



**International Journal of Biology, Pharmacy  
and Allied Sciences (IJBPAS)**

*'A Bridge Between Laboratory and Reader'*

[www.ijbpas.com](http://www.ijbpas.com)

---

---

**THE QUALITATIVE ROLE OF FAMILY IN CREATING THE DEVIANT BEHAVIORS  
OF ADOLESCENTS**

**GHOLAMREZA SHARAFI<sup>1</sup>, MOHSEN ZAREIE<sup>2</sup>, MOSTAFA TAVANI<sup>3</sup>, MOSLEM  
TAVANI<sup>4</sup>**

1. M.A. graduate of management

2. Phd graduate of Quranic sciences, Faculty member of Estahban Azad University

3. M.A. graduate of criminal law

4. Phd candidate of Sociology, Instructor of Payam-e-Noor University

**ABSTRACT**

Family is the initial group existed naturally and the society has based upon it. The quality and function of the family in achieving its roles is a proper indicator for evaluating the society function. The better and healthier function of family leads to a more stable and healthy society and conversely, the worse and more disordered function of family threaten the health of the society. While parents who are the base and foundation of the family tend to delinquency, it cannot be expected that other family members and especially children take action correctly. This study investigated the function of family in prevention or appearance of adolescent's risky behaviors through the qualitative method. For this study, 20 girl and boy students of Kazeroon high schools were selected through purposive sampling and for collecting data, the systematic interviews including deviant behavior, family function, structure of family, etc. were used. The analysis of data showed that various dimensions of family function and family structure were different in two groups with severe and mild risky behaviors.

**Key words: Adolescent, Risky behavior, Function of family, Family structure**

**INTRODUCTION**

The socio-mental, cognitive and biological evolutionary opportunities for adolescent to changes in adolescence provide a lot of be involved in the behaviors which are

implicitly important in taking a healthy way of life. (Haris et. Al, 2002) However, adolescents tend to discover the risky situations and this issue has increased their capacity of not having a long life and even death. (Estober & Gad, 1995) kerkemer and Green (2000) believe that risk taking is a tendency for involving in the behaviors that are threatening or damaging the physical or mental health of the person. Many of the researchers and psychologists agree that not only risk taking is natural in adolescence, but also is the essential factor for learning and personal growth. Without any risk, there is no growth. (Korin, 2001) By considering the differences of risky actions, some of them have inherently less danger and repetition or expansion of many of the risky actions such as use of alcohol and illegal drugs can be dangerous. (Plant & Plant, 1992) Stanzfield and kerestim (2005) say that adolescence is a period of risky behaviors and increase of discovery. This evolutionary period has been recognized by increasing the risk of starting drug use and growth of addiction. The use of illegal drugs can be started at 12 years old and at the age of 15 to 19 years will reach to its peak. For instance, the use of alcohol even for a short time causes academic problems, driving incidents and death, crime and suicide for adolescents. Early sexual activity

results in early pregnancy probability, sexual diseases, abortion and long term poverty, academic and socio-economic problems for adolescents and involvement in violent behaviors provides the probability of armed conflicts. (Estober & Gad, 1995)

Some studies have listed the different types of risky behaviors in which the adolescents are involved including the use of drug and alcohol, sexual illegal behaviors, violent physical conflicts, taking weapon, crime, educational failure, emotional problems and behaviors pertaining to severe diets. (Bras & Dart, 2001; Androz, 2000)

Investigating the prevalence and common predictors of drug use and aggression and crime in reported adolescents shows that aggressive behavior, crime, marijuana and drug use, drinking alcohol and smoking, and involvement in sexual behaviors have the most frequency. (Grifen et al., 2003; Topolsky et al., 2001; Androz, 2000; Mac, 2005; Brak et al., 1984)

Involvement in a risky behavior increases the possibility of engaging in dangerous behaviors. The adolescents who use illegal drugs have also used alcohol and involved in sexual activities and taken weapons with themselves and more use of cocaine, tobacco, alcohol and marijuana have resulted in depression, suicidal thoughts and hating from

school and attempt for sexual activity, emotional problems and low level of academic success and antisocial behaviors. (Topolsky et al., 2001; Tepar et al., 2001; Valios et al., 1995; Plant & Plant, 1992)

### **The effect of family function on the growth of adolescents**

The psychologists have studied the family factors and parents that promote the adolescents'

Level of social competence and many studies have cited the importance of the effect of family function on the growth of adolescents and investigated the parental procedures such as the control and managerial roles of parents (Santrak, 2005; Hanber & Havel, 2003; Goodarzi, Zamaghash & Zarnaghash, 2002), family correlation (kanjer, 1975; Rostami, 2002), the connection of parents and adolescent and parents' style (Golchin et al., 2001; Shahsavari, 2003) and many of the other factors. These findings propose that control and correlation and lack of conflict in the family can cause the positive growth of self-concept and social efficiency.

