

Assessment of the Contribution of Various Family Structures on Juvenile Delinquency in Embu County, Kenya

¹Florence Gesare Miruka, ²Pauline Thuku & ³Joshia Osamba

¹²³Karatina University

Abstract: Juvenile delinquency has been on the increase all over the world. Research has established a positive correlation between juvenile delinquency and family violence. However, few studies have assessed the relationship between the various family types and juvenile delinquency in Kenya, hence the need for this study. A descriptive survey research design that employed quantitative techniques was utilized. The target population was 360 juvenile delinquents in Embu County. Using Krejcie and Morgan's Table for Determining Sample Size from a Given Population, a sample size of 176 respondents was arrived at. Simple random sampling was used to select the respondents. A questionnaire with both open and closed ended questions was utilized in data collection. Cronbach's Alpha measured the instrument's reliability. A reliability coefficient of 0.805 was achieved indicating that the instrument was reliable. Data was analyzed using SPSS version 26. Data was described using frequencies and percentages. ANOVA was conducted in hypothesis testing and found a significant relationship between family structure and juvenile delinquency. The type of family in which a child was born and bred determines so much whom he becomes in adulthood. Most juvenile delinquents grew up in dysfunctional families characterized by violence, lacking role models from whom the children were to emulate. This study recommends the formulation of parental education programmes to sensitize parents on the role of family in addressing juvenile delinquency. Family being the smallest unit from whence community sprung, there is need to strengthen families of whatever type.

Keyterms: Juvenile delinquency, family, family violence, Kenya

I. Introduction

Like other parts of the world, juvenile delinquency is a common phenomenon in Kenya. There are two types of delinquents (Jenkins, 2009) the first type is the repeat offender also referred to as the life course-persistent offender who begins offending during adolescence or even in childhood and continues into adulthood. This type largely depends on the juvenile's family status (Shoemaker, 2005). The second type is referred to as age specific offender, which is also known as adolescence-limited offender who only commits criminal acts at the onset of their adolescence and ends with the completion of the turbulent period. Juvenile delinquency is caused by several factors. Many of the children with low learning abilities are likely to be delinquent as a result. A number of children take to delinquency due to the violence within their families and social circles (F.Liang,2019). The socio-economic statuses of their families also play a big role in juvenile delinquency as children are forced to start fending for themselves earlier than usual. Lack of role models from the adults around is a main cause of juvenile delinquency since the children learn vicariously by imitating the actions of the adults in their environment. Additionally, family stability determines to a large extent whether the children growing therein will be delinquent or not.

According to the United Nations (2013), the problem of juvenile delinquency is not only an issue confined to developed countries but also a prevalent issue in developing countries. Okorodudu (2010) observes that since

1995, incidents of juvenile offences in Sub-Saharan countries have increased by more than 30 per cent. This has been variously attributed to socio-economic challenges which have seen a deterioration of living standards, technology, influence of the media, parenting styles and changes in societal structures. This situation has led to deprivation, poverty, and lack of basic needs in homes which predisposes children to involvement in criminal activities as they try to fend for themselves. Saleebey (2014) affirms this view and adds that the numbers of children in especially difficult socioeconomic circumstances are estimated to have increased from 15 million to 60 million between 2010 and 2013 in Sub-Saharan countries alone.

Similarly, Kimani (2010) supported this notion and mentions that cases of delinquency among the youths in Kenya have increased tremendously in the last decade. On the other hand, Pius (2012) contends that studies in sociology have established that the family as a social institution plays a central role in preparation of children to responsible adulthood with adaptive moral and social behaviours. This is attributed to the fact that the family is the custodian of norms and values which are devoted to achieving the goals of the family as well as that of society (Sheryln, 2008). Where the values of the families are inappropriate or distorted, the children are likely to take to delinquent behaviours as a result of lack of good role models.

Wexler (2014) asserts that families are often examined when a child exhibits delinquent behaviour because the different ways of family functioning may promote or prevent juvenile delinquency. Among the areas of concern in the link between family factors and delinquency comprise the family structures such as nuclear family, extended family, grand parent family, single parent family and stepfamily (Wexler, 2014). Studies on the effects of family structure on juvenile delinquency show that family structure is an important factor in explaining delinquency among adolescents, since it accounts for over 70% recorded juvenile delinquency crimes, (Henggeler&Schoenwald, 2012). According to Okorodudu (2010), the foundation of juvenile delinquency is majorly rooted in the kind of family and home the child grows up in. Muhammed et al. (2009) observes that change of family structure, family volatility and disruption is on the increase and that the upsurge of crime trends among many children may be attributed to this hence the need for research.

