

The Comparison of Styles of Parenting, Incompatible Schema & Juvenile Offenders and Non-Offenders Identity Style

Leilya Rahmati* and Rahim Hamidipour

Islamic Azad University – Central Dept. of Science and Research - (Arak)

Corresponding author: Leilya Rahmati

ABSTRACT: The aim of research is to compare parenting styles, incompatible schema, resiliency and juvenile offenders and non-offenders identity styles. In the garment research, offender boys of Education Reform Centre and non-offenders in Tehran were planned. The research sample consisted of 120 juvenile offenders and non-offenders selected from the capital exclusive. Further, by using various questionnaires such as Baumrind parenting styles (1972), Konorod Davidson resiliency (2003) and Berzonsky identity styles (1989) Young schema brief form questionnaire (2005) was next collected. The results indicated that among the three parenting styles of authoritative (=F15/04) (01/0>P) permissive (= F12/96) (01/0>P) and authoritarian (=F22/67) (01/0>P) significance of discrepancy existed between the two groups of normal children and felony which virtually revealed that in the whole scheme of maladaptive (=F68/17) (001/0>P) and all subscales except continence, title, strict criteria, self-sacrifice and involvement significance of discrepancy among the two groups of normal and felony existed i.e. in the total score of resiliency (=F21/14) (01/0>P) normative identity style (=F20/10) (01/0>P), the subscale of merit / personal strength (=F23/65) (01/0>P) intuition confidence/ tolerate negative emotions and acceptance (=F23/65) (01/0>P) between the two groups of normal and felony children significance of discrepancy was convincing. Yet, in the two subscales of control (=F3/32) (05/0>P) and spirituality (=F2/53) no significance of discrepancy was observed al. Though there were three styles of identity information (F=21/14) (01/0>P), normative identity (F=30/34) (01/0>P) and diffuse/avoidant (F=15/81) (01/0>P) between the two groups of normal and felony children and significance of discrepancy did exist.

Keywords: Parenting Style, Resiliency, Identity Style, Incompatible Schema, Adolescents, Felon/Offender.

INTRODUCTION

Adolescent lawbreaker or offender is a critical issue that has attracted various researchers' attention (2013 Autheme). Law breakers are present among juvenile and youth age groups (Akbari, 2008). The expression of 'felony' is applied to juvenile law breakers. (Berck, 2012) Further, in consideration of the factors which cause developmental issues and felony in adolescents poor parenting practices is notable. (Davidson, 2005) Parenting practice is a combination of parent's stable behavior and engagement with children at various times, situation and conditions. (Bercke Laura, 2008) Based on surveys performed by Hopslamo and Trembli (1940) there is a relation between permissive parenting and juvenile felony. Hostile negative parenting practices can cause the emergence of maladaptive behaviours in children. (Golfando & Teti, 1990) Identity is the other effective influential variable in juvenile felony, significant in developmental aspects. (James Marshe 1979) According to James, identity is as an inner impulsive and dynamic organ originating from individual drives, abilities, beliefs and experiences. On that basis, three styles of identity processing such as information, normative and diffuse / avoidant are present and when individuals confront identity conflicts were used. (Brozinsky, 1992) In a survey performed by Hosseini and Tabatabaei in 1998 manifested that individuals with emotion-focused coping style face identity confusion and those with problematic style face identity style prosperity.

Resiliency in another factor that drive adolescence tendencies towards felony. Individual resiliency capabilities lied in the hands of leaving behind what had they confronted in the past with prosperity and compatibility during rigorous conditions. (Garmezy, 1993) In view of aforesaid and the fact that adolescence is a susceptible stage for individual shaping and personality evolution and also a landmark of future life, the present research was sought to compare parenting, resiliency, identity, Incompatible schemes for juvenile offenders and non-offenders.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Method of Research

The present research is a causal-comparative research. The study population of this survey involves all juvenile offenders and ordinary in Tehran in between the years 2014-2015. In this investigation, by the use of convenient sampling 130 cases were selected for further reviews that in consideration of the field of collaborations and juvenile/parents consents and lack of scoring percept after losses, 120 cases remained. Initially, the mandatory permits for execution of questionnaires among considered cases were received from Tehran Prisons Organization. Next, research devices were regulated in the form of questionnaires and distributed among juvenile offenders and non-offenders and their parents in spite of individual secrecy and in accordance with research objectives. At first the candidates were informed about questionnaires and made ascertained that there were no additional ambiguities. The questionnaires were then collected and analysed using SPSS 20 software. In this survey Diana Bemrind questionnaires of parenting was applied. The questionnaire consisted of 30 queries: 10 on permissive style, 10 on authoritarian styles and remaining 10 on decisive reliable (democratic) style. Also, against each question there is a continuum of 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree' and that in the middle of the spectrum options of 'I agree' 'I almost agree' and 'I disagree' are also placed. The options show scores of between 0 – 40. By adding the total scores of each style of parenting three separate scores shall be obtained. Moreover, from Young (1988) questionnaires schema 75 questions based on Schmitt et al. findings fifteen initial non-adaptive scheme is evaluated. The scheme of evaluation include emotional deprivation, triggered, mistrust / abuse, social isolation / alienation, defectiveness / shame, entitlements, dependence / incompetence, captured, obedience, sacrifice, emotional inhibition, unrelenting standards, self-control / inadequate self-discipline and vulnerability during loss or illnesses and eventually Conner and Davidson resilience questionnaires (2003) and Brozinsky identity styles (1989) were applied for evaluations. In the present research of data reviews descriptive methods such as mean and standard deviation and also for statistical review of hypotheses and their significance, multivariate of variance tests (MANOVA) and SPSS software were applied.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Conclusion