The effect of parents' management on the sexual activity and drug use in adolescents has been studied in many researches:

Some researches show that high level of connection and conversation between parent and adolescent is related with low level of

risky sexual relation (Rajerz, 1999) and drug use (Sedigh sarvestani, 2003) Moreover, the research of Ashbay wils and colleagues (2003) on the American adolescents with age average of 13 years in investigating the effect of family factor on the use of drugs and sexual behaviors showed that relation of parents and adolescent has a converse relation with the behavior of drug use and sexual activity and the quality of relation with parents and self-confidence and stability of efficiency is related.

Extensive studies have highlighted the role of family variables such as family disintegration, imbalance of parents, guilty parents, the mental illness of parents, parents' drug use, and rejection from parents as the reason or in the relation of risky behaviors and crime.( Salger, 1993; Sif, 1999; Mohamadi et al., 2003; Meshkani & Meshkani, 2002)

Some of the studies have investigated the effect of single parent families on the risky behaviors and the issue that living with their own parents decreases the risk of delinquent behaviors, educational failure and drug use in the adolescence (Hafman, 2002) and the adolescents with single parent in comparison to the adolescents with two parents more involve in health-related behaviors such as

crime, violence and unprotected sexual relations. (Haris et al., 2002)

The research questions are as following:

1. Is the family function of girls and boys with severe and mild risky behaviors different?
2. Is the family structure of girls and boys with severe and mild risky behaviors different?

**METHODOLOGY**

The method of the research is qualitative.

**Statistical population**

The sample population consists of the first, second and third grade students of high schools of Kazeroon. The research sample

was selected through the purposive sampling method. In this way, 20 students of girls and boys high schools of Kazeroon were selected as the following: 10 boy and girl students of deprived areas, and 10 boy and girl students of non-deprived areas that half of each group have severe risky behaviors and the other half have mild risky behaviors or did not have such behaviors. The economical condition was considered as the effective variable and for investigating the effective factors more precisely, the people with different type and intensity of risky behaviors were considered.

Table 1: Demography data of boy and girl students – According to the intensity of risky behaviors

		Girls with mild risky behavior				Girls with severe risky behavior				Sample Features		
10		9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		
17	16	15	15	15	15	16	15	16	16	16	Age	
third	second	first	first	first	second	third	first	Third	first	first	Education	
Post-graduate	Post-graduate	Diploma	Fifth degree	illiterate	Diploma	Associate of art degree	Diploma	Post-graduate	Diploma	father	Education	
Post-graduate	Post-graduate	Fifth degree	illiterate	illiterate	primary	Diploma	Eighth degree	Eighth degree	Diploma	mother		
instructor	instructor	employee	worker	worker	employee	instructor	freelance	Employee	freelance	father	Job	
+	+	-	-	-	-	employee	-	-	employee	mother		
4	6	7	9	9	8	6	5	9	6	The number of family members		
+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	personal	Home	
good	good	average	average	low	low	good	average	Average	good	Level		
Upper than 700	Upper than 700	150	150	120	150	150	200	300	500	Income average		

Boys with mild risky behavior					Boys with severe risky behavior					Sample feature	
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	Age	
15	17	15	17	17	15	15	16	15	17	Education	
first	third	third	first	third	first	first	first	First	third	Education	
Associate of art degree	Post-graduate	Diploma	Fifth degree	bachelor	Eighth degree	Diploma	Fifth degree	Clergyman	illiterate	father	Education
Diploma	bachelor	Eighth degree	illiterate	Associate of art degree	Eighth degree	Eighth degree	illiterate	illiterate	illiterate	mother	
instructor	instructor	military	worker	employee	freelance	freelance	military	Passed away	worker	father	Job
freelance	-	-	-	instructor	-	nurse	-	-	-	mother	
6	4	6	10	6	6	4	10	8	9	The number of family members	
-	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	personal level	Home
average	good	low	low	good	good	average	average	Low	low		
250	800	200	120	800	400	200	200	150	150	Income average	

The negative sign (-) shows the lack of sample feature and positive sign (+) shows the existence of sample feature. Mild risky behaviors show the non-existence or minimum of risky behaviors.