Family structure in Kenya has changed radically over the last three decades (Oloo, 2011). High rates of divorce often leave the children with a lot of resentment and sometimes without care due to the fact that most African families rely on fathers for support. Divorce also leads to increase in single-parent households and may be a contributing factor to the increasing rates of teenage pregnancy and delinquency for lack of fatherly guidance. The proliferation of step families, child-headed families, grandparents and other relatives acting as parents, foster parents, and an explosion in cohabitation have come to characterize contemporary family life (Oloo, 2011).

Research has shown that a significant number of children spend time in a single-parent family during their lives (Weintraub&Kaufman, 2019). About two-thirds of divorced women and three-fourths of divorced men eventually remarry. This suggests that a large number of children end up living through multiple family structure transitions (Maruna, 2010). Furthermore, many children are spending fewer years in intact married families and most of them can expect to experience multiple living arrangements during childhood. Studies have shown that such family structure transitions can be detrimental to children's well-being and are likely to contribute to juvenile antisocial behaviours (Government of Kenya, 2013). This implies that children may become delinquent if mitigation measures are not put in place, particularly at family level.

Mpabaisi (2012) posits that due to polarization of the society, the emerging family structures have been a great contributor towards juvenile delinquency. This is because children spend greater part of their time with parents, relatives and guardians. Considering the social and economic disruptions and challenges facing families today that has led to shift from traditional African family structure, many children are growing up in families with one or no parent at all. This exposes them to juvenile crimes. Furthermore, sociological theories affirm that children copy and transmit parental behavior into their immediate and future life (Finley, 2007).

Based on the idea that families are the foundation of social wellbeing, the traditional African society had well established socio-economic family structures that ensured the welfare of all children. As such, cases of juvenile delinquency were negligible before the colonial era (Government of Kenya, 2010). Nowadays, the changing socio-economic trends has led to emergence of various family structures characterized by family conflicts and broken marriages. This has forced children to live with single parents, relatives and guardians or even at times survive on their own. Such environments have exposed young people to higher risks of becoming delinquent hence the need to address the root cause of juvenile delinquency (Ibabe et al., 2013). The government and other stakeholders are engaged in activities aimed at juvenile crime prevention, but the overall effect of these programmes is rather weak. This is because the mechanisms in place are often inadequate to address the existing family situations that greatly contribute towards juvenile delinquency (Muthee, 2010). The responsibility of handling this fragile situation and generation has been left in the hands of parents and teachers, most of whom lack the requisite knowledge for handling the current deviant young generation (Maruna, 2010).

A number of criminological and sociological studies have documented a connection between family structure and juvenile delinquency (Sheryln, 2008; Matza, 2009; Jones, 2011). These studies reveal that children from dysfunctional families are more likely to engage in delinquent crimes than children from intact families (Jones, 2011). Prior research on family structure and delinquency, has operationalized family structure into two major static conditions, namely single parent and intact families. Although some studies have established that delinquent behavior is higher among adolescents residing in non-intact households, the degree to which specific family structures contribute towards juvenile delinquency has not been well established (Fouchard, 2011), particularly in developing countries such as Kenya.

II. Statement of the Problem

Studies have established a connection between family structure and juvenile delinquency (Sheryln, 2008; Matza, 2009; Jones, 2011). These studies reveal that children from dysfunctional families are more likely to engage in delinquency than children from intact families (Jones, 2011). The incidences of delinquency among young persons in Embu County, Kenya are alarming and this is a major challenge in many families. Affected families and communities lament about the increasing rate of juvenile crimes owing to their negative effects on the society, families and individuals. As a result, the government and other stakeholders have put in place measures to address juvenile delinquency. The measures include; after care programmes for young offenders, rehabilitation programmes, education campaigns as well as group or individual guidance and counseling for those affected. Yet, empirical studies continue to show an increase in the rate of juvenile delinquency in Embu County, hence the need for more research.

