

## HOW DOES A BROKEN FAMILY AFFECT THE SOCIALIZATION OF CHILDREN? (A CRITICAL ANALYSIS)

Manzoor Qadar\*<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Anwar Alam<sup>2</sup>

\*<sup>1</sup>PhD Scholar, Department of Sociology, University of Peshawar, Pakistan

<sup>2</sup>Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Peshawar, Pakistan

Corresponding Author: [manzoorqdr@gmail.com](mailto:manzoorqdr@gmail.com)

Received: 11 November, 2023    Revised: 25 January, 2024    Accepted: 30 January, 2024    Published: 05 February, 2024

### ABSTRACT

The current study was formulated to find out the effect of broken families on the socialization of children. Primary data was collected from selected Darul Kafalas (Child Care Centers) in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, i.e. Peshawar, Mardan, and Swat. A sample size of 226 was randomly selected for primary data collection through structured interview schedule in accordance with Sekaran (2003). The collected data was analyzed through statistical tool (chi-square test) to determine the association between independent variable (broken families) and dependent variable (socialization). The study findings revealed that children from broken homes reacted strongly against their elders, did not allow them to meddle in their lives, broken the rules of their home, used unsuitable language, no inclination to converse with others and were hooked to cigarettes and snuff. Further, children from shattered families did not want to make friends, unethical, misinformed, gender discriminatory, wild and irresponsible as a result of their damaged family. The study suggests parents should monitor children's activities to prevent misbehavior, while the government should provide learning, professional development, vocational education, and healthcare facilities at Dar Ul Kafalas.

**Keyword:** Socialization, Social Relationship, Broken Family, Divorce, Chi-Square.

### INTRODUCTION

Family is the most important social institution which is furnished and facilitated by a society as a larger social system (Kephart, 1998). Marriage is foundation of the family and people begin to dwell together through marriage in order to carry on their life as well as for the creation of a new generation. This social bond breaks between men and women through a court decision or an act of the legislature, which is called divorce or the legal end of a contract period (Sultana, 2004). Divorce effects family members and ultimately have a serious impact on society. It disrupts unit of the family, cut off rearing of child and socio-economic security of women and children as well. Divorce has become common and even tolerable overtime, though it has

an inverse relationship with social and economic status (Ahmed, 2012). Some factors should be considered before marriage for peaceful and harmonious life such as consent of couple, age of couple at marriage, age gap between the two, physical fitness, social and mental consistency, financial condition and same social rank etc (Alam et al., 2000). The divorce of parents' affects the children. It has both short-term and long-term effects. The short-term effects are; children of the divorced parents think that they are the cause of their divorce, feel blamable for it, become unwilling to cooperate, furious, assertive and aggressively challenge in speech to both parents. These children fear, being desolated due to poor emotional needs,

the lack of focus affect their academic performance and acquire strongly felt sorrow and loss. In spite of the fact that many effects of divorce on children are not so long and pass off when the child has time to make fit for the new family condition and all the alterations that have taken place. The effects of the broken family on children may be long-term. These children are often illiterate, have poor socio-economic status, their behaviors are anti-social, involve in delinquency, drug addiction, go through detachment and divorce the victim her/himself (Bhuiya and Chowdhury, 1997). Problems between the husband and wife leave a persistent impact on their children. When children witness fights and disputes between the parents in their teenage years, it leads to the problems like depression and anxiety. The emotional insecurity increases among children as a result of issues between the parents (Burton, 2012).

Furthermore, when families fall apart, society falls into social and cultural decline. There is a mountain of scientific evidence that shows that when families break up, children often end up with intellectual, physical and emotional scars that persist for life. People are talking about the drug crisis, the education crisis and the problem of teenage pregnancy and juvenile delinquency. But all these evils can be traced mainly to one source: broken families. Broken homes and broken hearts are not just the reason for so many social problems. They are also the reason for the economic difficulties we face as a culture. The moral foundation of society is eroding as children learn the wild values of the street rather than the civilized values of culture. And the government inevitably expands to intervene in the family and social crises caused by the disintegration of the family (Dusek et al., 2014).