**RESULTS**

The data related to the features of girl and boy sample groups such as type, amount and

intensity of involvement in risky behaviors

has been shown in table 2:

Table 2: The type and intensity of risky behaviors of girl and boy students sample groups – According to the intensity

Girls with mild risky behavior					Girls with severe risky behavior					Sample of variable	
10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		
1	1	1	1	1	1	3	4	5	5	cigarette	1.use of illegal drugs
1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	4	5	alcohol	
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	4	drug	
1	1	1	1	1	4	5	3	5	5	Non-sexual relations	2.Relation with opposite sex
1	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	5	4	Sexual relations	
1	1	1	1	1	1	3	2	3	4	threat	3.suicide

1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	1	action	
1	1	1	1	1	4	2	4	1	5	Member of violent groups	4.violence
1	1	1	1	1	3	2	3	1	5	verbal	
1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	5	Beating	
1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	4	Taking weapon	
Boys with mild risky behavior					15	Boys with severe risky behavior					Sample of variable
16	20	19	18	17		11	14	13	12		
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	cigarette	1.use of illegal drugs
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	5	4	alcohol	
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	drug	
1	1	2	2	3	5	1	5	1	5	Non-sexual relations	2.Relation with opposite sex
1	1	1	1	2	2	1	3	1	5	sexual relations	
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	threat	3.suicide
			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Action	
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	Member of violent groups	4.violence
1	2	1	2	2	4	5	2	4	4	verbal	
1	2	2	2	2	3	5	5	5	5	Beating	
1	1	2	2	1	3	5	4	4	5	Taking weapon	
20	20	28	29	20	17		19	22	24	Total of risky behaviors (minimum 11 and maximum 55)	

The minimum and maximum of the score has been 1 and 5 respectively. Score 1 means the non-existence of risky behaviors, i.e. if there is a chance, the risky behavior will not be seen and score 2 means the tendency for committing and score 5 shows the severe risky behavior.

The intensity difference of risky behaviors in two groups with severe risky behaviors - with sex differentiation – in table 2 shows that sample number 1 in a variety of risky behaviors (except the committing to suicide), sample number 2, in unprotected sexual relations, use of cigarette and alcohol, sample number 3, in casual use of cigarette and membership in violent group and tendency to

the use of drug and alcohol, sample number 4, in relation with opposite sex and casual use of cigarette and sample number 5, in membership in violent group and verbal violence and relation with opposite sex have been involved. Moreover, the intensity of involvement in risky behaviors in boys group is respectively specified in sample number 11 by use of alcohol and sometimes cigarette (not drug), relation with opposite sex and violence (except the verbal relation), sample number 12 by use of cigarette and alcohol and violence (except the membership in violent group), sample number 13 by involving in relations with opposite sex, violence (except the verbal violence) and use

of alcohol, sample number 14 by violent behaviors except the membership in violent group and sample number 15 by relation with opposite sex and verbal violence and sometimes beating and taking weapons.

The type of involvement in risky behaviors in two groups of boy and girl with severe risky behavior – respectively consisting of violence and use of illegal drug and sexual relations and suicide – has no difference, but there are some differences in the intensity average of two groups’ involvement, as the violent behaviors of boys is more than girls (score 80 vs. 53) and use of illegal drugs (40 vs. 30) and relations with opposite sex (37 vs. 26) have been more in girls than boys.

Moreover, the data was analyzed by use of Mann-Whitney test. The results (appendix table 1) showed that there is meaningful difference (in level of 0/001) between involvement intensity of risky behaviors in groups of girls and boys with severe and mild risky behaviors, between two groups of girls with severe and mild risky behaviors and also between two groups of boys with severe and mild risky behaviors.

The related data to the first question, “Is the family function of girls and boys with severe and mild risky behaviors different? ” has been shown in table 3:

**Table 3: The family functions of boy and girl students of sample group – According to the intensity of risky behaviors**