III. Objectives of the Study

The study was guided by the following research objectives, to;

- i. Establish the various family structures in Embu County.
- ii. Analyze the common anti-social activities committed by juvenile delinquents in Embu County.
- iii. Examine the relationship between family types and juvenile delinquency in Embu County.

Hypothesis

H₀. There is a significant relationship between family structure and juvenile delinquency.

Methodology

This study adopted a descriptive survey design and was conducted in Embu County, which is located approximately 130 Kilometres northeast of Nairobi, Kenya. The target population consisted of 334 juvenile delinquents who were distributed in five sub counties as indicated in Table 1. These juveniles were identified from records kept at the Probation offices in the respective probation stations within the County.

1: Target Population

S/No	Sub county	No of respondents
1	Embu West	63
2	Embu North	64
3	Embu East	66
4	Mbeere South	66
5	Mbeere North	75
	Total	334

A sample was selected to participate in the study using Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sampling formulae. According to this formula, a population of 334 juveniles is adequately represented by a sample of 176 respondents.

To collect data, the study used a questionnaire administered to the juvenile delinquents. Cronbach Alpha was used to evaluate the instrument's reliability. A reliability coefficient of 0.805 was achieved indicating that the instrument met the stipulated threshold of 0.7 recommended for studies in social sciences. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used in data analysis. The computer software, SPSS version 26 was used. To establish the relationship between the independent variable (family types) in the study and the dependent variable (juvenile delinquency), one way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), was conducted during hypothesis testing.

IV. Findings and Discussion

This section comprises of findings and discussion of the study, presented in accordance with the objectives of the study.

Anti-Social Activities Committed by the Respondents

The study sought to find out the anti-social activities that were committed by the juvenile delinquents in Embu County. The findings are presented in Table 2

Table 2: Anti-Social Activities Committed by the Respondents

Anti-Social Activities Committed	Frequency	Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent
1. Theft	76	42.9%	42.9
2. Murder	2	1.1%	44.1
3. Fighting	13	7.3%	51.4
4. Arson	3	1.7%	53.1
5. Assault	14	7.9%	61.0
6. Prostitution	12	6.8%	67.8
7. Drugs	30	16.9%	84.7
8. Others	26	15.3%	100.0
Total	176	100.0	

Table 2 shows that the most prevalent anti-social activity conducted by the respondents was theft 77(42.9%), this was followed by drugs 30(16.9%), assault 14(7.9%), fighting 13(7.3%), prostitution 12(6.8%), arson 3(1.7%) and murder 2(1.1%). These results demonstrate that many juvenile and youth generally are struggling

to have something for their basic need to sustain their life leading them to engage in theft and burglary. Also, substance use act as an attribute to stealing and theft for the sole aim of having money to buy drugs and related substances. Different approaches have been used in scientific and practical literature on explanation of juvenile crime and violence together with delinquent behavior by young people (World Youth Report, 2003). Criminal behavior involves different activities thus researchers focus on the wider context of antisocial behaviour. Antisocial behaviour is equated with criminality and delinquency in which they are both engaged in criminal acts (Hall, 2003). Moreover, whereas criminologists refer juvenile delinquency as all public wrongs committed by young people aged between 12 and 20, sociologists take the concept more broadly and believe it to cover violation of legal and social norms, both minor and serious offences committed by juvenile (World Youth Report, 2003).

Sociologists in the first half of the 20th century chronicled the correlation between neighborhood environment factors and juvenile delinquency. They mentioned neighborhood attributes such as poverty, percentage of single-parent households, population mobility and percentage of foreign born to have influenced crime through their impact on community-level disorder, residential cohesion and informal social control (McDonald et al., 2009). Social disorder occurs where there is low quality life and parents' or guardians' failure to provide material support hence young people cannot secure a well-paid employment due to poor education, which invokes crimes (Vanderschueren, 2000). This becomes a catalyst to high number of homeless people and the increase of street children who are now the most vulnerable to criminality and its victimization in almost every Africa's growing cities and towns (UN-Habitat, 2004).

It is important to note that, prevalence of juvenile crimes differ from one another in Embu County. Stealing is the most prominent offence; other offences are pick-pocketing, robbery, house breaking, assault and sexual offences. Drug abuse among juvenile and youth is also a major concern. In Kenya substance use among some Kenyan youth is the fact of life. According to research done on prevalence of substance use among college students in Eldoret, results show the prevalence on any substance use was about 70 % (Atwoli et al., 2011).

