

## **Empirical Evidence From The Relationship Between Lack Of Parental Control And Criminality**

**Mr. Waqar Ahmad<sup>1</sup>, Mr. Faraz Ali<sup>2</sup> and Dr. Muhammad Zakria<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Lecturer, Department of Sociology, the University of Swabi-Pakistan.

<sup>2</sup>Lecturer, Department of Political Science, the University of Swabi-Pakistan.

<sup>3</sup>Associate Professor, Department of Statistics, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad Pakistan.

---

### **Abstract:**

This study's main theme is to explore the relationship between lack of parental control and youth criminal behavior. The present study hypothesizes that lack of parental control is the contributing factor to criminality. Union Council Kalukhan in tehsil Razzar, district Swabi was taken as a universe of the study, which is comprised of five village councils i.e. Sheraghund, Bazid khel, Khatt, Munan Khel, and Parra. A sample size of 376 was randomly selected from the above-mentioned village councils. Data were analyzed through bivariate analysis. Findings of the study disclosed that youth criminal behavior significantly upsurgues in the absence of parental control. The study recommends that parents should aware of their children and promote a positive environment at home to inoculate social values like respect, trust, morality, and self-esteem. In addition, it is further suggested that true religious teachings should be incorporated into the curriculum for educated people and various programs should be aired on electronic media for illiterate people in their local languages to be properly equipped with the true spirit of Islam.

**Keywords:** lack of parental control, criminality, youth.

### **Introduction**

Crime shakes every fragment of society, which causes fear and vagueness that severely harms the quality of human life, hinders the procedure of growth and development, and disturbs social harmony (Anwar et al. 2015). The implication of early social familial life has been advocated by the Enforcement and Justice (1967) that the family is the premier institution for the development of a juvenile's aptitude. In a familial environment, children learn to restrain their wishes and internalized social norms and values. Control theory assumes that adolescents whose parents give slight attention are possibly less attached to their parents. Similarly, when a level of supervision and attention upsurgues, the bond of youths with their parents also surges, which leads to normative

behavior amongst youngsters (Baumrind, 1978). Similarly, Hoeve et al., (2009) endorsed that psychological control of youth and lack of familial support and supervision were considerable pushing factors towards criminality. Also, Petts (2009) advocated that living and spending more time with parents, and supportive practices by them diminish the chance of involvement of adolescents in criminal activities (Keijsers et al., 2010). While frequent monitoring of youths by parents reduces youth participation in antisocial activities and criminality (Gerald and Yoerger, 1993; Eitle, 2005). Moreover, familial failure, negligence, and physical abuse with the parental disorder were some of the foremost factors for anti-social behavior (Armey et al., 2014; Baron & Hartnagel, 1997a; Elijah, 2000). Therefore, the criminal behavior of youth is the consequence of poor parental control (Nye 1958; Hirschi, 1969; John et al., 1981). However, antisocial behavior amongst youngsters was the product of dysfunctional family management. Therefore, adverse family relations i.e. harsh disciplinary actions, and indifferences in children triggered criminal behavior (Peiser and Heaven, 1996).

Familial social structure has affectedly changed over in recent years in the form of broken homes in the world. Therefore, it has alluded to a positive relationship between broken families and the participation of youth in numerous crimes. Thus, Toby (1957) discovered that youth delinquency is considerably associated with a broken home. Majority of the youths from broken families were found more inclined to crimes as compared from intact families (Juby and Farrington 2001; and Slocum & Stone, 1963). Also, James and Herrnstein (1998) indicated that the connection amid parents and youth is adversely affected by disturbed home environment leading to shrink the ability of the parent to socialize, control and supervise their adolescents. Thus youngsters from broken families were mostly indulged in theft, status, and drug-related crimes (Price and Kunz, 2003).

Parenting style and family support have been considered some important determinants in the development of normative behavior in childhood. Correspondingly, the relationship between lack of social support and criminal behavior of youth was logically established by many scholars. It has been alluded by Medinnus (1981) that lack of socio-parental monitoring, parental and familial conflict, parental intolerance, and material support escalates the criminal behavior in youths. Similarly, in the empirical study revealed by Dahlberg (1998), the delinquent behavior of parents is negatively connected with the normative behavior of youth. In addition to this, lack of parental supervision and familial support, both material and emotional develops offensive behavior in youth. Thus it has been referred by Santrock (2003) that lack of familial support and hostile familial management practices trigger criminal tendencies in youth. However, the more recent study commenced by Sari and Nurhayati (2019) also revealed that harsh familial practices by parents upsurge the probability of youth participation in criminality. The study will proceed with the following research hypotheses.

