



Influence of Family Environment on Patterns of Crime Charged among Nigerian Inmates of Correctional Centres in Anambra and Federal Capital Territory (FCT).

ENE N. OKORO

Federal Capital Territory Administration, Abuja, Nigeria

ANDREW E. ZAMANI, EMMANUEL O. ALHASSAN

Nasarawa State University, Keffi, Nigeria

Abstract. The Nigerian Correctional Centres is witnessing an enormous increase in people going into crime despite adverse consequences. The present study studied the influence of family environment on patterns of crime charged among inmates of Anambra and FCT Correctional Centres, Nigeria. The study adopted a cross-sectional survey design and also adopted a purposive sampling technique to select participants for the study. The entire population of inmates in the selected correctional centres was 2,971. Using an online sample size calculator, the calculated sample size was 333. This number was further proportionately distributed but 170 questionnaires that were adequately filled and returned were analysed. One hypothesis was tested using Chi-Square and the result indicated that 98(57.6%) of the inmates were charged with felony crime out of which 58(34.1%) were from adequate family environment and 40(23.5%) were from inadequate family environment. The result also revealed that 72(42.4%) of the inmates were charged with misdemeanour crime, of which 37(21.8%) were from adequate family environment while 35(20.6%) were from inadequate family environment. Generally, the results revealed that 55.9% of the inmates were from adequate family environment while 44.1% were inmates from inadequate family environment. The study concluded among others that family environment influence patterns of crime charged among inmates of the selected correctional centers in Anambra and FCT, Abuja. The study recommended that government through ministry of Humanitarian and Social Development engage and assign

professionals: Psychologists, Social workers, Clinical Psychologists and Forensic & Correctional Psychologists to families for need assessment, stress coping skills, rehabilitation and care and support services and as well would provide adequate and functional family environment services training and retraining on interpersonal relations, system maintenance and children's personal growth and development, among others.

Keywords: Influence, Family environment, Patterns of crime Charged, Nigerian Inmates, Correctional Centres.

1. Introduction

The family is the most basic and ancient of all primary institutions and remains the fundamental social unit in every society. Family has two basic functions, first is the socialization of children so that they can truly become members of the society and the second aspect is the environment stability of the adult personality of the society. The family individuals come from and the experiences therein have a profound and pervasive influence on their later behaviour as adults. This clearly indicates that the family has an important role to play in the life of every individual (Robertson, 2010; Akagu 2006; Parsons & Bales 2002). As well, family plays several significant roles for society, some of which include: family formation, economic support, nurturance, and socialization, as well as protection of vulnerable members (Shaffer, 2000). Regardless of this, it is

disheartening, that all criminals or offenders were born into one family or the other. It becomes worrisome of what becomes of our Nigerian family. In assertion, Nwosuji (2008) noted that Nigerian society recently is witnessing a high level of moral decay and there is an implosion in the number of youths and adolescents exhibiting anti-social and immoral behaviours, and Ziehl (2003), as such posited, that it is causing a drastic change in the quality and quantity of relationships in the family.

The family also, is the most important primary group in the society, the simplest and the most elementary form of society. It is the most basic of all social grouping and first most immediate social environment to which a child is often exposed. It is an outstanding primary group because, it is in the family the child develops his basic attitude through the process of primary socialization. Each child is born into a family which composes parents and possible others and this is because the children's lives are centred initially within their families and the family environment becomes the primary agent of socialization. The family environment involves the circumstances and social climate conditions within families. Since each family is made up of different individuals in a different setting, each family environment is unique. The kind of family environment a child is born into can set limit for life's adjustment (Isangedighi, 2011). It also provides the basis for individual's ability to behave and play a role during different activities.

