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Abstract: The relationship between the role of the family in determining the deviant behavior is a topical aspect in interdisciplinal research. The family climate influences the child's harmonious development and helps him avoid the acceptance of deviant behaviors. The research was conducted on two groups of 30 young people (delinquents and non-delinquents) to track the influence of the family climate and the aggressiveness of the group who committed the crime without violence. The results reveal a rejective parental educational climate and a growing degree of aggression in the group that committed crimes.
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Theoretical framework

Family is the most important group of all social groups because it influences and shapes the human person. Some go even further and claim that its action on the person is so great that it equals the action of the other social groups (Bucur, Mociovan, 2003).

Transforming an individual into a person, that is, an "individual with a social status," is first of all the work of the family. There are two reasons that explain this family influence on the person; one is related to the fact that the family action is exerted earlier and the second is that for a long time the family is the way to channel any other socialization action, being identical to the whole social world of the child (Munteanu, 2009).

The main scheme of the family of child growth is formed on the model of relationships between parents or their relationship with the child. It was found that parents educated as they were educated. But the family does not only provide socialization prerequisites but at the same time it gives the child the
possibility of defining himself, through the play of comparisons, of imitations, of his own models, in other words his own position in the social universe. This permanent game of actions, relationships, attitudes that take place in the family environment contributes enormously to socialization, individualization of the child, and last but not least to the formation of the main springs that determine the personality's specificity (Bonchis, 2009).

All these contributions that the family has in the normal, mental and physical development and formation of the child, in some of the families they are child-bearing realities, but others unfortunately remain in the ideal state. For all these transmissions to be possible, for the existence of this family-child correlation, the psychic factors, the climate and the family atmosphere, the affective dynamics, must be of a positive nature, to have a good influence on the child's behavior.

The family educational climate is a very complex psychosocial formation, encompassing the set of mental states, interpersonal relationships, attitudes that characterize the family group for a longer period of time. This climate, which may be positive or negative, interferes as a filter between the educational influences exerted by parents and the behavioral acquisitions made at the level of the children's personality (Ilut, 2001).

The family educational climate can be analyzed according to several indicators: the way of interpersonal reporting of parents (level of approach and understanding, agreement or disagreement on various issues); the system of parental attitudes in relation to different norms and social values; the way the child is perceived and considered; the mode of manifestation of parental authority (unitary or differentiated); the degree of acceptance of various child behavior; the dynamics of the emergence of tension and conflict states; how to apply rewards and sanctions; the degree of openness and sincerity of the child in relation to the parents (Miftode, 2010).

However, there are also types of faulty family climate, which affect the normal development of the child, with subsequent serious behavioral deviations. Among these faulty familial climates can be mentioned:

The rigid family climate is largely determined by the excess severity. Severity, within certain limits, imparts order, discipline, seriousness, it is constructive if it is based on good intentions. But the excess of severity, expressed by the parents, expressed through rigidity and authoritarianism, will cause the child conflicting and oppositional states, a generally stressed atmosphere. Through such an excess the parent can impress the child with the feeling of alienation. In such cases the child can make the decision to leave the family.

In other cases, excess severity can cause and prolong the parent-child dependency, or a generation-to-generation conflict at the age of preadolescence.
and adolescence. Under these circumstances, and especially when children are in great need of love, understanding, guidance, excess severity causes anxiety and resentment, generates a lack of confidence and demoralization (Buzducea, 2010).

*The libertine family climate* creates a casual, unconventional atmosphere in which the independent and tolerant parents adopt permissive attitudes. In such an environment, children are deprived of supervision, their education being entrusted to children or other relatives.

Lack of interest and firmness in the education of children is detrimental to their psychosocial maturity. At older ages, children are confused, suggestive or excessively independent by their negative autonomy, achieving school and professional outcomes below their aspirations and capabilities, and thus become victims of social nonconformity and delinquency.

The sense of affiliation is affected by negligence and "apparent" abandonment, which causes the child a feeling of embarrassment that belongs to that family (Ilut, 1997).

*The anxiogenic family climate* creates an atmosphere of deception and suspicion, of permanent anxiety caused and amplified by fear of illness, school failure.

This ambiance of tension, creates shyness in the child, prolongs the child’s addiction to parents, increases distrust itself. It favors the inclination towards melancholy and reverse. Regarding the term "anxiety" we refer to frequent tension anxiety, expression of distrust in the favorable evolution of the desired situation, and not to anxiety, as a pathological condition.

*The naive family climate* is created by parents who are not mature enough to be responsible for raising children's education. Such relationships are broken down by the abolition of marriage or divorce. Parents are accused of social immaturity, and in such an environment, children are neglected and abandoned (Lacan, 1966)

*Conflictual family climate* is created because of family disputes due to alcoholism, neglect of marital relationships. Thus cohabitation in the family becomes a stress for every family member, children are traumatized by conflicts, placed on the side of one or the other parents, judging them. All these relate to the child, to the level of learning in particular (Scripcaru, Astărăstoae, 2003).