Table1. Descriptive Sex demographic variables Specifications

Group	Male	Female	Abundance	Percentage
Offender	60	0	60	50
Normal	60	0	60	100

As indicated in Table 1 all candidates are male that amongst 120 individuals 60 belong to juvenile offender group and 60 to ordinary group

Table 2. Indicate age descriptive demographic variables specifications in the two offender and ordinary groups

Group	Variable	Min	Max	M	SD
Offender	Age	12	18	16/54	3/34
Ordinary		11	17	17/12	4/31

Table 3. Indicate the descriptive demographic variables specifications of Education between the two groups of offenders and ordinary

Group	Variable	Min	Max	M	SD
Offender	Age	3	11	8/23	3/87
Ordinary		6	12	10/08	2/17

As shown in Table 2 the domain of sample selected individual education in offender group is between 3 to 11 years with a mean of 8/23 and standard deviation of 4

Table 4. Descriptive specifications of parenting style variable (mean and standard deviation)

Variable	Group		Ordinary M	Offender SD
	M	SD		
Permissive Style	29/08	8/22	34/77	7/16
Despotic Style	25/82	6/25	32/25	7/57
Authoritative Style	32/37	8/25	24/18	7/47

Table 5. The results of univariate analysis and variance test (ANOVA) in parenting style

Variable	SS	df	MS	F	Sig
Permissive Style	969/08	1	969/08	12/96	0/01
Despotic Style	1241/63	1	1241/63	22/67	0/01
Authoritative Style	1147/4	1	1147/4	15/04	0/01

Table 6. The results of multivariate test (MANOVA) in identity style

Variable	Value	F	df _{Hypo}	df _{Err}	Sig
Pillay Effect	0/31	18/07	3	116	0/01
Lambda Wilkes	0/68	18/07	3	116	0/01
Hetling Effect	0/46	18/07	3	116	0/01
Largest Root	0/46	18/07	3	116	0/01

Table 7. Descriptive specifications (mean and standard deviation) resiliency variables

Variable	Group		Ordinary M	Offender SD
	M	SD		
Merit / Personal Strength	27/87	5/03	22/92	6/09
Trust Intuition/Tolerate Emotions & Negative Emotions	23/18	4/62	20/33	4/45
Positive Reception / Security Relations	17/27	3/96	15/72	3/32
Control	10/58	2/42	9/73	2/68
Spirituality	8/70	2/67	7/50	2/04
Total	87/60	14/59	76/20	13/28

Table 8. The Results of resiliency multivariate test (MANOVA)

Variable	Value	F	df _{Hypo}	df _{Err}	Sig
Pillay Effect	0/20	5/70	5	114	0/001
Lambda Wilkes	0/80	18/07	5	114	0/001
Hetling Effect	0/25	5/70	5	114	0/001
Largest Root	0/25	5/70	5	114	0/001

Table 9. The Result of univariate analysis and variance test (ANOVA) of resiliency

Variable	SS	df	MS	F	Sig
Competence	735/07	1	735/07	23/65	0/001
Confidence	243/67	1	243/67	11/82	0/01
Admission	72/07	1	72/07	5/23	0/05
Control	21/67	1	21/67	3/23	0/07
Spirituality	43/20	1	43/20	2/53	0/11
Total	3898/80	1	3898/80	20/01	0/001

Table 10. Descriptive specifications (mean and standard deviation) incompatible variable scheme

Variable	Group		Ordinary M	Offender SD
	M	SD		
Emotional deprivation	13/31	5/71	16/37	5/93
Triggered	13/76	5/79	17/72	6/03
Mistrust / abuse	12/93	4/83	16/57	5/40
Social isolation / alienation	11/14	5/30	16/43	6/13
Defectiveness / shame	10/86	4/71	16/22	6/65
Defeat	11/21	5/13	16/48	6/35
Dependence / incompetence	11/41	4/67	16/17	5/45
Vulnerability	12/31	5/44	15/53	6/07
Plight	14/57	5/35	15/46	5/04
Obedience	12/24	4/67	14/30	5/26
Dedication	16/29	5/77	16/85	5/21
Emotional Inhibition	13/52	3/36	16/52	4/77
Strict criteria	17/97	5/88	17/17	5/23
Title	14/91	5/45	15/63	15/78
Restraint/Self-discipline	15/12	6/11	16/88	5/59
Total Score	200/63	57/92	222/88	55/07

Table 11. The Results of univariate analysis and variance test (ANOVA) for incompatible variable scheme