### **Hypotheses**

H1: Lack of parental control is positively associated with youth participation in crimes.

H2: Lack of parental control will increase youth participation in crimes.

### Materials and methods

Union Council Kalukhan in tehsil Razzar, district Swabi was taken as a universe of the study, comprised of five village councils i.e. Sheraghund, Bazid khel, Khatt, Munan Khel, and Parra. Thus all of the respondents from the study area were taken potential male members aged 18 years and above. However, as per **Census Report (2017)** the total population of males in the taken Union Council were 20000, from which the sample size has been taken through **Sekaran (2003)**, which was 376. Further the sample size was distributed to each stratum (village council) through proportional allocation method, and they were identified through simple random sampling technique.

**Table No: 1 Table showing distribution of each village household and relative sample size**

S. No.	Name of the village	Household (each village) (N)	Sample size (n)
1	Sheraghund	6000	112
2	Khataa	4500	85
3	Bazid Khel	3000	56
4	Munan Khel	3300	63
5	Perra	3200	60
	<b>Grand total</b>	<b>20000</b>	<b>376</b>

The study adopted the “Likert scale” to distinguish the level of respondent’s choices on the given questioner, in which attributes were classified into “Agree, Disagree, and Uncertain”. “Likert Scale” a tool of measurement was taken to operationalize and measure responses of the independent variable i.e. lack of parental control and dependent variable i.e. criminality. Similarly, in the study, indexation was also applied, which is considered one of the leading norms in social research, which is based on raking into two or more things to construct the basis for the forming of indexation (**Smith, 1975; and Nachmias & Nachmias, 1976**). Subsequently, the data was analyzed by using a statistical method i.e. uni-variate or frequency distribution over the SPSS version 22. Afterwards Bi-variate analysis was also applied, in which the dissemination of data presented in the outcome of cross tabulation of both dependent and independent variables. Therefore, relationship of both dependent and independent variables was cross-tabulated and listed in the 3/3 table. Moreover, to determine level of association, Chi-Square test was applied on the data set (**Nachmias & Nachmias, 1976; and McCall & Kagan, 1975**).

**Table No: 2 Conceptual framework**

Independent variable	Dependent variable
Lack of parental control	Criminality

## Results and discussion

### Demographic Sketch

Demographic characteristics of the sampled respondents i.e. age, education, occupation, family type, household head, marital status, and monthly income of family are explained below.

#### Age group of respondents

The below table 3 portrayed frequency and percentage distribution of age of the sampled respondents, in which majority sampled respondents i.e. 25.7% were 36 to 40 years old, 22.07% of them were in the range of 31-35 years, 21.01% of the sampled respondents belonged to the age group of 26-30, while 21.01% respondents had the age group of 18-25 years. While it had been alluded that 8.77% sampled respondents ranged from 41 to 45 years, while 5.57% of them were 46-50, and 4.56% of the sampled respondents were above than 51 years.

**Table 3 Frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents according to their age group**

<b>Range</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent %</b>
18-25	46	12.23 %
26-30	79	21.01 %
31-35	83	22.07 %
36-40	97	25.79 %
41-45	33	8.77 %
46-50	21	5.57 %
51 and above	17	4.56 %
<b>Total</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>100.0</b>

#### Education

The below mentioned table 4 disclosed frequency and percentage distribution of education level of respondents, in which majority 25.79% of respondents had completed 10<sup>th</sup> grade, and 22.60% of the sampled respondents had masters and above. While 19.41% of the sampled respondents had completed intermediate, and 15.95% of them were graduates. Additionally, 16.22% respondents were illiterate as well.

**Table 4 Frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents according to their educational level**

<b>Status</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent %</b>
Illiterate	61	16.22 %
Metric	97	25.79 %
Intermediate	73	19.41 %
Graduate	60	15.95 %
Master and above	85	22.60 %
<b>Total</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>100.0</b>

### Occupation of respondents

Table 5 displays the frequency and percentage distribution of occupation type of respondents; in which it has been revealed that majority i.e. 31.38% of respondents were government servants, and 25% of them have their own business. While 18.08% of the sampled respondents were jobless, 14.37% labors, and 11.17% of them were farmers.