Additionally, Yankelovich (2006) puts it this way: Americans suspect that the nation's economic difficulties are not based on technical economic forces (e.g. exchange rates or capital formation) but on fundamental moral causes. There is a deeply intuitive sense that the success of a market economy depends on a highly developed social morality: trustworthiness, honesty, concern for future generations, an ethic of service to others, a humane society that cares for those in need, frugality rather than greed, high quality standards and concern for the community. These economically desirable social

values, in turn, are seen as rooted in family values. Thus, the link in public thought between a healthy family and a robust economy, albeit indirect, is clear and firm. Charles Murray believes that illegitimacy is the most important social problem of our time, more important than crime, drugs, poverty, illiteracy, welfare or homelessness because it drives everything else. The public costs of illegitimacy are very high. Children born out of wedlock tend to have high infant mortality, low birth weight (with associated morbidities), and high probabilities of being poor, not finishing school, and remaining in social assistance. As a matter of public policy, if not morality, it is worth it for society to approve marriage as the best scenario for children and discourage having children outside of marriage (Prideaux, 2010).

Moreover, Whitehead et al (2005) warned Americans about the cost of ignoring family breakdown: If we don't accept the relationship between family structure and declining child well-being, it will be increasingly difficult to improve children's life prospects, not it matters how many new programs the federal government funds. Nor will we be able to make progress in improving school performance or reducing crime or improving the quality of the nation's future workforce, all domestic problems closely related to family breakdown. Worse still, we can contribute to the problem by applying policies that actually increase instability and family breakdown (Van Den Berghe, 1990).

## **METHODOLOGY**

Research methodology is a process focuses on the types of tools, measures to be used in the study. Research methodology focuses on data collection, sampling procedure, analysis and the findings of the study (Babbie & Mouton, 2010). The study was conducted by using quantitative method.

### **Universe of the Study**

There are no specific rules for the selection of a study universe, but it depends on the nature and scope of the investigation, either it has similar or different characteristics (Creswell, 2014). The universe of the study was the children from the broken families of the selected Darul Kafalas of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. These Darul Kafalas were selected because of the presence of higher number of children over there. For this study the Darul Kafalas of Peshawar, Mardan

and Swat were selected. According to Social Welfare Institutions Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (2018) the sampled children were selected as study units because they were in adequate numbers 560.

**Sample Size and Sampling Procedures**

The quality of a piece of research stands or falls not only by appropriateness of methodology and instrumentation but also by the suitability of the sampling strategy that has been adopted (Morrison, 2009). According to Social Welfare Institutions Khyber

Pakhtunkhwa, 2018, the total population of children in the sampled Darul Kafalas in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa was 560. The researcher used simple random sampling as a technique of probability sampling. Using sample size framework of Krejcie and Morgan (1970), the researcher collected data from a total of 226 out of 560 children as sample size in the quantitative segment of the study which was further distributed into the number of children in sampled Darul Kafala as per the proportional allocation method.

**Breakup of the Quantitative Study Respondents**

Darul Kafalas	No. of Children	Sample Taken
Peshawar	297	120
Mardan	150	60
Swat	113	46
<b>Total</b>	<b>560</b>	<b>226</b>

Proportional Allocation Method Formula

$$n_i = \frac{n \cdot N_i}{N}$$

$n_i$  = Proportion of sample allocated to  $i$ th strata

$N_i$  = Population of  $i$ th stratum

$n$  = Total sample size

$N$  = Total Population

(Chaudry and Kamal, 2004)



**TOOLS OF DATA COLLECTION**

Data collection is a procedure through which the researcher gathers the information from related resources to get responses (answers) to the study issue, test the hypotheses, give answers to the research questions and evaluate the results. Though collecting the information, the investigator must identify the types of the information, source of information and the technique to be used to gather the information. The most important, the researcher has to give respond to the questions that who, when and where the information is to be collected (Sapsford & Jupp, 2006). Neuman (2013) explained that through which methods the data collected depends on the research problem to be studied, the research design and the data collected about the exact variable. There are two major methods of data collection.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

**Univariate Analysis**

This portion deals with the univariate analysis of independent variables (broken family) and dependent variables (socialization issues). Children response regarding impact of broken family on socialization of children is given in Table. A number of statements about socialization of children from the broken family were used to determine whether there are effects on the socialization and social life of children or not. The majority of children respondents 57.1 percent added that they respect their elders, 38.1 percent said that they did not respect their elders and only 4.4 percent did not share their views about their respect for elders after family break up. While asking whether children obeying their elders, the majority of respondents 73.3 percent said that they did not obey their elders, 22.1 percent were of the view that they always obey their elders and only 4.0 percent did not express their views. Asking about neglecting and carelessness of their elders, the majority of children

