

DOES SOCIAL DYNAMICS LEAD TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRIMINAL TENDENCIES IN PESHAWAR, PAKISTAN?

Miss Zarsanga, M.Phil Scholar,
Institute of Social Work, Sociology and Gender Studies,
University of Peshawar, Pakistan,

Prof. Dr. Rahid Khan, Professor,
Institute of Social Work, Sociology and Gender Studies,
University of Peshawar, Pakistan,

Dr. Yorid Ehsan Zia, Assistant Professor,
Quaid-e-Azam College of Commerce, University of Peshawar.

ABSTRACT

The present study was concerned with exploring the various factors responsible for emergence of criminal attitudes in the adults in district Peshawar, Pakistan. Central Jail Peshawar was chosen as universe of the study with a population size of 360 convicted criminal out of which a sample size of 196 sample size was drawn out through random sampling procedures. Univariate analysis was carried out to display the data in terms of percentages. Moreover, at bi-variate level, Chi-Square test was used to ascertain the level of significance between the dependent variable i.e. Criminal Attitude and Independent Variables namely Social, Psychological and Economic aspect of the study. The study found that there was a significant relationship between relatives were involved in criminal activities ($p=0.006$) with criminal attitude, large family size is responsible for committing crimes ($p=0.001$) with criminal attitude and father distanced position at job as the main cause of association of kids with the criminal ($p=0.000$) with the criminal attitude along with intoxicant practices in the presence of kids ($p=0.001$) as the contributing factors of the criminality in the study area. Joint family system, liaison of the criminals with parents of the respondents while using intoxicants, joint family system and furthered position of father at job were some the main conclusions of the study. Control over big family size, avoiding intoxicant practices in the presence of kids by parents and allocation of role in the absence of father at the family level for taking care of the family affairs.

INTRODUCTION

Crime is an act which violates the law and considered to be dangerous to the society and community social fabrics, thus by taken as punishable by the state. The word crime stems out from Latin word “Crimen” (crimines), which indicates in meaning towards committing of guilt and accusation (Encarta Microsoft Corporation, 2003). It has been witnessed that crime significantly violates the existing law and traditions that is why negative sanctions are always prevalent for ensuring the smooth and congenial environment based on predictability in behavior with reference to crime. It is usually responsible for disorganization into the existing law of the land which resultantly sprouts anti-social behavior leading to a number of moral, social and criminal offences (Williams, 1997; Bogardus, 1993).

Spriggs (1952) has found that criminal attitudes usually emerged in the human personality is due to social environment. The origin of violence has a number of dimensions with a lot of mysteries associated to. Some of the people commit crimes irrespective of taking into considerations societal reflection. It has been found that in such cases imprisonment, drug treatment and other alternatives to imprisonment are worthless. Perhaps education could serve as a criminal deterrent if properly used as a tool for return to work. Moreover, the stigma of arrest has also been in some cases seem a workable unit of deterrence to crime (Wilson and Petersilia, 1995; Williams and Sickles, 2001; and Lochrien, 1999). Community intervention for the treatment of adolescents with criminal attitudes could be used as one of the yardstick to control the anti-social activities through adult arrest but it's very success is not yet conclusive and needs some more efforts to prove its vitality (Grisso, 2007). Youth is one of the important segment of society where future is associated to it because countries in particular and whole world at large looking towards them as future workforce and true custodian to the new era. Anywhere an attitude that may lead to crimes or involvement in such activities which are tantamount to deviating from the law is in all aspects expensive to individuals, families, societies and the world at large. For the last so many years attempts are being made to dig out the actual causes of delinquency which later on lead to the emergence into criminal attitude. The researchers so far have been succeeded in discovering some of the core factors which are responsible for the emergence into juvenile delinquency and later on the development of criminal attitude in adulthood. These are broken homes, space of association between parents and children and overcrowded families (Demuth & Brown, 2004; and Derzon & Lipsey, 2000).