Girls with mild risky behavior					Girls with severe risky behavior					Sample of variable	
6	7	8	9	10	1	2	3	4	5		
2	2	2	2	4	1	2	2	1	4	Freedom (no control)	1.freedom vs. control
4	4	4	3	4	2	3	3	2	2	Persuasion vs. forcing	2. method of control
5	5	4	5	3	2	3	3	1	2	Warmth and reception (no coldness and rejection)	3. reception and warmth
5	5	3	5	2	2	3	2	2	1	Relation (intimacy)	4. relations of family members with each other
25	25	19	24	17	14	18	18	16	11	14	Total of minimum 6 and maximum 30
Boys with mild risky behavior					Boys with severe risky behavior					Sample of variable	
15	16	17	18	19	20	1112				13	14
3	3	4	5	2	5	4	3	5	4	Freedom (no control)	1.freedom vs. control
3	3	5	4	3	2	2	4	2	3	Persuasion vs. forcing	2. method of control
4	4	5	5	4	4	4	3	5	3	Warmth and reception (no coldness and	3. reception and warmth

										rejection)	
4	4	5	5	4	2	4	4	4	3	Relation (intimacy)	4. relations of family members with each other
4	3	5	5	4	2	3	4	4	4	Responsibility and cooperation	
3	3	5	4	3	2	2	4	2	3	Persuasion vs. forcing	
4	4	5	5	4	4	4	3	5	3	Warmth and reception (no coldness and rejection)	
4	4	5	5	4	2	4	4	4	3	Relation (intimacy)	
4	3	5	5	4	2	3	4	4	4	Responsibility and cooperation	
2	3	4	5	2	1	2	4	4	2	Problem solving method (Persuasion vs. Forcing)	
20	20	28	29	20	17	19	22	24	19	Total of minimum 6 and maximum 30	

The minimum and maximum of score is 1 and 5 respectively. For analyzing the interview results and identifying the amount of each of these variables, the scale of 1 to 5 was used that score 1 shows the non-existence or low existence of the sample variable and score 5 shows the existence of variable at the extreme level.

Comparison between girls with severe and mild risky behaviors shows that in all cases, except the sample number 6, the amount of control has been more than freedom. (It should be cited that control over girls with risky behaviors has been implemented after their involving in risky behaviors or the control has not been effective because of the busy parents, i.e. despite of implementing control, they had the chance for doing risky behaviors covertly.) Furthermore the method of control in samples number 2,1, and 5 tends

to forcing and in the families of girls group with mild risky behavior, persuasion is the control method and in samples number 3,4, and 7 both methods of – persuasion and forcing – are used.

In analysis and comparison of the amount of reception and warmth in relations of parents and adolescent in both groups of girls is observed that relation with parents in families of group with severe risky behavior tends more to coldness and rejection (especially in samples 1, 2, and 5) and in group of mild risky behaviors, warmth and reception in parents' relations (except the sample number 6 that relation with mother – and not with father – was along with coldness and rejection) have been dominant. Investigation of relations of family members with each other, in the dimension of relation (intimacy), responsibility and problem

solving method, in both groups of girls with severe and mild risky behaviors shows that relations in girls families with mild risky behaviors (except in sample 6) are intimate, along with responsibility and more than the severe group. Respectively, numbers 4 and 5 evaluate the relations with more warmth.

Comparison of the function of boys' families with severe and mild risky behaviors (table 3) shows that freedom in families of group with severe risky behaviors (except number 13) is more and control in the group with mild risky behaviors, (except number 17) is more. Moreover, the control method in families of group with severe risky behaviors tends more to forcing (especially in the cases of 12, 14 and 15) and in the mild group, the control method of persuasion has overcome the forcing (especially in the samples of numbers 18 and 20). In the case of relation with parents, although there is not a great difference it can be said that the relations of parents and adolescent is warmer and along with reception in boys' families with mild risky behavior. In the relations of family members with each other, in the dimension of relation and intimacy, although there is not a clear difference, the relations of family members of group with mild risky behaviors is better than the opposite group with a slight difference. In numbers 12 and 13, the

relations of family members with each other is evaluated positive and in sample number 15, the relations tend to forcing and non-cooperation and in the opposite group in the samples of numbers 17 and 18, the relations of family with each other are evaluated positive. Therefore, according to the results of table 3, the function of family (in the dimensions of control vs. freedom and warmth vs. coldness and relations of family members with each other) in the boys' families with severe and mild risky behavior is different.

Analysis and comparison of the family function of boys and girls with severe and mild risky behaviors, according to the table 3, show that amounts of freedom and control in the families of boys and girls with severe risky behaviors are different. The amount of control for girls and freedom for boys are more. Furthermore, relations with parents for girls is cold and dismissive and for boys is warm and along with reception. While in the dimension of control method and relations of family members, they do not have a great difference. Also, the amount of control in the families of girls and boys with mild risky behaviors is more than freedom. At the same time, warm relations along with more reception are dominant in the family and the control method tends to persuasion and the

relations of family members are intimate and with responsibility.