Family is one of the prominent socializing agents in life. Environment on its own is the complex set of psychological, physical, geographical, biological, social, cultural and political conditions that surround a family, individual or organism and that ultimately determine its form and nature of its survival (World Bank 2001). Family instability and crime is prevalence, and has become a common phenomenon in Nigeria. It should be noted that a healthy family results in positive relationships and transactions; while negative family environment leads to negative relationships and transactions. Researchers, such as Fukuyama, (1999); Putnam, (1995); Whitley & McKenzie, (2005) in their studies argued that the family is the most fundamental source of social capital, and that positive family experiences and environments are associated with high levels of social competence, civic engagement, and trust and tolerance in social groups and institutions.

The family environment involves the circumstances and social climate conditions within families. The family environments can differ in many ways, for

example, on the basis of socio-economic level and parenting practices (Zastrow & Kirst-Ashman, 2013). In addition, family environment is the quality and quantity of socio-emotional support and understanding that parents provide to their children and share among siblings or other family members within the home. Bhatia and Chadha (2004) have illustrated eight aspects of family environment: cohesion, expressiveness, conflict, acceptance and caring, independence, active-recreational orientation, organization, and control. Cohesion (is degree of commitment, help, and support family members provide for one another (Moos & Moos 1986). Also Stokes and Grimard (1984) stated, that increased family cohesion is associated with increased support provided to individual children by family members, Moos and Moos (1986) stated, expressiveness (is extent to which family members are encouraged to act openly and express their feelings and thoughts directly).

Family and its environment can sometimes have certain levels of instability in children upbringings, and this has been described as crisis and changes in functional prerequisite of the family institution. Although, family environment can be appealing through constant interaction, intimate relationship, emotional bonding, and interdependency and shared responsibilities, it can also create tensions that result in violent behaviour between family members (Kratcoski, 1987). It is a paradox that although families normally provide nurturance, warmth and emotional support in our impersonal mass society, many families bring abuse despair and violence into the lives of one or more of their members (Reiss, 1980).

Crime today is common among the young people, many have been caught in one criminal behaviour or the other, such as kidnapping, armed robbery, internet fraud, drug abuse, assault, rape, theft, house breaking, forgery, larceny and culpable homicide, and even suicide. Operationally, crime is defined by us as behaviour of engaging or involving in crime or other criminal behaviours by means of betrayal, conspiracy, falsehood, force or pretence depriving the target population their peace and right as stipulated by law, and as well causing physical or psychological pains to humanity at large.

The family is no longer effective and stable as it used to be, and it leads resultant negative effects on the society. The onset of crime can be traced to a deterioration of family bond during childhood marked by a weakened attachment to parents in the family and belief in conventional values. The

beginning of crime is supported by residence in a family and social settings in which criminal values and attitudes can be learned and reinforced by criminal peers. Hence, defective family relationship has more effect among criminals than the non-criminals (Thornberry, 1987).

The prevalence rate of crime among the young and adults in Nigeria, respectively, is alarming. It leads to day to day death, arrest, detention, trial and conviction and admission of individuals to correctional centres nationwide as inmates, resulting from unknown gun men attack, kidnapping, child trafficking, armed robbery, drug distribution or trafficking, rituals and rape. This has raised serious concerns for worry to our great nation that researchers introspect for confabulations to searching for solution to redeem Nigeria from present and future calamity that crime posits to our nation building.

Essentially, we believe every nation building starts from family and its environment, and family is the root foundation for association and behavioural attributes or impressions individual children learn or keep and expressed in the larger society as young and adults respectively in forms of kindness and responsibility or delinquency and crime, resulting from the methods and nature of family environment both is nurtured.

The rate of family decay and irresponsibility today seem to contribute so much to crime in Nigeria. According to UNICEF (2020), the most common form of violence affecting children take place in a home and family environment. Also, UNICEF (2020) stated in their global databases that about three quarters of young children are subjected to violence discipline by their caregivers on a regular basis. In support of the report gave by UNICEF, parents and caregivers no longer seem to take responsibility in children upbringing, coordination and correction.