The distinction between offenders and offenders should be sought in the "delinquent threshold", meaning that some of the non-respondents need events, severe pressures to provoke a delinquent reaction, others pass out from a very slight outside excitation. Unlike them, the delinquent - opposed to the uninvited - does not wait for a good occasion, an external excitation, but causes the very opportunities in which he then operates.

In the final analysis, what makes it possible to distinguish the non-indictment of the offender, but even of the delinquents among them, is the more or less pronounced aptitude for the act. "Fundamental criminology is the science of passing on to the act of crime and nothing else" - concludes Pinatel (apud Buzducea, 2017).

Further analyzing the criminal behavior point out that the offender is not detained in committing his act of social abuse because he is labile, incapable of organizing himself in the long run, as well as being able to overcome the obstacles to his criminal action, because
he is dynamic and eminently aggressive. At the same time, he succeeds in overcoming his aversion to odious acts, for he does not care about anyone, he does not nurture feelings of sympathy for anyone and consequently can commit any crime (Durnescu 2009).

The offender presents himself as a deformed personality which allows him to commit atypical actions of an antisocial or disocial nature. It appears as an individual with insufficient social maturity, with social integration deficiencies, which conflicts with the requirements of the valor-normative and cultural system of the society in which he lives. On this basis, both the personality of the offender and the internal mechanisms (motives, motivations, goals) that trigger the transition to the criminal act as such are attempted to be highlighted. From the point of view of psychological peculiarities, some common characteristics found in most of those who frequently violate the law: emotional-acuity inactivity, social inadequacy, duplicity of criminal behavior, intellectual immaturity, affective immaturity, special sensitivity, frustration, complex of inferiority (Eibl – Eibesfeldt, 1995).

**Hypothesis and objectives**

Behavioral disorder has its roots in the parent-child relationship. Parental failure in maintaining a high degree of adaptation of the child to the environment can be addressed from the perspective of the following research objectives:

- Identifying aggression as an internal factor that maintains or accentuates the psychopathological process of deviant behavior.
- Highlighting the role of family educational patterns in determining behavioral disorders.

The hypotheses from which they started were:

H1: There are statistically significant differences between the two batches in terms of physical aggression. This will be statistically significantly higher for offenders than for those who did not commit a crime.

H2: Subjects who have committed a crime have assimilated a predominantly rejecting parental model as opposed to those who have not committed a crime.

**Methodology**

*Lots studied*

A total of 60 subjects aged between 19 and 30 were studied, divided into two lots:

- Lot A - is represented by 30 male subjects who have been deprived of their liberty for violent crime. They are convicted of committing a crime or several crimes.
- Lot B - is made up of 30 male subjects who have not committed any crime, are not in the records of the investigation or police investigators.
Methods used

The anamnesis which is a method used to obtain data about the individual's life and its evolution;

Carlo Perris' Inventory for Measuring Parenting Education Models - EMBU - This sample consists of 81 items and aims to measure the following 14 subsets of parental models: Abusive, Privative, Punitive, Humiliating, Rejective, Overprotective, Overprompted, Tolerant, Targeting performance, Generating guilty, Stimulating, Favoring others, Favored topic. These subscales are grouped into the following four factors: Emotional Heat, Overprotection, Rejection, and Favored Subject.

The Aggressivity Questionnaire (A.H. Buss and M. Perry)
This questionnaire represents an improvement in the Hostile Inventory conducted by A.H. Buss. It has as its primary objective the measurement of aggression and includes 29 items. They are grouped into four scales targeting physical aggression (9 items), verbal aggression (5 items), anger (7 items), and hostility (8 items).

For the quantitative interpretation of the hypotheses of this study, we used the SPSS11.0 statistical program.

Results and discussions

Testing the hypothesis 1.

For testing the hypothesis, the t test was used to compare the averages of the individual samples.

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
<th>Std.Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot A – crime without violence</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.27</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot B – control sample</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average of the two batches for the aggressivity variable is 20.27 for group A and 11.87 (standard deviation of 4.32 for physical aggression and 3 for the anger variable) for group B. The higher the average, the higher it approaches the maximum value of aggressiveness for subjects so that the first batch is closer to this maximum value than the second batch.

In order to support the hypothesis of a difference in the level of aggression between the two categories of offenders and offenders, we must reject the null hypothesis. To reject the null hypothesis, we must show that the
chance that these differences occur by chance is less than 0.05. Following the t test for independent samples we obtain the following essential information extracted from the output provided by SPSS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Index</th>
<th>Levene's test for equality of variance</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physic Equal variances</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressivity Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>9.112</td>
<td>47.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the physical aggressivity variable $t (58) = 9.11$, the difference between batches is statistically significant at a $p < .01$ which leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis showing that there are no significant differences between the two batches in this variable.