**Table 5 Frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents according to their occupation**

<b>Type</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Govt Servant	118	31.38
Own business	94	25
Farmers	42	11.17
Labors	54	14.37
Jobless	68	18.08
<b>Total</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>100.0</b>

### Marital status of respondents

The below table 6 divulges frequency and percentage distribution of marital status of the respondents; in which majority 77.66% of them were married, and 22.34% of the sampled respondents were unmarried.

**Table 6 Frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents according to their Marital Status**

Status	Frequency	Percent %
Married	292	77.66
Unmarried	84	22.34
<b>Total</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>100.0</b>

### Household head of respondents

The below table 7 elaborates frequency and percentage distribution of the household head of the sampled respondents, in which it has been revealed that the household head of majority of the sampled respondents' i.e. 53.45% were their fathers, 16.22% were their grandfathers, and 14.09% respondent's household heads were their elder brothers. While, 11.72% of the respondents described themselves as the household head to support their family. Though only 4.52% of respondents stated that their mothers are their head of the household.

**Table 7 Frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents according to their household head**

Head	Frequency	Percentage %
Grandfather	61	16.22
Father	201	53.45
Elder brother	53	14.09
Mother	17	4.52
Self	44	11.72
<b>Total</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>100.0</b>

### Family type of the respondents

The below explained table 8 determines the frequency and percentage distribution of family type of respondents, in which it has been exposed that majority of respondents i.e. 68.35% living in joint family system, while 17.81% of them were living in extended families, and 13.84% of the sampled respondents belonged to nuclear family as well.

**Table 8 Frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents according to their family type**

Status	Frequency	Percentage %
Nuclear	52	13.84
Joint	257	68.35
Extended	67	17.81
<b>Total</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>100.0</b>

### Family monthly income

Frequency and percentage distribution of monthly income of the sampled respondents has been revealed from below mentioned table 9, which presented that monthly income of majority of the sampled respondents i.e. 31.66% was in the range of 30000 to 40000 rupees, while income of 26.86% respondents was in the range of 20000 to 30000 rupees. Thus 14.09% of respondents declared their family monthly income in the range of 10000-20000 rupees, while 19.15% respondents confirmed in the range of 40000-50000 rupees. The least number of the sampled respondents 8.24% reported their family monthly income as 50000 rupees and above.

**Table 9 Frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents according to their Family monthly income**

Income in PKR	Frequency	Percentage %
10000-20000 PKR	53	14.09
20000-30000 PKR	101	26.86
30000-40000 PKR	119	31.66
40000-50000 PKR	72	19.15
50000 PKR and above	31	8.24
<b>Total</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>100.0</b>

### Lack of parental control

Frequency and percentage distribution of lack of parental control and criminality are described in table 10, in which the results indicated that more than half of the sampled respondents i.e. 204(54.3%) revealed that revenge is basic characteristic of Pashtun society, but it was rejected by 157(41.8%) of the sample size. Correspondingly, more than half of the respondents i.e. 209(55.6%) rejected that revenge is the only way for settling disputes among peoples, though more than one third of the respondents i.e. 132(35.1%) admitted it. Moreover, more than half of the sampled respondents i.e. 194(51.6%) indicated that hatred environment is responsible factor in the intensification of crime ratio, but only 157(41.8%) out of 376(100) respondents refuted the statement. The results are identical with the work of **Sarwat Inayat (2006)** that harsh and abusive parental attitude increases criminal tendencies in children. Furthermore, majority of respondents i.e. 240(63.8%) declared that forefather animosity paves the way to criminality, but one fourth of them i.e. 96(25.5%) denied the same statement. Moreover, majority of respondents i.e. 221(58.8%) alluded that mediation and arbitration are not accepting in disputes settlements, but only least number of respondents i.e. 110(29.3%) overruled the above statement. Furthermore, majority of the sampled respondents i.e. 237(63.0%) approved with the statement that lack of proper socialization leads to criminal tendencies, while one third i.e. 124(33.0%) of them were disagreed with the same statement. Similarly, three fourth of the sampled respondents 282(75.0%) divulged that lack of familial control leads to crime rate, while only slight number of respondents i.e.