The environment cares less in helping family developing children's moral right and behaviour, and it is the right of a child to receive correction from elders where he/she erred. Kohlberg (1969), applied the concept of moral development to the study of criminal behaviour. He argued that all people travel through six different stages of moral development. At the first stage, people only obey the law because they are afraid of punishment. By the sixth stage, however, people obey the law because, it is an assumed obligation and because they believe in the universal principles of justice, equity, and respect for others. In his research, Kohlberg found that violent

youth were significantly lower in their moral development than non-violent youth, even after controlling for social background (Kohlberg, 1969).

Also, we think, family may possibly guide and give corrections to a child in the absence of the immediate parents and immediate environment. When children are denied such corrections, they gain access to live in total world of freedom and take charge of their own game, in doing something wrong believing the world is a place of absolute freedom and pleasure-oriented zone, where you are free to do what you wish to do at any given time you wish it is right to do it, irrespective of what the family, society and others think. These become pattern of behaviour such individuals gain approval, gratification to live, and therefore, seeing no resistance and interference in adopting such pattern of behaviour as a way of life.

In our observation, family irresponsibility and over protection of children by parents seem to be serious concerns in building family environment that protects the society against crimes. This irresponsibility makes non biological parents to be less concern in correction of children in the family. In olden days, if a child report back of a beaten or correction from an elder, the first question you ask "what did you do", before any other action. Today, parents take their children to fight or abuse the elders, even teachers that gave such corrections or disciplines. This irresponsibility gives children wild access to gain liberty control for such actions that gain parents' supports, and relatively for other behaviour that gradually leads to crime.

It was reported in the social media on the 21st of November, 2019, the 16-year-old girl that fixed eye lashes to school, on arrival the class teacher sent her home, when she got home and reported to her mother, the mother quickly took her to school, abused the teacher and warned the teacher not to dare her daughter and that her daughter did not use the teacher's money to fix it. There is an adage in Igbo land that "the child his father sends to steal, uses leg to breaking the door." Also, if a child passes an elder without regards or greetings, the elder passes the child without showing concerns of the dangers ahead" This phenomenon is the evidence of what happen to our families today, resulting to crime, and evident to high influx of Nigerian inmates in Correctional Centres Nationwide.

Several studies have been conducted on the pattern of crime among inmates in Nigeria. Take for instance, Abrifor (2019) in his research on effect of societal level factors on recidivism among inmates in selected

prisons in South- Western, Nigeria, using descriptive and explorative research designs found out that cultism/drugs, stealing/robbery, murder, fraudster/impersonation, and assaults/damages were the patterns of crime committed by inmates of the selected correctional centres in Nigeria.

In another related study, Oguntunde, Ojo, Okagbue, and Oguntunde (2018) conducted a study on the analysis of selected crime data in Nigeria, using descriptive and inferential statistics, found out that murder, arm robbery, assault, felonious wounding, man slaughter, bribery and corruption, burglary (including store breaking and house breaking) were pattern of crimes committed by Nigerian inmates among some selected correctional Centres.

Lastly, Abrifor, Atere and Muoghalu (2012) conducted a study on gender differences, trend and pattern recidivism among inmates in selected Nigerian prisons , using a proportional sampling technique found out that theft, stealing, armed robbery, burglary, and attempted murder cases were the patterns of crime committed among Nigerian inmates of the Correctional Centres.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Crime consumes and remains the nuisance and a psychologically pandemic monster that Nigeria encounters in this modern era. Certainly, no individual seems like standing protected against the hostile possessions of crime. Indeed, crime is today a forceful disease that triumphs nearly in every single chunk of our national existence. The opposing possessions in the country have reached nearly prevalent magnitudes that seems like all hope is lost in the fight against crime in Nigeria. This titanic “pandemic” call crime ruins beyond comprehension the peace of its victims, it creates a lasting pain and stampedes the progress of our common national growth. Nevertheless, crime is overbearing, and it is significant to understand and disclose the factors that are abetting crime in the society (Demombynes & Ozler, 2005).

It is worrisome the rate at which young people who ought to be under the loving, caring and supervision of their parents in the family engage in crime. However, the researcher is interested in studying and understanding the influence of demographic characteristics and family environment on crime among the inmates in the correctional centres.