A number of factors are concerned to criminal attitude which includes poverty, low education level, peer association etc. It has been assumed that parent with large families are incapable of giving time to all children on egalitarian basis that is why increase in number of siblings is associated to increase in probability of committing crimes (Derzon & Lipsey, 2000; Williams, 2001; and Grogger, 1998). These factors include risk of causing a criminal attitude amongst the youth mostly devoid of attentions being paid at sibling level by the parents. It is often associated with the big family size having large number of kids. However the research shows that delinquency or criminal attitude has mostly been traced in male than female sibling (Brownfiel & Sorensen, 1994; Jones, Offord & Abrams, 1998; Jones et al., 1980; and Farington et al., 1996). Youth as a major asset of the present day world is being focused since long with the objectives for making them the viable citizens, capable enough to cope with the futuristic demands of life. Keeping into account these assumptions, the present study was design to look into the social factor responsible for generating criminal attitude. The study proceeded with the objectives like assessing the juvenile tendencies in relation to socio economic profile of the respondents in the study area.

6.1 METHODOLOGY

- I. The present study was conducted in District Central Jail, Peshawar, Pakistan as universe of the study

For the purpose of conducting the present study which is concerned with ascertaining the behavioral tendencies of criminals towards committing offences, Central Jail Peshawar has been chosen as universe. The main purpose of choosing Peshawar was its central position where criminals from the whole province is shifted here and thus the study would be a representative of the whole province. All the adult male criminals with an age group of (21-64) constituted the population for this study. All those criminals who had been sent to jail during the year 2011-2012 in various crimes as punishment were the potential respondents for this study.

A sample size of 196 respondents out of the total 360 respondents punished and sent to central Jail Peshawar during the year 2011-2012 were randomly drawn out to thoroughly analyze the situational factors influencing the phenomena at hand. The sample size taken out was quite enough as it justified its size through the criteria adopted by Sekaran (2010), where a sample size of 196 was considered appropriate for a population size of 360. This determination of sample size helped the researcher in minimizing the biasness in the study while acquiring a high degree of precision which was necessary for making the sample size appropriate to the population size in nature and characteristics.

A well thought out interview schedule was constructed for collecting the information pertaining to the study. Appropriated attitudinal scale was used known as Likert Sclae was used as the data was qualitative in nature and the study main domain was ascertaining the attitude of the respondents.

6.1.1 *Data Analysis*

6.1.2 *Uni-Variate Analysis*

The collected data were analyzed by using proper statistical technique (Frequency Distribution) through SPSS version 20. This section reflected the responses of the respondents in percentages. It covered both dependent and independent variables along with demographic variables.

Bi-Variate Analysis

It is the distribution of the data in the aftermath of cross-tabulation of the dependent and independent variables respectively. Different appropriate statistical tests are helpful in determining the level of association or the degree of correlation between the two variables (Nachmias & Nachmias, 1992). In this study the relationship between independent (Social Aspect) and dependent variable (Criminal Attitude) was indexed and cross tabulated and presented into a 3/3 table as per requirement of the nature of the data. Moreover, to ascertain the degree of association Chi Square test was applied.

This analysis was carried out through Chi-Square Test statistics designed as represented by the formula as below;

$$\chi_{obs}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^r \sum_{k=1}^c \frac{(O_{jk} - E_{jk})^2}{E_{jk}} \quad (I)$$

Where chi-square

O_{jk} = observed frequencies at jth row and kth column in the cross classified categories.

E_{jk} = Expected frequency, assuming no relationship among variables.

Degree of freedom is calculated as follow;

$$df = (r-1)(c-1)$$

df = degree of freedom.

r = number of rows

c =number of columns

(Mac Call, 1975).

Whenever the frequencies in the cells were less than 5 Fisher Exact Test was used instead of simple Chi-square, by adopting the procedures of Baily (1982).

In addition, the sample size must fairly be large such that no expected frequency is less than 5, for r and c >2, or <10 if r=c=2. However, this assumption was violated several times in the data and therefore, Fisher Exact Test (also known as Exact Chi-square Test) was used instead of simple chi- square. The relationship developed by Fisher is given in equation-II (Baily, 1982);

$$\text{FisherExact Test Probability} = \frac{(a+b)!(c+d)!(a+c)!(b+d)!}{N!a!b!c!d!} \quad (II)$$

Where a, b, c and d were the observed numbers in four cells of contingency table and “n” the total number of observations.