respondents 47.8 percent were of the mixed reactions that they were neglecting and careless as well as attentive and take care of their elders and only 4.4 percent did not responded. Asking about obeying rules, the majority of children respondents 62.4 percent agreed that they did not care about the rules of the family as well as the state, 26.5 percent said they follow rules regulations and 11.1 percent did not say anything. Asking whether they tell a lie or deliberately deviating from the truth, the majority of children respondents 61.9 percent agreed they were lying to their mother as well as to their family members, 35.8 percent disagreed and only 7.5 percent were remain neutral. Asking whether children care for their cleanliness, a majority of children respondents replied that they did not care for cleanliness habit, 27.9 percent were of the view that they were taking care of their cleanliness and only 7.5 did not share their answer. Asking whether children from the broken family share their personal information inappropriately to others, the majority of respondents 69.9 percent agreed they did it, 27.0

percent did not agreed and were of the view they kept their secrets and did not share it with others and only 3.1 percent did not express their opinions. While asking whether children from the broken family were impatient during conversation with people, the majority of children respondents 70.8 percent agreed they did it during conversations with people, 23.9 percent did not agreed and were of the view they kept silence and when turn come they talk to others and 5.3 percent did not express their statements. Asking whether children use abusive and vulgar language while talking, the majority of respondents 59.7 percent said that they used it without any care, 37.2 percent disagreed, and were of the view they did not abused anyone and did not used vulgar language yet and only 3.1 percent did not express their views. Asking whether children from the broken family use substance abuse, the majority of respondents 72.9 percent said at some stages of life they were gone through it, 22.6 percent added that did not use in their entire life and 4.9 percent did not express their opinions.

**Frequencies and Percentage Distribution of Respondents regarding their Socialization issues**

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Total
	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)
Children don't respect elders	87 (38.5)	129 (57.1)	10 (4.4)	226 (100.0)
Children don't obey elders	167 (73.9)	50 (22.1)	9 (4.0)	226 (100.0)
Children neglect elders	108 (47.8)	108 (47.8)	10 (4.4)	226 (100.0)
Children don't obey rules	141 (62.4)	60 (26.5)	25 (11.1)	226 (100.0)
Children are often tell a lie	140 (61.9)	81 (35.8)	5 (2.2)	226 (100.0)
Children don't care for cleanliness	146 (64.6)	63 (27.9)	17 (7.5)	226 (100.0)
Children share info inappropriately	158 (69.9)	61 (27.0)	7 (3.1)	226 (100.0)
Children are Impatient while conversation	160 (70.8)	54 (23.9)	12 (5.3)	226 (100.0)
Children use abusive language	135 (59.7)	84 (37.2)	7 (3.1)	226 (100.0)
Children use substance abuse	164 (72.6)	51 (22.6)	11 (4.9)	226 (100.0)

**Bivariate Analyses**

Bivariate analyses seek association between dependent variable (socialization issues) and independent variables (broken family), which were worked out through cross tabulation (chi square test). The Table reflects results of variable of socialization of children after family breakdown in the sampled Darul Kafalas of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Socialization is to explain persons with the rules of a specified social collection. It helps children to contribute in a social set up by exemplifying the prospects of that circle. The adoption of the behavior patterns of the surrounding culture is a key for children, who start the progression at home with family, and stay it at school, college and university. These children are trained to be mature enough, to become full members of society. It was observed that the children don't respect their elders, family members and others. There was no special eye from the established learning surroundings, as explicated through high significant association ( $\rho=0.000$ ). Furthermore, most of the children were disobeying and not carrying out commands and instructions from the elders without their parents. A high significant association ( $\rho=0.000$ ) observed with the absence of the one or two parents. It was observed that at their homes children were having willful lack of care, attention, neglecting responsibilities and lack of concern; where a highly significant association ( $\rho=0.000$ ) was found with disturbed family bond. Furthermore, it was observed that children were disobeying explicit rules and regulations of the family as well as of the particular areas; where a high significant association ( $\rho=0.000$ ) was found with dispersion of the family. Furthermore, it was observed that children were often lying to people around them and were