Currently, Nigeria is at the peak of atrocious and dreadful types of crime and the rate of these crimes,

such as, armed robbery, abduction, human trafficking, banditry-kidnapping, unknown gun men and terrorism just to mention a few, become nightmares in different parts of the country, and very frightening that every geopolitical zone and ethnic group in Nigeria wail for this “titanic psychological pandemic” called, crime.

However, the unequalled epidemic of kidnappings, unknown gun men, terrorism and other criminal behaviours are alarming, and making individual psyche to ponder “why crime”, seek for an answer and consider a significant question, “Do individuals perpetrating these atrocities come from a family or family environment at all”? The present study sought to provide an answer to that, as there is paucity of literatures to that effect.

1.3 Research Hypothesis

There will be a significant influence of family environment on patterns of crimes charged to the inmates of the Correctional centres.

2. Research Methodology

This section deals with research design, population, sample and sampling techniques, methods of data collection, procedure, techniques for data analysis and justification of methods.

2.1 Research Design

This study used a cross-sectional survey design; this helps the research study to take place at a single point in time by giving researcher a short time process to cover a particular population within a short possible time. The design does not involve manipulating variables, it is often considered to look at prevailing characteristics in a given population and, as well, it allows researcher to look at numerous demographic characteristics at once, (Sex, gender, age, religion, education, criminal charge, etc.). Also, the cross-sectional research design provides information about what is happening in a current population. In this study, the cross-sectional design was adopted to uncover the influence of demographic characteristics and family environment on crime among Nigerian inmates of Anambra (Awka & Onitsha) and FCT (Kuje & Suleja) Correctional Centers.

2.2 Population, Sample and Sampling Techniques

The population of inmates in Anambra Correctional Centres was 1,259 and FCT Correctional Centres was made up of 1,712 inmates as at the time of data

collection. This gave a total population of 2,971 inmates in the Nigerian Correctional Services Centres of interest. To get the required sample size, the study adopted an online sample size calculator (www.surveysystem.com). Afterward, the sample size was proportionately distributed. The population was calculated at 5% margin of error, confidence interval of 95% and a predetermined response distribution of 50%. Based on the calculation, three hundred and thirty-three (333) sample size were generated. Three hundred and thirty-three questionnaires were administered to the participants, and at the end of data collection, one hundred and seventy (170) questionnaires were found useful as other questionnaires were incorrectly filled. The study adopted a purposive sampling technique. In purposive sampling technique, a particular case is chosen because it illustrates some features or process that is of interest for a particular study (Neuman, 2000; Strydom & Venter, 2002).

2.3 Methods of Data Collection

Two instruments were used in the study; Family Environment Scale (FES) and Psychopathic Deviant (PDS) Scale. Family environment was assessed using the Family Environment Scale (FES), a 50-item inventory developed by Moos & Moos (1981). The Family Environment Scale (FES) is a 50-item inventory developed by Moos & Moos (1981) to measure the social environment characteristics of the family which focuses on the measurement and description of interpersonal relationships (IR) among family members, on the directions of personal growth (PG) which are emphasized in the family, and on the basic organizational structure or system maintenance (SM) of the family (Moos, Insel, & Humphrey, 1979). Also, FES is intended to measure the real/actual form (Form R), ideal/preferred form (Form I), and expected/likely form (Form E) family-social environments (Moos & Moos, 2009). The scale places interest on the level of relationship/difference between individual family members, like individual children and parents, in regard to current perceptions they have, ideal preferences, and expectations of their families-social environment. However, the FES is suitable for understanding how individual family members perceive their family environment and how individual member's behaviour affect the individual family unit and society at large. In other words, FES intend to measure and highlight the influence of family environment on crime among inmates of Correctional Centres.