V. Contribution of Family to Juvenile Delinquency

The second research objective sought to establish the contribution of family types to juvenile delinquency. The respondents were provided with 18 items in a five-point Likert scale that ranged from never (1), rarely (2), sometimes (3), very often (4) and always (5). For the purposes of this study the researcher collapsed "never" and "rarely" to "rarely" and "very often" and "always" to "often." The responses obtained were also used to compute a mean score (\bar{x}) and standard deviation (s) for each of the statements and an overall mean score for all the 18 statements. The mean scores ranged from 1- 5 and were interpreted as follows; 1.00-2.33(rarely), 2.34-3.67 (sometimes) and 3.68-5.00 (most of the times). Table 2provides a summary of the findings.

Table 3. Contribution of Family to Juvenile Delinquency

	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	n	\bar{x}	s
1. I was regularly/routinely supervised by my guardian/parents.	25 (14.1%)	37(20.9%)	115(65.0%)	177	1.73	.98
2. Some of my siblings committed anti-social act.	120 (67.8%)	54(30.5%)	3(1.7%)	177	2.05	.82
3. I was treated unfairly by my parents/guardians.	75 (42.4%)	81(45.8%)	21(11.9%)	177	2.51	.93
4. My brothers and sisters were friendly towards me.	53 (29.9%)	79(44.6%)	45(25.4%)	177	2.88	.89
5. My parents/guardian were friendly towards me.	62 (35.0%)	79(44.6%)	36(20.3%)	177	2.73	.94
6. There are record of delinquency or anti-social act committed by my parent(s)/guardian(s).	138(78.0)	31(17.5%)	8(4.5%)	177	1.68	.96
7. There are records anti-social act committed by persons in the place where you have grown up.	108(61.0%)	62(35.0%)	7(4.0%)	177	1.99	.99

8. I usually spent time with my parents together.	138(78.0%)	18(10.2%)	21(11.9%)	177	1.85	1.06
9. My parents/guardian provided adequate proper food and basic amenities.	98(55.4%)	56(31.6%)	23(13.0%)	177	2.40	.98
10. I was usually monitored by my parents or guardians.	145(82.0%)	13(7.3%)	19(10.7%)	177	1.98	.99
11. I enjoyed a close relationship with members of my family.	130(73.5%)	25(14.1%)	21(11.9%)	176	1.93	1.08
12. I felt free and comfortable talking to your parent/guardian about anything.	141(79.7%)	26(14.7%)	10(5.6%)	177	1.83	.88
13. I experienced violence in my home	82(46.3%)	57(32.2%)	38(21.5%)	177	2.57	1.18
14. My parents/guardians quarreled	102(57.6%)	28(15.8%)	47(26.6%)	177	2.33	1.33
15. My siblings fought each other.	116(65.5%)	54(30.5%)	7(4.0%)	177	2.00	.92
16. My parents/guardians fought each other.	112(63.3%)	30(16.9%)	35(19.8%)	177	2.10	1.28
17. I liked the way my parents treated me.	123(69.5%)	40(22.6%)	14(7.9%)	177	1.92	1.04
18. My parents/guardian showed adequate love towards me.	132(74.6%)	21(11.9%)	24(13.6%)	177	1.94	1.10

Table 3 presents the responses of contribution of family to juvenile delinquency. On whether the respondent was regularly/routinely supervised by guardian/parents, 115(65.0%) indicated rarely, 37(20.9%) sometimes and 25 (14.1%) often, the mean score (1.27) and standard deviation (.98) implied that the respondent was supervised most of the times. When asked whether some of the siblings committed anti-social acts; 120 (67.8%) indicated rarely, 54(30.5%) sometimes and 3(1.7%) often. The computed mean score and standard deviation ($\bar{x} = 2.05, s = .82$) indicated that the siblings rarely committed anti-social acts. On whether the respondent was treated unfairly by his/her parents/guardians 75 (42.4%) indicated rarely, 81(45.8%) sometimes and 21(11.9%) often, mean score for this statement ($\bar{x} = 2.51, s = .93$) implied the respondents were sometimes treated unfairly by his/her parents/guardians.