conveying the false impression to deceive others by different means; over the single parenthood, where a highly significant association ( $\rho=0.000$ ) was found. The children were failing to give due care or attention to their cleanliness was tested with single parenthood. The data revealed a high significant association ( $\rho=0.000$ ) in this respect. Another dismal picture was portrayed in the form of; children sharing information in an inappropriate manner with family and friends was crossed with the disruption of family. A significant relation of the variable was found with significant value ( $\rho=0.000$ ). The data further reveal that the children were impatient while conversation with family members and folks around them. They were clueless about the manner to oral communication. They were complaining, shouting and cursing during informal exchange of views, ideas. This statement was also supported with a highly significant association ( $\rho=0.000$ ). In the next statement it was observed that children had no ethics, norms and were using abusive language to the people around them whether they were friends or elders; where a highly significant association ( $\rho=0.000$ ) was found. In the last statement it was unveiled that children were using substance abuse at some stage of life and usually or often intently use till now; where a highly significant association ( $\rho=0.000$ ) was found. It is concluded on the basis of study findings and the variable discussed above in details, that they were lacking of respect, had social evils and even did not aware of good oral communication. They had social evils and serious threats to their mental and physical health. There were many problems in children's attitudes and behavior. The lack of parents eye on their own offspring, keeps them away from a better social life.

**Association between Socialization issues of Children and Broken Family (N=226)**

Socialization Issues	Perception	Broken Family			Total	Statistics ( $\chi^2$ & $\rho$ )
		Agree	Disagree	Neutral		
Children don't respect elders	Agree	54(23.9)	33(14.6)	0(0.0)	87(38.5)	$\chi^2 = 39.851$ ( $\rho=0.000$ )
	Disagree	44(19.5)	47(20.8)	38(16.8)	129(57.1)	
	Neutral	5(2.7)	0(0.0)	4(1.8)	10(4.4)	
Children don't obey elders	Agree	80(35.4)	81(35.8)	6(2.7)	167(73.9)	$\chi^2 = 82.261$ ( $\rho=0.000$ )
	Disagree	22(9.7)	6(2.7)	22(9.7)	50(22.1)	

	<b>Neutral</b>	2(0.9)	0(0.0)	7(3.1)	9(4.0)	
Children neglect elders	<b>Agree</b>	60(26.5)	48(21.2)	0(0.0)	108(47.8)	$\chi^2 = 48.222$ ( $p=0.000$ )
	<b>Disagree</b>	35(15.5)	38(16.8)	35(15.5)	108(47.8)	
	<b>Neutral</b>	6(2.7)	0(0.0)	4(1.8)	10(4.4)	
Children don't obey rules	<b>Agree</b>	84(37.2)	57(25.2)	0(0.0)	141(62.4)	$\chi^2 = 117.997$ ( $p=0.000$ )
	<b>Disagree</b>	13(5.8)	29(12.8)	18(8.0)	60(26.5)	
	<b>Neutral</b>	5(2.2)	0(0.0)	20(8.8)	25(11.1)	
Children are often tell a lie	<b>Agree</b>	69(30.5)	71(31.4)	0(0.0)	140(61.9)	$\chi^2 = 79.982$ ( $p=0.000$ )
	<b>Disagree</b>	32(14.2)	14(6.2)	35(15.5)	81(35.8)	
	<b>Neutral</b>	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	5(2.2)	5(2.2)	
Children don't care for cleanliness	<b>Agree</b>	72(31.9)	74(32.7)	0(0.0)	146(64.6)	$\chi^2 = 94.612$ ( $p=0.000$ )
	<b>Disagree</b>	22(9.7)	10(4.4)	31(13.7)	63(27.9)	
	<b>Neutral</b>	9(4.0)	0(0.0)	8(3.5)	17(7.5)	
Children share info inappropriately	<b>Agree</b>	79(35.0)	76(33.6)	3(1.3)	158(69.9)	$\chi^2 = 93.475$ ( $p=0.000$ )
	<b>Disagree</b>	21(9.3)	7(3.1)	33(14.6)	61(27.0)	
	<b>Neutral</b>	4(1.8)	0(0.0)	3(1.3)	7(3.1)	
Children are Impatient while conversation	<b>Agree</b>	76(33.6)	82(36.3)	2(0.9)	160(70.8)	$\chi^2 = 124.668$ ( $p=0.000$ )
	<b>Disagree</b>	19(8.4)	1(0.4)	34(15.0)	54(23.9)	
	<b>Neutral</b>	9(4.0)	0(0.0)	3(1.3)	12(5.3)	
Children use abusive language	<b>Agree</b>	90(39.8)	45(19.9)	0(0.0)	135(59.7)	$\chi^2 = 99.779$ ( $p=0.000$ )
	<b>Disagree</b>	9(4.0)	38(16.8)	37(16.4)	84(37.2)	
	<b>Neutral</b>	4(1.8)	0(0.0)	3(1.3)	7(3.1)	
Children use substance abuse	<b>Agree</b>	81(35.8)	77(34.1)	6(2.7)	164(72.6)	$\chi^2 = 100.251$ ( $p=0.000$ )
	<b>Disagree</b>	16(7.1)	5(2.2)	30(13.3)	51(22.6)	
	<b>Neutral</b>	3(1.3)	0(0.0)	8(3.5)	11(4.9)	

\*Figure in the table denotes the frequency while the figure in parenthesis denotes percentage. The symbol ( $p$ ) represents the significance level and ( $\chi^2$ ) represents the value of chi square.