The three scales is made up of 10 subscales, IR; Cohesion, Expressiveness, & Conflict, PG;

Independence, Achievement-orientation, Intellectual-cultural orientation, & Moral-religious Emphasis, and SM; Family Organization & Control subscales. It is as well measures what individuals perceive as their type of family environment, with its three principal climate dimensions of family environment: interpersonal relationships (IR)-measures with items 1, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 34,38, 40, 44, 46 & 49; system maintenance (SM)-measures items 2, 4, 5, 11, 13, 15, 16, 29, 33, 35, 37,41, 42, 43, 47,& 48; while personal growth (PG)-measures with items 3, 7, 8, 17, 18, 21, 24, 26, 36, 39, 45, & 50 respectively. Moos (1979) provided the original Psychometric properties where a sample of 73 two-parent and 19 single-parent families were studied. Mothers and fathers completed the FES questionnaire while the child within the family environment closest to 11 years old was as well administered the FES in an interview.

Moos reported initial internal consistency coefficient estimates (Kuder-Richardson 20s) between .64 and .79 for the scale. Also, provided the content validity, test-retest reliability and normative score of the instrument using Nigerian samples. Using Law she (1975) minimum values of content validity ratio per item at $P < 0.5$, a score of 0.99 and above of the judges agreement as to the relevance of an item was used as the criterion for accepting an item. The whole 50 items were included in the final version. Test-retest reliability was conducted and a coefficient of 0.77 was obtained.

Crime was assessed by the Psychopathic Deviant (PD) Scale, a 72-item inventory developed by (Hathaway & Mckinley, 1967). It consists of 72-items derived from 4 sub scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). It is administered as an independent test because of its multiple values in assessing different populations. Out of the 72-items, 51 are designed to obtained clinical information about client's personality while 30 of the items constitute the K scale which is one of the correct/validity scales of MMPI designed to assess the extent to which a client truthfully responded to items of the whole test.

In terms of scoring the PD Scale, 1 point for each of the following items shaded are awarded: True;7,9,10,11,12,13,15,21,22,23,25,27,28,29,31,33, 34,35,37,39,40,45,50,59,60,61,62,63, and 67. False; 1,6,8,14,18,24,26,30,32,38,43,44,49,51,52,53, 58,64,65, and 66. K scale awarded 1 point for following items shaded: True – 5, 39, 40, and 45. False – 1,2,3,4,16,17,18,19,20,41,42,43,46,47,48,49,54,55,56

,57, 58,68,69,70,71, and 72. Hathaway and Mckinley, (1967) provided the reliability coefficient of the instrument to be .80 for PD scale and .76 for K scale.

2.4 Validity of Research Instruments

A pilot study was conducted using 50 inmates from Nasarawa Correctional centre. The participants in the study were randomly sampled using a systematic sampling technique to select inmate from the Correctional centre’s Record Registers. The study adopted a test re-test reliability method to revalidate the two instruments: Family Environment Scale (FES) and Psychopathy Deviant Scale (PDS).

The results of the pilot study revealed the following: The reliability analysis for the index of Family Environment obtained a Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficient for the full scale as 0.752, mean of 32.16, and standard deviation of 6.447 and variance of 41.506. Thus, the results of the subscale shows that interpersonal Relationship (22-items) obtained a Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficient of .582, Mean of 12.66, Standard Deviation (SD) of 3.280 and variance of 10.760; System Maintenance (16-items), obtained a Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficient of 0.567, mean of 10.84, standard deviation of 2.510 and variance of 6.300 and Personal Growth (12-items), obtained a Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficient of 0.531, mean of 7.64, standard deviation of 2.275 and variance of 5.174.

The reliability analysis for the index of Psychopathy Deviant Scale obtained a Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficient of 0.788, mean of 39.02, standard deviation of 8.508 and variance of 72.387.

The results of the social demographic characteristics of the participants revealed that 46 male and 4 female inmates participated in the study where 28 inmates were adolescents between the 19-29 years and 22 inmates were adults between 30-61 years. Education: Primary 3, SSCE 33 inmates, ND/NCE 7 and BSc. /HND 7 inmates. Norms for interpretation indicates for Family Environment Scale is a mean score of 32.16 (male=31.65 and female= 38.00); for age: adolescent is 32.00 and adult is 32.36. For Crime (PD-Scale) is a mean score of 39.02 (male=39.13 and female=37.75); for age: adolescent is 40.00 and adult is 37.77.