Results and Discussions

Table-1 indicted that majority 93.5 percent respondent’s parent’s relationships were hostile. Moreover, majority 83 percent respondents have broken families which were reported as a cause of becoming criminal. In addition, majority 77 percent respondents reported the lack of control of parents was the cause of criminality. Furthermore, 75.5 percent respondents replied that their father distanced position of job was the main cause of association of kids with criminals. Similarly, 63.5 percent respondents reported that living in a joint family is the real source of generating criminal attitude due to interaction with other criminal kens.

Moreover, 59 percent respondents had friendly relationship with their parents, whereas 46 percent respondents reported that they had taken influence from Peer groups who were involved in illegal activities. Likewise, 40 percent respondent’s parents were using intoxicating drugs and 36-36.5 percent respondents parents were illiterate and had large family size. The rest i.e. 25 percent respondents parents were sentenced several times and 21.5 percent respondents relatives were indulged in criminal activities. A complex

situation regarding the existence of crimes in the study area could be explicitly deduced and could be attributed to a comprehensive disorganization of the family either due to lack of control by the elders, big family size and parents distant position at job place. Moreover, inclination towards committing criminal attitude could also be an associative factor of the parents and kids interaction with other criminal gangs in the area. Big family size and disorganization of the families along with the non-existence of close relationship between the parent and children and interaction with criminals could be the real harbinger to the development of criminal attitude (Demuth and Brown, 2004; Hoffmann and Johnson, 1998 and; Derzon and Lipsey, 2000).

Table-1 Social causes of criminal tendency

S.no	Statements	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
1	Parental relationship was hostile	187(93.5)	9(4.5)	2(2)
2	Parental relationship was friendly	182(91)	7(3.5)	9(4.5)
3	Parental attitude toward children was friendly	118(59)	75(37.5)	5(2.5)
4	Parents were involve in criminals activities	4(2)	184(92)	10(5)
5	Parents were sentence several times	50(25)	144(72)	4(3)
6	Peer groups were involve in illegal activities	93(46.5)	99(49.5)	6(3)
7	Parents were illiterate	73(36.5)	117(58.5)	8(4)
8	Relatives were involved in criminals activities	43(21.5)	149(74.5)	6(3)
9	Large family size is responsible for crimes	72(36)	125(62.1)	1(.5)
10	Parent were using intoxicating drugs	81(40.5)	115(57.5)	2(1.0)
11	Lack of parent control leads to criminal behavior	154(77)	44(22)	0
	joint family is the real source of generating criminal attitude due to interaction with other criminal kins	127(63.5)	70(35)	1(.5)
	breakdown of relationship between parents lead to the emergence of criminal tendency	166(83)	23(11.5)	9(4.5)
	father distanced position of job is the main cause of association of kids with criminal	151(75.5)	37(18.50)	10(5)

2. BI-VARIATE ANALYSIS

Table showing the relationship between social aspect of life and criminal attitude.