Variable	SS	df	MS	F	Sig
Emotional deprivation	275/48	1	275/48	8/11	0/05
Triggered	485/81	1	485/81	14/01	0/001
Mistrust / abuse	389/81	1	389/81	12/32	0/01
Social isolation / alienation	826/98	1	826/98	25/12	0/001
Defectiveness / shame	845/57	1	845/57	20/01	0/001
Defeat	821/06	1	821/06	20/38	0/001
Dependence / incompetence	666/20	1	666/20	21/51	0/001
Vulnerability	504/68	1	504/68	15/13	0/001
Plight	22/89	1	22/89	0/88	0/35
Obedience	124/98	1	124/98	14/18	0/05
Dedication	9/14	1	9/14	0/30	0/58

Discussion and Conclusion

The results of finding analysis suggest that between parenting styles of the two groups of ordinary and offender juveniles significance of discrepancy does exist i.e. the discrepancy between the two groups is higher than chance and coincidence. In fact the mean of parenting variable styles of permissive and despotic incline towards offender children where parenting variable style of strong powerful incline towards ordinary children i.e. the average children felony parents are permissive and despotic is higher than in ordinary children. Yet, the average ordinary children parents are higher in power than offenders. These findings are ipsilateral with Shokrbeigi (2012), Hoffman (2003) Sucker et al. (2005) and Jennifer et al. (2006) but not in conformity with Brozinsky et al. (2012), Ebrahimi et al. (2011), Azizi & Tarkhan (2013), Koozehgaran (2012) and Hoif et al. (2008) investigations. On the other side the discrepancy between the two groups rises higher than pure chance and coincidence. In fact, the mean of the two variable informational and normative identity styles is compatible with ordinary and diffuse / avoidant identity style variable with felony juveniles and youth; in other words, informational and normative identity styles mean is higher in ordinary juveniles in comparison with felony. This is such that diffuse/avoidant identity styles mean is other in felony as compared to ordinary juveniles and youth. This discovery is in conformity with Azizi & Tarkhan (2013), Brozinsky et al. (2012), Ebarhimi et al. (2011), Koozehgaran (2012), Hoif et al. (2008), Hoffman (2003) and Jennifer et al. (2006).

There are numerous various effectives for juvenile inclination tendencies towards felony. In the third manner of finding analysis output suggests that there is significance of discrepancy between resiliency of ordinary and offenders. These findings are ipsilateral with Khabaz et al. (2011), Bonard (2004), Warner & Smith (2001), Brown (2008), Kohan & Stein (2006), Chatman (2006), William, Teasdale, Segal and Cabatzon (2007) Lean, Ersmund, Caster and Kohan (2010). Lastly, the results of the research findings analysis suggest that there is significance of discrepancy between incompatible schemes in ordinary as compared to juvenile offenders. These findings are in conformity with Khodabakhsh, Yazdi & Abassiyani (2013), Khodabakhshi Kolaie et al. (2014), Ebrahimi et al. (2012) and Zargar et al. (2011).

REFERENCES

- Baker E and Beech AR. 2004. Dissociation and variability of adult attachment dimensions and early maladaptive schemas in sexual and violent offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19, 1119-1136.
- Cassandra JD, Stephen JB, Hoffman P and Harmony EL. 2004. Parenting Practices as Moderators of the Relationship between Peers and Adolescent Marijuana Use. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 163- 178.
- Ebrahimi Sani E, Doganaei F, Jamshidi A, Ebrahimi sani N. 2011. Comparative study of families of children and juvenile offenders and normal functions of Shomali Khorasan Province. *Correction and Rehabilitation Journal*;127:2-6.
- Ebrahimi Sani E, Doganaei F, Jamshidi A, Ebrahimi sani N. 2011. Comparative study of families of children and juvenile offenders and normal functions of Shomali Khorasan Province. *Correction and Rehabilitation Journal*;127:2-6.
- Fergus S and Zimmerman MA. 2005. Adolescent resilience: A framework for understanding healthy development in the face of risk. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 26, 399-419.
- Grunert S. 2008. The relationship between adult attachment and resilience factor of hope and positive affect.unpublished doctoral disserstion .teacher in school psychology .capella university.
- Hoffmann J P. 2003. A Contextual analysis of differential association, social control, and strain theories of Delinquency, *Social Forces*; 81(3): 753-58.
- Khalaj-Abadi Farahani F and Ebadi-Fard-Azar F. 2004. Comparing the effect of peer-led versus adult-led AIDS education on knowledge, attitude and selfefficacy of female students in high schools in 4thregion of education ministry in Tehran, using sociocognitivetheory. *Journal of Reproduction andInfertility*, 5, 77-91.
- Kozagaran Bejestan M. 2012. Demographic characteristics and variables associated with crime in a juvenile. Institution for juvenile offenders in the city of Yazd. *Correction and Rehabilitation Journal*, (131):3-7.
- Nouri R, Ghorbani T. 2010. The relations of identity styles, resiliency, and high risk behaviors:substance use. The fifth Seminar of college student's mental health: Iran-Tehran. 2010.