2.4 Techniques for Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were used to analysed stated hypothesis.

3. Data Analysis and Results

The hypothesis stated that, there will be a significant influence of family environment on the patterns of crime charged to the inmates of the correctional centres. This hypothesis was tested using Chi-Square test in the table below:

Influence of Family Environment on the Pattern of Crime Charges

Crime Charges	Family Environment		Total
	Inadequate (< 28 score)	Adequate(>= 28)	
Felony	40(23.5%)	58(34.1%)	98(57.6%)
Misdemeanour	35(20.6%)	37(21.8%)	72(42.4%)
Total	75(44.1%)	95(55.9%)	170(100%)

The table above shows the frequencies and percentages of the pattern of crime charges and family environment to reveal the influence of these variables among inmates. Thus, the results showed that 98(57.6%) of the inmates were charged with felony crime out of which 58(34.1%) were from adequate family environment and 40(23.5%) were from inadequate family environment. The result also revealed that 72(42.4%) of the inmates were charged with misdemeanor crime, of which 37(21.8%) were from adequate family environment while 35(20.6%) were from inadequate family environment. Generally, the results revealed that 55.9% of the inmates were from adequate family environment while 44.1% were inmates from inadequate family environment. With this result, regardless of the type of family

environment a person comes from, crime could be perpetrated in the society.

4. Discussion of Findings

The result of hypothesis one revealed that the pattern of crime charges was predominantly influenced by family environment among inmates. The study found out that there was presence of crime across the scales of family environment. It indicated that 23.5% (Felony) and 20.6% (Misdemeanour) came from inadequate family environment respectively while 34.1% (Felony) and 21.8% (Misdemeanour) came from adequate family environment respectively. We can infer based on the result of the present study that various crimes committed by inmates are patterned after stealing, cultism, murder, fraud/impersonation,

armed robbery, assault, felonious wounding, bribery and corruption, etc. All these are classified as felony and misdemeanour respectively and this present study supports the results of Abrifor, (2019); Oguntunde et al., (2018); and Abrifor et al., (2012).

The result of the present finding also supports the research of Kierkus, Johnson, and Hewitt (2010) who indicated that family environment predicts patterns of crime. Though, the result indicated that family environment did not statistically influence pattern of crime charges among the inmates, this might be as a result of prevalence crime within family environment, learned behaviour or interest on setting preferred crime, crime profit-worth system in a setting, and the profits or benefits the individuals set to achieve that motivate individuals in a setting environment, states or zones to engaging to setting crimes seen as pattern of crime charged among the inmates of Correctional centres in Nigeria. It was discovered in study, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) stated, that crime is a style or pattern of behaviour characterized by self-centeredness, indifference to the suffering and needs of others, and low self-control. This can be observed in the classic pattern of crime in all states and geopolitical zones of Nigeria. Every part of the country has a setting crime that seen to be enterprising and rewarding forcing other part of the country to engaging in similar crime.

The crimes looting of treasury in the government, the kidnapping, armed robbery and unknown gun men in the South East, militancy, child trafficking and Kidnapping in the South-South, rituals, rape, armed robbery and kidnapping in the South West, banditry, kidnapping and ransom payment, armed robbery in the North Central, Boko-haram, terrorism, banditry, kidnapping and ransom payment in the North East and North West show that every part of the country has a pattern of crime they engage. In a study, family environment, Pratt, Gau and Franklin (2011) in validation posited that “the more significant an individual’s values are in relation to a certain crime, such as theft or rape, the less expected the individuals are engaged in the same crime.

