Rethinking the paradigm of juvenile delinquency as related to divorce. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 39(1-2), 109-133.
- Rankin, J. H. (1983). The family context of delinquency. *Social problems*, 30(4), 466-479.
- Rankin, J. H., & Kern, R. (1994). Parental attachments and delinquency. *Criminology*, 32(4), 495-515.

- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1993). Structural variations in juvenile court processing: Inequality, the underclass, and social control. *Law and society review*, 285-311.
- Wang, R., Bianchi, S. M., & Raley, S. B. (2005). Teenagers' Internet use and family rules: A research note. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(5), 1249-1258.
- Willetts, M. C., & Maroules, N. G. (2004). Does remarriage matter? The well-being of adolescents living with cohabiting versus remarried mothers. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 41(3-4), 115-133.