When asked if brothers and sisters were friendly towards him/her, 53 (29.9%) indicated rarely, 79(44.6%) sometimes and 45(25.4%) often; mean score and standard deviation ($\bar{x} = 2.88, s = .89$) demonstrated that the respondents brothers and sisters were sometimes friendly. On whether the parents/guardian were friendly towards the respondents, 62 (35.0%) indicated rarely 79(44.6%) sometimes and 36(20.3%) most of the times. The mean score and standard deviation ($\bar{x} = 2.73, s = .94$) showed that the parents/guardian were sometimes friendly towards the respondents. Asked if there were records of delinquency or anti-social act committed by their parent(s)/guardian(s), 138(78.0) indicated rarely, 31(17.5%) sometimes and 8(4.5%) most of the times. The computed mean score ($\bar{x} = 1.68, s = .96$) for this statement implied that anti-social acts committed by their parent(s)/guardian(s) were rare. On whether there were records anti-social act committed by persons in the place where you have grown up, 108(61.0%) specified rarely, 62(35.0%) sometimes and 7(4.0%) most of the times. The mean score for this statement ($\bar{x} = 1.99, s = .99$) signified that there rarely were records anti-social act committed by persons in the place where you have grown up.

On whether the respondents usually spent time together with their parents; 138(78.0%) indicated rarely, 18(10.2%) sometimes and 21(11.9%) most of the times. The mean score ($\bar{x} = 1.95, s = 1.06$) showed that on average the respondents didn't spend time with their parents. Asked if the parents/guardian provided adequate proper food and basic amenities; 98(55.4%) said rarely, 56(31.6%) sometimes and 23(13.0%) most of the time, the mean score ($\bar{x} = 2.40, s = .98$) revealed that the parents/guardians sometimes provided adequate food. On if the respondent was usually monitored by my parents or guardians; 145(82.0%) rarely, 13(7.3%), sometimes and 19(10.7%) most of the times. The mean score ($\bar{x} = 2.98, s = .99$) indicated that the respondents were rarely monitored by the guardians or parents. Asked if they enjoyed a close relationship with members of their family; 130(73.5%) rarely, 25(14.1%) sometimes and 21(11.9%) most of the times. The mean score ($\bar{x} = 1.93, s = 1.08$) indicated that the respondents rarely enjoyed a close relationship with members of their family. On if they felt free and comfortable talking to their parent/guardian about anything; 141(79.7%) said rarely,

26(14.7%) sometimes and 10(5.6%) most of the times. The mean score ($\bar{x} = 1.83, s = .88$) indicated the respondents did not feel free and comfortable talking to their parent/guardian about anything. When asked if they had experienced violence in their homes; 82(46.3%) said rarely, 57(32.2%) sometimes and 38(21.5%) most of the times. Mean score ($\bar{x} = 2.57, s = 1.18$) revealed that on average the respondents sometimes experienced violence in their homes.

On the question if their parents/guardians quarreled; 102(57.6%) said rarely, 28(15.8%) sometimes and 47(26.6%) most of the times. Mean score rarely, sometimes and most of the times. ($\bar{x} = 2.33, s = 1.33$) showed that sometimes parents/guardians quarrelled. On whether the siblings fought each other; 116(65.5%) said rarely, 54(30.5%) sometimes and 7(4.0%) most of the times. Mean score ($\bar{x} = 2.00, s = .92$) indicated that the siblings sometimes fought each other. Asked if parents/guardians fought each other; 112(63.3%) rarely, 30(16.9%) sometimes and 35(19.8%) most of the times. The mean score ($\bar{x} = 2.10, s = 1.28$) indicated that sometimes the parents/guardians fought each other. On whether the respondent liked the way my parents treated him/her; 123(69.5%) said rarely, 40(22.6%) sometimes and 14(7.9%) most of the times. The mean score ($\bar{x} = 1.92, s = 1.04$) revealed that on average the respondent rarely liked the way the parents treated him/her. On whether their parents/guardian showed adequate love towards them; 132(74.6%) said rarely, 21(11.9%) sometimes and 24(13.6%) most of the times. The computed mean score ($\bar{x} = 1.94, s = 1.10$) showed that their parents/guardian rarely showed adequate love towards them.