68(18.1%) denied the same statement. Additionally, more than three fourth of the sampled respondents i.e. 289(76.9%) unveiled that inefficient and poor governance is responsible factors in the escalation of criminality, but only least number of respondents i.e. annulled the statement. Similarly, majority of the sampled respondents i.e. 271(72.1%) professed that religious trip cycle or religious disobedience is the main cause of criminal tendencies, although some lesser respondents i.e. 71(18.9%) disclaimed the same statement. The results were reinforced by Anomie Theory of Durkheim; in which it has been revealed that normless society leads to deviant behavior.

**Table 10 Frequency and percentage distribution of lack of parental control**

S.No.	Statement	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain	Total
1	Revenge is the only way for settling disputes among peoples	132(35.1%)	209(55.6%)	35(9.3%)	376(100)
2	Revenge is basic characteristic of Pashtun society	204(54.3%)	157(41.8%)	15(4.0%)	376(100)
3	Inefficient and poor governance is responsible factors in the escalation of criminality	289(76.9%)	72(19.1%)	15(4.0%)	376(100)
4	Lack of familial control leads to crime rate	282(75.0%)	68(18.1%)	26(6.9%)	376(100)
5	Lack of proper socialization leads to criminal tendencies	237(63.0%)	124(33.0%)	15(4.0%)	376(100)
6	Hatred environment is responsible factor in the intensification of crime ratio	194(51.6%)	157(41.8%)	25(6.6%)	376(100)
7	Mediation and arbitration are not accepting in disputes settlements	221(58.8%)	110(29.3%)	45(12.0%)	376(100)
8	Forefather animosity paves the way to criminality	240(63.8%)	96(25.5%)	40(10.6%)	376(100)
9	Religious trip cycle or religious disobedience is the main cause of criminal tendencies	271(72.1%)	71(18.9%)	34(9.0%)	376(100)

### **Criminality**

The below mentioned table 11 reveals the frequency and percentage distribution towards criminality, in which it has been indicated that almost half of respondents i.e. 177(47.1%) declared that aggression is better than negotiation, while a large number of respondents i.e. 148(39.4%) negated the same statement. Similarly, majority of sampled respondents i.e. 167(44.4%) referred that people prefer aggression to solve conflicts and disputes, but a bulk of sampled respondents



i.e. 164(43.6%) overruled the above statement. Additionally, majority of respondents i.e. 233(62.0%) stated that people use force against those who do not act upon their decisions, while a minor number of sampled respondents i.e. 103(27.4%) contrasted that. Thus, majority of sample respondents i.e. 307(81.6%) disclosed that people beat their siblings at home when they don't behave as they desire, but less of them i.e. 52(13.8%) disagreed with the statement. Though, these findings are thoroughly in line with the work of Hegger (2015), that lack of self-control is the leading factor of criminal tendencies among people. However, majority of the sampled respondents i.e. 254(67.6%) indicated that aggression is the best way to become prominent in the social group, while only lesser of them i.e. 103(27.4%) denied the above statement. Likewise, majority of the sampled respondents i.e. 240(63.8%) declared that people enjoy physical fights in society, while near to one third of them i.e. 115(30.6%) disproved the same statement. Additionally, majority of respondents i.e. 308(81.9%) alluded that people don't follow norms and values because they consider it secondary, but lesser of them i.e. 49(13.0%) disagreed with above statement. Likewise, majority of respondents i.e. 317(84.3%) stated that people don't like interference of others in their daily social life activities, while only 45(12.0%) of them denied the above statement.