We can also say that the difference between test values in the case of physical aggression of subjects who committed a violent crime ($M = 20.27$, $SD = 4.34$) and those who did not commit a crime ($M = 11.87$, $SD = 2.58$) is 8.40. The 95% confidence interval for this difference is from 6.55 to 10.25, because the interval does not contain the 0.00 point difference is statistically significant at the level of two-tailed significance of 1%.

A first explanation for the significant differences in the two batches for the level of aggression is that for those who committed a theft offense, there is an increase in aggressive antisocial manifestations in interpersonal relationships as opposed to the other subjects in group B. Also, the first passive components (egocentrism, lability, affective indifference) have the role of letting aggressiveness manifest itself freely, (the barriers that normally inhibit
aggression, these people are missing). The core of criminal behavior in these subjects is made up of four elements: egocentrism - the tendency to relate everything to itself; lability - behavioral instability; aggressiveness - the component that eliminates barriers in the way of human acts; affective indifference - that is, the absence of emotions. The active component of aggression plays a decisive role in the transition to the criminal act, and the passive, represented by the neutralization of the inhibition at the time of committing the criminal act, has the role of letting the aggressiveness manifest itself freely. Although the offender's behavior is often assimilated to simple aggressive behavior, in reality it is a behavior made possible by the absence of barriers that usually inhibit aggression. Aggressivity appears as a continuous inner pressure with destructive tendencies and requires continuous discharge. This spontaneous aggressiveness episode is an urgent need for unloading. People who have committed a violent crime talk about the compulsion to kill that is felt as an internal force that urges them to kill. Switching to act is the release from inner tension that becomes unbearable. Once theft is accomplished, tension is diminishing and some satisfaction occurs over a period of time.

In the case of non-offenders, aggression is under the influence of society turning into altruism as a reactionary formation. It is a transformation of selfishness and cruelty to their opposite: altruism and compassion. The hostile pulses have not disappeared, but they are reversed and maintained by the inverse tendencies.

Testing the hypothesis 2

The mean mean and standard deviations for the parental rejection model variable are shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot A – crime without violence</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50.63</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot B – control</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42.47</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For those with violent offenses, the average value of the design of a rejection parental model is 50.63 and the standard deviation of this value is 13.03. For subjects who have not committed an offense, the average value of the parental model is 42.47 and the standard deviation of 6.64. Following this notification, we can say that the average for this dependent variable is closer to the maximum value for people who committed a violent crime than to the other lot. To see if this difference between test values is significant, we need to inspect Table 4 of the comparison index.

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's test for equality of variance</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Model</td>
<td>10.698</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>3.058</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the parental rejection model variable t (58) = 3.05 the difference between lots is statistically significant at a p < .01 which leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis showing that there are no significant differences between the two batches in this dependent variable. The difference of 8.17 for the parental rejection model variable is also statistically significant (p > .01) at a confidence interval of 2.78 to 13.55. (M = 50.63, SD = 11.03 for group A and for group C M = 42.47, SD = 6.84).

Family life is the place to offer the most opportunity to investigate the etiology of anti-social behaviors, and precisely in this family life, or in its substitutes, the character of the subject is built in all its positive aspects. In the antisocial behavior an important element is that at a certain point or at a certain stage of development there has been a true failure of the Ego support that
sustained the emotional development of the individual. Instead of natural growth, there has been an individual's reaction to this disorder.

The maturing processes of those who have committed a crime have been resolved by the failure of the favored environment. It is known that the True Self can not become a living reality as a result of repeated mother's success in meeting the spontaneous gesture or the sensory hallucination of the subject during childhood (the baby's ability to use a symbol). Moreover, the severity of the parents practiced in a chaotic, excessive or too diminished way, as well as the inadequate supervision as well as the parental conflicts, have increased the number of crimes committed by the subjects in question, in general the presence in the education of the children of some factors adds to the parent doubles the risk of committing crimes later.

Conclusions

Behavior of the offender in the social environment is investigated by approaching individual development from childhood to maturity. Destructive impulses vary from individual to individual, are an integral part of psychic life, even under favorable conditions, so that child development and adult attitudes result from the interaction between internal and external influences.

The research carried out on two comparative lots of offenders and non-offenders revealed that there are statistically significant differences between the two groups in terms of physical aggression in their personality structure. It has also been shown that the subjects of the offender group have experienced childhood offensive paradigmatic models that have influenced their dysfunctional development.

The aim of the research was to highlight factors that can be worked through various forms of therapy to improve individuals' behavior and their future reintegration into society.
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