The second research objective sought to establish the contribution of family structure to juvenile delinquency. The study established that the delinquent's relationship with their parents/guardians rarely involved routine supervision, monitoring or spending time together. In addition, the child sometimes felt treated unfairly by their parents/guardians, the parents rarely showed love and were not friendly towards them. The delinquents did not enjoy a close relationship with members of the family but there were no records of anti-social act committed by their parent(s)/guardian(s) or persons in the place where you have grown up. However, they felt that their brothers and sisters were sometime friendly towards them. The study revealed that parents/guardians quarreled or fought each other, the child did not feel free and comfortable talking to the parent/ guardian about anything and they sometimes experienced violence at home.

The family as a social institution is currently undergoing substantial changes; its form is diversifying with, for example, the increase in one-parent families and non-marital unions. The absence of fathers in many low-income families can lead boys to seek patterns of masculinity in delinquent groups of peers. These groups in many respects substitute for the family, define male roles, and contribute to the acquisition of such attributes as cruelty, strength, excitability and anxiety. Studies show that children who receive adequate parental supervision are less likely to engage in criminal activities. Dysfunctional family settings—characterized by conflict, inadequate parental control, weak internal linkages and integration, and premature autonomy—are closely associated with juvenile delinquency. Children in disadvantaged families that have few opportunities for legitimate employment and face a higher risk of social exclusion are overrepresented among offenders. When young people are exposed to the influence of adult offenders they have the opportunity to study delinquent behavior, and the possibility of their engaging in adult crime becomes more real. The “criminalization” of the family also has an impact on the choice of delinquent trajectories. A study carried out in prisons in the United States reveals that families involved in criminal activities tend to push their younger members towards violating the law. More than two-thirds of those interviewed had relatives who were incarcerated; for 25 per cent it was a father and for another 25 per cent a brother or sister.

ANOVA on Differences in Family Structure Contribution to Delinquent Behaviours

In order to establish whether the observed differences in family contribution to delinquent behaviours among children the researcher tested the null hypothesis (H_0), which stated thus;

H₀: There is a statistically significant relationship between family structure and juvenile delinquency.

To test this hypothesis, One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was computed. The statistical relationship between the levels of family's contribution to juvenile delinquency was computed. Table 3 provides a summary of the findings.

Table 3b Analysis of Variance of Family Contribution to Delinquent Behaviours

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	12.549	7	1.793	16.332	.05
Within Groups	18.550	169	.110		
Total	31.099	176			

Table 3 shows that the results yielded p-value = 0.05 indicating that the differences in family's structure to juvenile delinquent behaviours was statistically significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that there were significant differences in family's contribution to delinquency. The various family structures in operation have a significant impact on juvenile delinquency in our society.

VI. Conclusions

This study makes the following conclusions;

The study established that various family structures contributed differently to juvenile delinquency in children, the order of their family membership starting from the highest to the lowest was; two biological parent families, mother only, grandparent headed families, father only child headed and lastly children's homes. The study indicates that the more children there are in a family, the higher the chances of them turning delinquent due to lack of proper behavioural control.

The study established that the delinquents did not enjoy cordial relationships with their parents/guardians, brothers and sisters. They mostly felt treated unfairly, misunderstood and were rarely showed love and friendliness. The delinquents did not enjoy a close relationship with members of their family. A family is the smallest unit where love and cohesion is to be experienced. The economic statuses of the family structures children belonged to contributed to delinquency as the parents/guardians spent a lot of their time searching for means of livelihood, thus neglecting the most important task, parenting. Juveniles who felt neglected were likely to engage in anti-social activities either to seek for attention or find satisfaction from their criminal activities.

The juveniles did not feel free and comfortable talking to their parent/ guardians about the challenges they were facing in life. This is due to the fact that in a traditional African family, children are to be seen and not heard. Juveniles are afraid of condemnation by parents/guardians if they were to share life threats they were. Facing. Most juveniles did not enjoy cordial relationships with their parents/guardians who thought that they were busy fending for the juveniles.

VII. Recommendations

This study makes the following recommendations;

There is need for the central and county governments, NGOs, religious and child welfare organizations to register child headed families to enable them meet their basic needs such as the elderly programme.

The central and county governments, NGOS, religious and child welfare organizations to formulate parental programmes to sensitize parents/guardians on the best practices of parenting and care giving no matter the family structure.

The governments of the day should construct recreational facilities to engage the juveniles positively as if left idle, they are likely to become delinquent.