In other word, adequate family environment discourages crime or promotes positive behaviour among family members and inculcate a sustainable value with conforming lifestyles to individuals which often stimulate family members’ conscience against crime, while inadequate family environment encourages and promotes crime among family members. This empirical proof shows the family environment individuals come from and the experiences therein have a profound and pervasive

influence on their later behaviour as adults. This clearly indicates that the family has an important role to play in the life of every individual (Akagu, 2006; Parsons & Bales 2002; Robertson, 1987).

Similarly, Isangedighi, (2011) stated that kind of family environment a child is born into sets the limit for life’s adjustment. Also offers the basis for one’s ability to behave and function during different activities. It is believed that a destructive and disturbed family can have a significant influence on socialization because the family is the primary unit in which individuals learn the values, attitudes, patterns and processes that guide their behaviours throughout their lives (Lowie, 1979). Family instability and crime is prevalence, and has become a common phenomenon in Nigeria.

5. Conclusion

Based on the findings of the present study, the paper concluded that pattern of crimes among inmates such as stealing, cultism, murder, fraud/impersonation, armed robbery, assault, bribery and corruption, arson, kidnapping, drugs, manslaughter, illegal possession of firearm. Cybercrime, and terrorism have causal-relationship with the family.

6. Recommendations

In keeping with the content and context of the current study, we made the following recommendations:

That government through ministry of Humanitarian and Social Development engage and assign professionals: Psychologists, Social workers, Clinical Psychologists and Forensic & Correctional Psychologists to families for need assessment, stress coping skills, rehabilitation and care and support services and as well would provide adequate and functional family environment services training and retraining on interpersonal relations, system maintenance and children’s personal growth and development, among others.

Government considerations to establish family environment Management Agency in the Ministry of Humanitarian and Social Development that would provide family functional services for training, retraining and capacity building for parents or caregivers on interpersonal relations, system maintenance and children’s personal growth.

References

- Abrifor, C.A. (2019). Societal level factors and Recidivism among Inmates in selected Prisons in South-Western, Nigeria. *African Journal for the Psychological Study of Social Issues*. Vol.22No.2.
- Abrifor, C.A., Atere, A. & Muoghalu, C. (2012). Gender Differences, Trend and Pattern Recidivism among Inmates in Selected Nigerian Prisons. *Psychology. European Scientific Journal*, ESJ. DOI: [10.19044/V8N24P%P](https://doi.org/10.19044/V8N24P%P)
- Akagu, A.H. (2006). The impact of Family Instability on Youth Crime: A Case Study of Ilorin Metropolis. An Unpublished B.Sc Thesis of the Department of Sociology, University of Ilorin.
- Bhatia, H., & Chadha, N. K. (2004). Family Environment Scale. National Psychological Corporation, Agra.
- Demombynes, G. & Ozler, B. (2005) Crime and Local Inequality in South Africa, *Journal of Development Economics*, 76, 265–292.
- Fukuyama, F. (1999). *The Great Disruption: Human Nature and the Reconstitution of Social Order*. New York: Free Press.
- Gottfredson, M., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University press.
- Hathaway, S. R., & McKinley, J. C. (1967). *The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory Manual*. New York: Psychological Corporation.
- Hirsch, T. (1969). *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Johnson, B.R., David B.L., Spencer D.L., & Sung J.J. (2000). Escaping from the crime of inner cities: Church attendance and religious salience among disadvantaged youth. *Justice Quarterly* 17: 377–91.
- Judge, S. I. (1999). Eastern European adoptions: Current status and implications for intervention. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education* 19, 244–252.
- 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.
- Kohlberg, L. (1969). *Stages in the Development of Moral Thought and Action*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Kratcoski, P. C. (1987), Families who Kill: Marriage and Family Review, *Journal of Social Issues* 12 (2).
- Moore, A., Stambrook, M., & Peters, L. (1993). Centripetal and centrifugal family-life cycle factors in long-term outcome following traumatic brain injury. 7, 247–255.
- Moos, R. H., & Moos, B. S. (2009). *Family Environment Scale manual and samples set: Development, applications and research*. Mind Garden Inc. Palo Alto, CA.
- Moos, R. H., and Moos, B. S. (1981). *Family Environment Scale Manual*, Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, Calif., (in press).
- Moos, R. H., Insel, P.M., & Humphrey, B. (1979). *Preliminary Manual for Family Environment Scale*. Work Environment Scale Group, Environment Scale. Palo Alto, CA: Counselling Psychologists Press.
- Moos, R., & Moos, B. (1986). *Family Environment Scale manual*, (2nd edition). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Neuman, W. L. (2000). Qualitative and Quantitative Research Design. *Journal of Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approach* 1, 121-155
- Nwosuji, E., (2008). The role of Husband & Wife in contemporary Nigeria society. At: <http://nigsocioculture.blogspot.ro/2008/08/role-of-husband-wife-in-contemporary.html> Accessed 19 July 2017.
- Oguntunde, P.E., Ojo, O.O., Okagbue, H.I. & Oguntunde, O.A. (2018). Analysis of Selected Crime Data in Nigeria. *Elsevier. Data in Brief* 19: 1242–1249.
- Okoro, E.N., Zamani, A.E., (2022). Influence of Family Environment on Crime among Nigerian Inmates Centres in Anambra and Federal Capital Territory. *International Journal of Management, Social Sciences, Peace and Conflict Studies (IJMSSPCS)*, 5 (1), 95-105;ISSN:2682-6135
- Parsons, T. & Bales, R. F. (2002). *Family: Socialization and Interaction Process* (1st ed.). International Library of Sociology. New York: Routledge and Kogan Ltd.
- Parsons, T. (1961). *An Outline of the Social System*. In T. Parsons, E. Shils, K.D. Naegele & J. Pitts (Eds.), *Theories of society* (pp. 36–40). Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Pratt, T., Gau, J., & Franklin, T. (2011). *Key Ideas in Criminology and Criminal Justice*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Putnam, R. (1995). Bowling alone: America’s declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy*, 6(1), 65–78.
- Reiss, I. L. (1980). *The Family System in America*, (3rd ed.) New York. Worth Publisher Inc.