### **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

In this research, the effect of family function and family structure on the risky behaviors of girl and boy adolescents was investigated. The qualitative findings showed that the effect of family function – in the dimensions of control vs. freedom, control method, reception and warmth and also the relations of family members with each other and family structure in the dimensions of single parent and two parents or parents' presence and parents' engaging in risky behaviors - is different on expansion of risky behaviors of girl and boy adolescents.

By considering the research findings, it is assumed that the intensity of risky behaviors in groups of girls and boys with severe risky behaviors is not different and also the adolescents who involve in a risky behavior, more probably involve in other risky behaviors. But in comparison of intensity of girls' and boys' involvement in risky behaviors, some differences can be expected, i.e. on equal condition, the probability of involvement or the tendency of boys for involving in risky behaviors is more than girls. The results of findings are compatible with the researches proposing that adolescence is the period of risky behaviors

and increasing discovery and also involving in a risky behavior increases the probability of involving in other hazardous behaviors. ( Stanzfield & Kerestim, 2005; Topolsky et al., 2001; Tapart et al., 2001; Valios et al., 1995; Plant & Plant, 1992)

Meanwhile, the findings showed the importance of function and structure of girls and boys' families that the existence of warm relation along with reception of parents, having an effective pattern and after that control factor were respectively identified as the important factors in preventing the risky behaviors of girl adolescents. As the results showed that the most involvement in risky behaviors was seen in samples (numbers 2 and 4) with features of cold and dismissive relations among parents and adolescent and family members, control through forcing, addiction or absence of father and after that in samples (respectively 3 and 1) with addicted parents and cold relations with parents.

And in sample number 6, the warm relations along with the effective pattern of father played the role against the cold relations with mother and addiction of mother. It should be cited that in the families of girls with severe and mild risky behavior, control was more

than freedom; however, girls of the severe risky behavior group have had the chance for doing risky behaviors covertly. Therefore, it seems that the warm relation with reception – even with one parent – has been important in family as the protective factor against doing the risky behaviors.

The findings pertaining to the preventive factors in boys showed that control factor and effective supervision on the adolescent's behavior with persuasion method are important factors in prevention of risky behaviors of boy adolescents. As if, the samples with lower involvement in risky behaviors reported the existence of control with persuasion method and conversely the extreme amount of freedom and control method of forcing were known as the hazardous factors. As the results showed in sample number 11, freedom and lack of control and improper relations with parents and family members have probably played a role as the hazardous factor and in sample number 18, the positive function of family and warm relations with parents and family members have acted as a protective factor. These findings are compatible with the research results that have known the parental procedures such as managerial and control role of parents (Santrak, 2005; Habner & Havel, 2003; Goodarzi et al., 2002),

correlation of family (Kagner, 1992 and Rostami, 2003), the relation of parents and adolescent and parents' style (Golchin et al., 2001; Shahsavari, 2003) as the effective factor in preventing the risky behaviors.

## **RESOURCES**

1. Ashbywill. T. Gibbons. X. Gerrard, M. Murry. V.M. B. Brody GH, (2003)family communication andreligiosity related to substance use and sexual behavior in early adolescence.
2. Androws D(2000) understanding adolescent problem behavior.
- 3- Broke. J. S. Lukoff. I.F. Whiteman M, (1984), drug use and abuse ,aguide to research
4. Hoseini. Seied Reza (2002) Take a look at the statistics of crime in Iran – the researches collection of first national conference of social damages in Iran, Vol.1, p.120.
- 5.Hamidi, Farideh. Afrooz, Gholamali. Kiamanesh, Alireza. Tabatabaee, Mohamad kazem (2004). The investigation of family structure of escaped girls. Psychological magazine, Eighth year, pp.114-120
- 6.Rostami, Elyas.(2002).The investigation of adolescents' attachment

to parents and peers in Iranian society.

Thesis of Master Degree.Tehran

7.Sedigh Sarvestani,

Rahmatollah.(2003).The investigation of hazardous factors in adolescents' deviation. Thesis of social sciences, p.11

8.Abdollahi, Mohammad.Zarnaghash,

Mina& Maryam. (2004). Drug abusers understanding of parents' disciplinary patterns – Thought and Behavior

Quarterly, Tenth year, p.241

9.Ashbywill.T.Gibbons.X.Gerrard,M.

Murry.V.M.B. Brodygh (2003) family communication and religiosity related to substance use and sexual behavior in early adolescence.

10.Androws d(2000)understanding adolescent problem behavior.

11.Broke.j.s.lukoff.i.f.whiteman-

m(1984)drug use and abuse , a guide to research