**Table 11 Frequency and percentage distribution of criminality**

S.No.	Statement	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain	Total
1. 1	Aggression is better than negotiation	177(47.1%)	148(39.4%)	51(13.6%)	376(100)
2. 2	People prefer aggression to solve conflicts	167(44.4%)	164(43.6%)	45(12.0%)	376(100)
3. 3	People use force against those who do not act upon their decisions	233(62.0%)	103(27.4%)	40(10.6%)	376(100)
4. 4	People beat their brothers/sisters at home when they do not behave as they desire	307(81.6%)	52(13.8%)	17(4.5%)	376(100)
5. 5	Aggression is the best way to become prominent in the group/community	254(67.6%)	103(27.4%)	19(5.1%)	376(100)
6. 6	People enjoy physical fights in society	240(63.8%)	115(30.6%)	21(5.6%)	376(100)
7. 7	People don't follow norms and values because they considered it as secondary	308(81.9%)	49(13.0%)	19(5.1%)	376(100)
8. 8	People don't like interference of others in their daily life activities	317(84.3%)	45(12.0%)	14(3.7%)	376(100)

### Association between lack of parental control and criminality

Theories of parental control revealed that in modern era every individual in society are prone to commit crime, in which society presents numerous opportunities for anti-social activities i.e. drug abuse, and car theft etc., but people obey the norm and values of society because their behavior and attitude are being controlled and crafted by internal and external drives. However, result concerning lack of parental control and its association with criminality are given and explained in below table 12. It has been alluded that revenge is basic characteristic of Pashtun society and criminality had significantly ( $p = 0.002$ ) associated with each other. Additionally, a strong and highly significant ( $p = 0.000$ ) association was found amid revenge is the only way for settling disputes among peoples and criminality. It has been affirmed that Pashtun are straight forward in the routinely interaction predominantly in the case of Badal (Revenge), whatever you have done with them, they will do the same in return on due time (Rzehak, 2011). There are numerous well-known Pashto proverbs about revenge i.e. Pashtun took revenge after twenty years. Likewise, mediation and arbitration are not accepting in disputes settlements was found highly significant ( $p = 0.000$ ) with criminality. Similarly, a strongly significant ( $p = 0.000$ ) association was revealed between forefather animosity paves the way to criminality and criminality. Furthermore, hatred environment is responsible factor in the intensification of crime ratio was highly significant ( $p = 0.000$ ) associated with criminality. Though, lack of familial control leads to crime rate and lack of proper socialization leads to criminal tendencies were both found highly significant ( $p = 0.000$ ) associated with criminality. Likewise, a strongly significant ( $p = 0.000$ ) relationships were found amongst inefficient and poor governance is responsible factors in the escalation of criminality, religious trip cycle or religious disobedience is the main cause of criminal tendencies and criminality. It has been revealed from the study that inefficient and poor governance not only affects the development of a nation, but also creates violence in society (Plessis, 2015).

**Table 12 Association between lack of parental control and criminality**

S. No.	Attribute	Response	Crime in society			Statistic	Total
			Agree	Disagree	Uncertain		
1	Revenge is the only way for settling disputes among peoples	Agree	100(43.3%)	31(26.3%)	1(3.7%)	$x^2 = 77.560$ $p = 0.000$	376(100%)
		Disagree	127(55.0%)	69(58.5%)	13(48.1%)		
		Uncertain	4(1.7%)	18(15.3%)	13(48.1%)		
2	Revenge is basic characteristic	Agree	125(54.1%)	64(54.2%)	15(55.6%)	$x^2 = 17.196$ $p = 0.002$	376(100%)
		Disagree	99(42.9%)	51(43.2%)	7(25.9%)		
		Uncertain	7(3.0%)	3(2.5%)	5(18.5%)		