S.No	Attribute	Response	Criminal Attitude			Statistics
			High	Medium	Low	
1	Relationship between parents were friendly at household	Agree	152(77.6)	20(10.2)	8(4.1)	$\chi^2=7.050$ (P=0.133)
		Disagree	5(2.6)	1(0.5)	1(0.5)	
		Don't know	7(3.6)	0(0.0)	2(1.0)	
2	Parental attitude toward children was friendly	Agree	100(51.0)	12(6.1)	5(2.6)	$\chi^2=3.207$ (P=0.524)
		Disagree	60(30.6)	9(4.6)	5(2.6)	
		Don't know	4(2.0)	0(0.0)	1(0.5)	
3	Parents were involved in criminals activities	Agree	3(1.5)	0(0.0)	1(0.5)	$\chi^2=4.866$ (P=0.301)
		Disagree	152(77.6)	21(10.7)	9(4.6)	
		Don't know	9(4.6)	0(0.0)	1(0.5)	
4	Parents were sentenced several times	Agree	43(22.4)	6(3.1)	1(0.5)	$\chi^2=1.768$ (P=0.413)
		Disagree	117(60.9)	15(7.8)	10(5.2)	
		Don't know	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	
5	Peer groups were involved in illegal activities	Agree	78(39.8)	10(5.1)	4(2.0)	$\chi^2=2.309$ (P=0.679)
		Disagree	81(41.3)	11(5.6)	6(3.1)	
		Don't know	5(2.6)	0(0.0)	1(0.5)	
6	Parents were illiterate	Agree	65(33.2)	5(2.6)	2(1.0)	$\chi^2=4.1736$ (P=0.383)
		Disagree	93(47.4)	15(7.7)	8(4.1)	
		Don't know	6(3.1)	1(0.5)	1(0.5)	
7	Relatives were involved in criminals activities	Agree	40(20.4)	1(1.0)	1(0.5)	$\chi^2=14.453$ (P=0.006)
		Disagree	120(61.2)	20(10.2)	8(4.1)	
		Don't know	4(2.0)	0(0.0)	2(1.0)	
8	Large family size is responsible for crimes	Agree	67(34.2)	1(0.5)	2(1.0)	$\chi^2=19.586$ (P=0.001)
		Disagree	97(49.5)	19(9.7)	9(4.6)	
		Don't know	0(0.0)	1(0.5)	0(0.0)	
9	Parent were using intoxicating drugs	Agree	71(36.2)	6(3.1)	3(1.5)	$\chi^2=18.690$ (P=0.001)
		Disagree	93(47.4)	13(6.6)	8(4.1)	
		Don't know	0(0.0)	2(1.0)	0(0.0)	
10	Lack of parent control leads to criminal behavior	Agree	129(65.8)	15(7.7)	8(4.1)	$\chi^2=0.715$ (P=0.700)
		Disagree	35(17.9)	6(3.1)	3(1.5)	
		Don't know	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	
11	Joint family is the real source of generating criminal attitude due to interaction with other criminal kins	Agree	105(53.3)	15(7.7)	5(2.6)	$\chi^2=11.035$ (P=0.026)
		Disagree	59(30.1)	5(2.6)	6(3.1)	
		Don't know	0(0.0)	1(0.5)	0(0.0)	
12	Breakdown of relationship between parents lead to emergence of criminal tendency	Agree	139(70.9)	15(7.7)	10(5.1)	$\chi^2=3.226$ (P=0.521)
		Disagree	18(9.2)	4(2.0)	1(0.5)	
		Don't know	7(3.60)	2(1.0)	0(0.0)	
13	Father distanced position of job is the main cause of association of kids with criminals	Agree	131(66.8)	8(4.1)	10(5.1)	$\chi^2=33.134$ (P=0.000)
		Disagree	29(14.8)	7(3.6)	1(0.5)	
		Don't know	4(2.0)	6(3.1)	0(0.0)	

Social patterns of life are so much intricate in their relationship among themselves that prediction pertaining to any dimension of human behavior is difficult. Certain branches of knowledge have focused on knowing about this complex phenomenon while relating it to the fore mentioned unpredictability. Criminal behavior is one of the major focuses of the scholars for making criminals viable citizen and preventing them from committing of crime. However, despite all these efforts man seems to be unable to succeed in his endeavor due to behavioral inconsistency related to human being. It is postulated that crime within the social purview of life could be confined too branched strategy i.e. short term and long term. Moreover, childhood and adulthood are two other major factors need to be focused on for making or ascertaining any association of criminal tendency to social aspect of life. Keeping into consideration the importance of social circumstances some attributes was designed and their relationship was ascertained with the criminal attitude. It was found that the relationship between parents were friendly at household was not non-significant with the criminal attitude. Moreover, parental attitude towards children were friend along with criminals were involved in criminal activities were found non-significant with criminal attitude. It could be detected from the above relationships that parent had little role in making their children criminal either due to parents non-involvement in criminal activities or keeping their kids on a particular distance where children had little access to parents activities outside home. Moreover, being cultural in nature the study area indicated a strong parental role under the strong social pressure from the society, which dictated for a sound moral character on part of the parents for their children to adopt. Thus situational factors are highly helpful in predictability upon the behavioral outcomes in any particular situation. Horney (1990) has also came up with his results based on his study that social situation throughout the life and changing life patterns are mostly contributing towards unpredictability in behavior. Situational factors are helpful in explaining the occurrence of crimes. It includes categorization of roles being performed by the senior member at family level and other situational factors such as low income and dense family structure could be one of the major factors leading towards the emergence of criminal tendencies amongst the individuals. Moreover, parents were sentenced several times was found significant ($P = 0.013$). It could be attributed to the breeding social environments which provide enough situational opportunities for the youngsters (kids) to commit crimes. It is usually based on learned human motives due to taking influence from their parent's deeds. Crime is a learned behavior and usually attributed to socio-cultural environment based on the existence of appropriate social situation (Sutherland, 1940). Moreover, a tense social situation at home with emotional trends related to tension based on quarrelling between parents and parent's involvement in criminal activities or some other factors of criminality amongst the youngsters (Glueck, 1934). However, peer group involvement in illegal activities was found non-significant with criminal attitude. In addition parent's illiteracy also had non-significant relationship with criminal attitude. It could be attributed to sound peer group activities, wherein little chances of availability of criminal models to be around. Moreover, though parents were illiterate but the social situation was strong enough due to strong social norms and values system which were controlling the individual behavior towards conformity to the social situation. This is absolutely in line to the findings of Sutherland (1940) that criminal behavior is usually learned through interaction with other criminal and has thus a link to environmental criminal behavior pattern with little connection to other factors like literacy and family type. Moreover, an individual tendency of conformity or deviance is always dependent on relation with other for behavioral adjustment or otherwise. On the other hand relatives involved in criminal activities was found significant ($P = 0.006$) with criminal tendencies. This is very much obvious from the result that individuals while observing others committing something had higher probability to commit such things by themselves. It is due to an individual ability based on learning which is a social phenomenon and usually crops up due to situational scenario. In addition large family size was found having a significant relationship ($P = 0.001$) with criminal attitude. The motif associated with this result could be the parental lose control