- Robertson, I. (1987) *Sociology* (3rd ed.) USA: Worth Publishers Inc.
- Robertson, R.P., (2010). Family is for life: Connections between childhood family experiences and wellbeing in early adulthood. Article in *Family matters*, January 2010. Melbourne, Vic.
- Shaffer, D.R., 2000. *Social and Personality Development* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Stokes, J.P., & Grimard, W.D., (1984). The Inventory of Socially Supportive Behaviors: Dimensionality, prediction, and gender differences. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 12(1), 53-69).
- Strydom, H. and Venter, L. (2002). Sampling and Sampling Methods. In De Vos, A.S., (Ed.), *Research at Grass Roots: For the Social Sciences and Human Service Profession*, Van Schaik, Pretoria, 197-211.
- Thornberry, T. P. (1987). Toward an interactional theory of delinquency. *Criminology* 25, 863–891.
- UNICEF, (2020). *Designing parenting programmes for violence prevention: A Guidance Note*. Big Yellow Taxi, Inc.
- Whitley, R., & McKenzie, K. (2005). Social capital and psychiatry: Review of the literature. *Harvard Review of Psychiatry*, 13(2), 71–84.
- World Bank. (2001). *The World Bank Annual Report 2001: Volume 1. Year in Review*. WashingtonDC.WorldBank.<https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/139> License:CC BY 3.0 IGO.
- Youngblade, L. M., Theokas, C., Schulenberg, J., Curry, L., Huang, I., & Novak, M. (2007). Risk and promotive factors in families, schools, and communities: A contextual model Understanding Human Behavior in the Social Environment, Australia; Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole. (WHO).
- Zastrow, C., & Kirst-Ashman, K. K. (2013). Schooling. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89(3), 538-548.
- Ziehl, S.C., (2003). Forging the links: Globalization and family patterns. *Society in Transition*, 34(2), pp.320-337.