	of Pashtun society						
3	Inefficient and poor governance is responsible factors in the escalation of criminality	Agree	188(81.4%)	87(73.7%)	14(51.9%)	$x^2 = 40.734$ $p = 0.000$	376(100%)
		Disagree	42(18.2%)	23(19.5%)	7(25.9%)		
		Uncertain	0(0.0%)	8(6.8%)	6(22.2%)		
4	Lack of familial control leads to crime rate	Agree	179(77.5%)	87(73.7%)	16(59.3%)	$x^2 = 22.734$ $p = 0.000$	376(100%)
		Disagree	45(19.5%)	19(16.1%)	4(14.8%)		
		Uncertain	7(3.0%)	12(10.2%)	7(25.9%)		
5	Lack of proper socialization leads to criminal tendencies	Agree	162(70.1%)	67(56.8%)	8(29.6%)	$x^2 = 30.460$ $p = 0.000$	376(100%)
		Disagree	65(28.1%)	45(38.1%)	14(51.9%)		
		Uncertain	4(1.7%)	6(5.1%)	5(18.5%)		
6	Hatred environment is responsible factor in the intensification of crime ratio	Agree	129(55.8%)	50(42.5%)	15(55.6%)	$x^2 = 24.908$ $p = 0.000$	376(100%)
		Disagree	96(41.6%)	55(46.6%)	6(22.2%)		
		Uncertain	6(2.6%)	13(11.0%)	6(22.2%)		
7	Mediation and arbitration are not accepting in disputes settlements	Agree	153(66.2%)	66(55.9%)	2(7.4%)	$x^2 = 54.159$ $p = 0.000$	376(100%)
		Disagree	66(28.6%)	31(26.3%)	13(48.1%)		
		Uncertain	12(5.2%)	21(17.8%)	12(44.4%)		
8	Forefather animosity paves the way to criminality	Agree	170(73.6%)	68(57.6%)	2(7.4%)	$x^2 = 65.686$ $p = 0.000$	376(100%)
		Disagree	47(20.3%)	37(31.4%)	12(44.4%)		
		Uncertain	14(6.1%)	13(11.0%)	13(48.1%)		
9	Religious trip cycle or religious disobedience is the main	Agree	193(83.5%)	73(61.9%)	5(18.5%)	$x^2 = 61.999$ $p = 0.000$	376(100%)
		Disagree	27(11.7%)	31(26.3%)	13(48.1%)		
		Uncertain	11a (4.8%)	14(11.9%)	9(33.3%)		

	cause of criminal tendencies						
--	------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

It has been précised from the above explained results that revenge is the only way for settling disputes among people along with non-acceptance of mediation and arbitration in disputes settlement, forefather animosity, hatred environment, lack of familial control, lack of proper socialization, poor governance, and religious disobedience were also found strongly significant ( $p = 0.000$ ) associated with criminality.

### **Conclusions**

The aim of the study was to dig-out diverse causative factors in the escalating of criminality, in while it has been concluded that the sentiments of revenge in the cultural domain of Pashtun society, and then with non-acceptance of mediation and arbitration in enmities and disputes settlement were discovered as the flaming ingredients in intensification of criminalities in society. The study further explored that forefather animosity in families, hatred environment in surrounding's and bad peer groups of youths, lack of parental and familial control on their children were the contributory factors in rise of crime rate. Therefore, the study also discovered that lack of proper familial and parental socialization, poor governance, and religious disobedience were positively and significantly associated with criminality. The data also found a strong and significant association between the sentiments of revenge for disputes settlements, hatred social environment and criminality. Further, the data rejected the role of mediation and arbitration in the settlements of disputed, while the study witnessed that forefather animosity paves the way to criminality.

### **Recommendations**

Following are some of the recommendations on the basis of study findings:

1. Nobody can deny the importance of socialization in shaping personality of youth in each and every society of the world. It is evident from the findings that lack of family control over children and lack of proper socialization is highly significant to crime in society. So; the parental socialization and strong hold on their children is very essential for the personality development of the children. Furthermore, parents should aware their children and promote positive environment at home to inoculate social values like respect, trust, morality and self-esteem.
2. Family feuds is a long-term enmity among families on any issue like, property disputes, murder and revenge etc. Property disputes in study area was found highly significant with crimes in society. In Pashtun society land is considered as sacred object and conflicts over

the property are very common in rural as well as in urban areas. So aforementioned disputes should be easily resolved through Jirga as informal social institution. Jirga system in Pashtun society is highly valued but government should give it a formal status to strengthen its decision in short time as well as in minimum cost.

3. Hatred environment and religious disobedience were found highly significant with crime in society. Miss interpretation of Islamic values from religious as well as from each and every interest group creates hatred environment in societies particularly in Pashtun society in Pakistan. It is suggested that member and stage should be fully monitored by law enforcing agencies to control the miss interpretation of Islamic teachings and other self-interested goals. It is further suggested that true religious teachings should be incorporated in the curriculum for educated people and various programs should be on aired on electronic media for illiterate people in their local languages to properly equipped with the true spirit of Islam.