The social skills of the juveniles should be enhanced in such a way that they are able to make the right decisions on their own.

The child welfare organizations should endeavor to provide mentors for the juveniles to prevent them from entering into crime and eventually the criminal justice system.

Parents should be role models and avoid conflicts in front of their children.

Establish and enhance programs that bring together teachers, school administrators, social service providers, police, juvenile justice practitioners and the citizenry

References

- [1.] Atwoli et al., (2011). Evidence based on study conducted on drug and substance and prevalence among juveniles in Kenya.
- [2.] Finley, L.L. (2007). *Encyclopedia of Juvenile violence Green Publishing Group*. Retrieved on 29th January 2017 from <http://www.greenessay.com/samples/family-structure-and-its-effects-on-juvenile>.
- [3.] Fouchard, L. (2011). The making of the juvenile delinquent in Nigeria and South Africa, 1930-1970. *The Journal of African History*, 47 (3), 115-137.
- [4.] Government of Kenya (2010). *National development plan 2010-2012*. Nairobi:Government Printers.
- [5.] Government of Kenya (2013). Kenya Gazette Supplement No 95, (Act No. 8). *Challenges Facing The Children Act*. Nairobi: Government Printers.
- [6.] Henggeler, S. & Schoenwald, S. (2012). Evidence based interventions for juvenile offenders and juvenile justice policies that support them. *Social Policy Report*, 25. Society for Research on Child Development.
- [7.] Ibabe, I., Jaureguizar, J. & Bentler, P.M. (2013). "Risk factors for child-to-parent violence." *Journal of Family Violence*, 28:523-534.
- [8.] Jones, G. (2011). *Innovative trends and specialized strategies in curbing juvenile delinquency*. New York: Garland.
- [9.] Kimani, A. (2010). *Influence of family structure on juvenile delinquency in Nakuru children's remand home* Retrieved on April 20th, 2019 from <http://www.freeonlinepaper.com/family-structure-pdf>.
- [10.] Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W., (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*.
- [11.] McDonald et al., (2009). Residential cohesion and informal social controls as mediators between neighborhood and child maltreatment
- [12.] Maruna, S. (2010). Revisiting rehabilitation formula. *Journal of Crime and Sentencing*, 2(1), 158-180.
- [13.] Matza, H. (2009). Juvenile delinquency and subterranean values. *American Sociological Review* 26: 712-719.
- [14.] Mpabaisi, S.K. (2012). *Integrating social rehabilitation and reintegration in community service*. A paper presented at Community Service Workshop, Kampala, May.
- [15.] Muhammed, A., Salawu, B., Adekeye, D, Ayinla, S. & Adeoye, M. (2009). The nexus between family instability and youth crime: Evidence from Nigeria. *International Journal of Human Development and Information System*. 2(2), 41-53.
- [16.] Muthee, M.W. (2010). *Hitting the target, missing the point: youth policies and programmes in Kenya*. *African public policy scholar*. Washington DC: Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars.
- [17.] Okorodudu, G. (2010). Influence of parenting styles on adult delinquency in Delta Central Senatorial District. *Journal of Counselling*, 3(1) 58-86

-
- [18.] Oloo, J. (2011). The Practice of Probation Paper presented at the Commonwealth East African Workshop on Alternative Sentencing and Strategies to Reduce Prison Overcrowding. Kigali, May.
- [19.] Pius, M. A. (2012). Probation and community service as an alternative to imprisonment in the UK. *American Journal of Crime and Criminal Justice*. 4, 34-56.
- [20.] Jenkins (2009). Scholarly article for juvenile delinquency and various categories.
- [21.] Saleebey, D. (2014). Introduction: The power of family unit. *The Strengths Perspective in Social Work Practice*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- [22.] Sheryln, T. (2008). *The effects of family on juvenile delinquency*. Retrieved on April 20th, 2011 from <http://www.marshaledu/essay/htm.pdf>.
- [23.] Shoemaker, D. J. (2005). *Theories of delinquency*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [24.] United Nations. (2013). Juvenile crimes: Epidemiology, risk factors, early interventions, and policy implications. *Developmental and Psychopathology*, 12(4), 737-762.
- [25.] Wexler, H. K. (2014). Outcome evaluation of a prison therapeutic community for substance abuse treatment. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, 17(1), 71-92.