## CONCLUSION

The study focused on the effect of broken families on the socialization of their children at the sampled Dar Ul Kafalas (child care centres) of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Data was collected from children and then analyzed through chi-square test to measure the association of dependent variables with independent variables. After analyzing socialization issues faced by broken family children in the selected Dar Ul Kafalas, the

study concluded that children insulted their elders; even the administration staff understood the disobedience. They had neglected parents and stopped them from interfering in their lives, violated the principles of family and rules of the sheltered homes without any fear. Many children were lying to their elders in their family and were neglected by cleaning their bodies, shared views and ideas anonymously in dialogue and used abusive language and substance.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The study recommends that the society should educate children about their rights and the conditions under which children may live. The problems facing by children should be addressed in the community through mass media, print media, electronic media and social media. Communities should be treated like normal children to avoid rehabilitation of children, to promote healthy recovery and recovery after child carrying off. Parents, relatives and friends of children should do their best to advocate for the inspection of children to prevent the negative effects of the broken family.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S. (2012). The Status and Rights of Women in Islam. The Muslim Sunrise. Retrieved October 28, 2012 from <http://www.muslimsunrise.com/>
- Alam, N., Saha, S., & Van Ginneken, J. K. (2000). Determinants of divorce in a traditional Muslim community in Bangladesh. Demographic Research, 3. Retrieved August 13, 2012 from <http://www.demographic-research.org/volumes/vol3/4/>.
- Babbie, E. & Mouton, J. (2010). The practice of social research. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Bhuiya, A., & Chowdhury, M. (1997). The effect of divorce on child survival in a rural area of Bangladesh. *Population Studies*, 51(1), 57-61.
- Burton, N. (2012). Divorce Effect On Kids: Do You Wish Your Parents Had Split? The Huffington Post. [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/natasha-burton/divorce-effect-on-kids\\_b\\_1601627.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/natasha-burton/divorce-effect-on-kids_b_1601627.html).
- Chaudry, S. M., & Kamal, S. (2004). *Introduction to Statistical Theory II*: 6th edition. (pp. 169-175), Ilmi Kitab Khana Lahore, Pakistan.
- Dusek, G., & Ayhan, A. B. (2014). A study on problem solving skills of the children from broken family and full parents family attending regional primary boarding school. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 152, 137-142.
- Kephart, W. M. (1998). *The Family, Society and the Individual*. London: Houghton Mifflin
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 30(3), 607-610.
- Morrison, G. S. (2009). Likelihood-ratio forensic voice comparison using parametric representations of the formant trajectories of diphthongs. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 125(4), 2387-2397.
- Neuman, W. L. (2013). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Pearson education.
- Prideaux, S. J. (2010). The welfare politics of Charles Murray are alive and well in the UK. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 19(3), 293-302.
- Sapsford, R., & Jupp, V. (Eds.). (2006). *Data collection and analysis*. Sage.
- Sekaran. (2003). towards a guide for novice research on research methodology: Review and proposed methods." *Journal of Cases of Information Technology*.
- Social Welfare Institutions Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. (2018). Social Welfare Institutions. Retrieved from swkpk website: [https://swkpk.gov.pk/?page\\_id=1252](https://swkpk.gov.pk/?page_id=1252).
- Sultana, N. (2004). Polygamy and Divorce in Rural Bangladesh. *Empowerment: A Journal of Women for Women*, 11, 75-96.
- Van den Berghe, P. L. (1990). *Human family systems: An evolutionary view*. Waveland Press.
- Whitehead, D. B., Bellah, R. N., de Waal, F. B., Pollick, A. S., Pope, S. J., Wuthnow, R. (2005). *Family transformed: Religion, values, and society in American life*. George town University Press.
- Yankelovich, D. (2006). Rediscovering market segmentation. *Harvard business review*, 84(2), 122.