### **List of Contributor**

Mr. Waqar Ahmad corresponding author of this paper is working as Lecturer in Department of Sociology, at University of Swabi since Oct, 2020. He completed his MA in rural sociology, and M.Phil. Sociology from Agriculture University, Peshawar and is currently pursuing his PhD in Rural Sociology from above mentioned university. His areas of interest are peace and conflict studies, and sociology of Religion. He can be reached at [waqaryousafzai99@gmail.com](mailto:waqaryousafzai99@gmail.com)

Mr. Faraz Ali is working as Lecturer in Political Science, the University of Swabi since December, 26, 2014. Additionally, he is serving as head of the department, Department of Political Science from October 2019. He did his Masters and M. Phil from the Department of Political Science, University of Peshawar. His research interests are Human rights, Gender politics and Non-traditional Security Studies. He can be reached at [faraz@uoswabi.edu.pk](mailto:faraz@uoswabi.edu.pk)

Dr. Muhammad Zakria working as Associate Professor in the Department of Statistics, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad. He can be reached at [Zakria@aiou.edu.pk](mailto:Zakria@aiou.edu.pk)

### **References**

- Anwar, S., Khan, S. E., Chaudhry, A. G., Khan, K. E., & Sultana, S. (2015). Exploring Socio-Cultural Factors of Recidivism in Juvenile Delinquents: An Anthropological Perspective. *Sci. int*, 817-819.
- Arney, L. E., Lipow, J., & Webb, N. J. (2014). The impact of electronic financial payments on crime. *Information Economics and Policy*, 29, 46-57.
- Baumrind, D. (1978). Parental disciplinary patterns and social competence in children. *Youth & Society*, 9(3), 239-267.

- Baron, S. W., & Hartnagel, T. F. (1997b). ATTRIBUTIONS, AFFECT, AND CRIME: STREET YOUTHS'REACTIONS TO UNEMPLOYMENT. *Criminology*, 35(3), 409-434.
- Baron, S. W., & Hartnagel, T. F. (1997a). Attributions, Affect, and Crime: Street Youths' Reactions to Unemployment. *Criminology*, 35(3), 409-434.
- Dahlberg, L. L. (1998). Youth violence in the United States major trends, risk factors, and prevention approaches. *American journal of preventive medicine*, 14(4), 259-272.
- 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.
- Elijah, A. (2000). *Code of the street: Decency, violence, and the moral life of the inner city*: WW Norton & Company.
- Enforcement, P. s. C. o. L., & Justice, A. o. (1967). *Science and Technology: A Report to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice*: US Government Printing Office.
- Gerald, P., & Yoerger, K. (1993). Developmental models for delinquent behavior. In *Mental disorder and crime*. (pp. 140-172). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: Univer. In: of California Press.
- 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(6), 749-775.
- John, S, T. P., & Lorber, R. (1981). A social interactional approach to the treatment of abusive families. *Violent behavior: Social learning approaches to prediction, management, and treatment*, 83-101.
- Juby, H., & Farrington, D. P. (2001). Disentangling the link between disrupted families and delinquency: Sociodemography, ethnicity and risk behaviours. *British Journal of Criminology*, 41(1), 22-40.
- James and Herrnstein Smith, & Jonathan. (2003). *The nature of personal robbery*. Great Britain: Home Office. Research, Development Statistics Directorate
- 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.
- Medinnus, G. R. (1981). Delinquent's Perceptions of Parents. *Journal Consulting Psychology University or Michigan*. , 592-593.
- Petts, R. J. (2009). Family and religious characteristics' influence on delinquency trajectories from adolescence to young adulthood. *American Sociological Review*, 74(3), 465-483.
- Peiser, N. C., & Heaven, P. C. (1996). Family influences on self-reported delinquency among high school students. *Journal of Adolescence*, 19(6), 557-568.

- Toby, J. (1957). The differential impact of family disorganization. *American Sociological Review*, 22(5), 505-512.
- Slocum, W. L., & Stone, C. L. (1963). Family culture patterns and delinquent-type behavior. *Marriage and Family Living*, 25(2), 202-208.
- Price and Kunz Smith, J. (2003). The nature of personal robbery. London Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
- Santrock, J. W. (2003). *Adolescence perkembangan remaja*. Jakarta: Erlangga, 422-424.
- Sari, N., & Nurhayati, S. R. (2019). Parent and child relations in the perspective of adolescents with Juvenile delinquency. *Psychological Research and Intervention*, 2(1), 36-42.