over their children in directing them towards social conformity due to; either poor social management at family level, due to low income and unable to provide basic amenities of life on equal basis or due to persistent quarrelling between them. Rita and Adler (1975) have shown the economic condition and role differentiation as the major factor of criminality. Moreover, family environment and parent's attitude and behavior of the offenders were negatively influencing the attitude, personality of their offspring. Parent child disharmony is another management flaw which is responsible for the arise of crimes at family level (Kaufman, Makkay and Zilbach, 1959; Sarwat Inayat, 2006; and Joseph G Weis, 1978). Moreover, parents were using intoxicating drugs was found highly significant ($P = 0.001$) with criminal attitude. It again indicates about learning while aping as disclosed by Sutherland, (1940). Lack of parent control leads to criminal behavior was found non-significant with criminal attitude. It is either due to strong social environment having well defined cultural values where little room of deviance for an individual is around. Conversely, joint family is the real source of generating criminal attitude due to interaction with other criminal kins were found significant ($P = 0.026$) with criminal attitude. It is in line to the fore mentioned relationship where criminal relative and large family size were disclosed as contributing factors to the creation of criminal attitude. The main reason associated, could be lose control and high chance of learning by giving and taking due to high chances of opportunities of interaction. Learning of any attitude is situational as disclose by Sutherland (1940). Moreover, lose family structure with parental criminal record is also a breeding factor of criminality (Sarwat, 2006). However, breakdown of relationship between parents lead to the emergence of criminal tendencies was found non-significant with the criminal attitude. This could be the negligible chances of any big breakdown of the relations between parents at family level. It is attributable to the strong cultural condemnation in the study area where social stigma is associated with the breakdown between parents with no social endorsement. On the other hand father distant position of job is a main cause of association of kids with criminal was found highly significant ($P = 0.000$) with criminal attitude. Division of labor at family level is markedly distributed. Male has a dominant role in controlling the family affairs due to patriarchal structure. Father having a leading role has to contain and provide protection to the family in all terms. Long term absence of father is usually attributable to the high chances of becoming criminals for their offspring. A sound family is considered to be highly contribution towards social conformity. Individuals have always chances of living in law abiding situation however lose chances may tend them to commit crimes. Human behavior is learned by observing others as model. Violent role model could exist at home. In addition media is also responsible for transmitting learning opportunities through different programs (Brown E. Stephen, 1991; and , 1986).

Conclusions and Recommendations

It was concluded on the basis of the study that joint family system was the main cause of leading to criminal attitude. Moreover, liaison of the criminals with parents of the convicted proved another factor responsible for criminality. Lack of parents control over the family operational mechanics while doing jobs at a distanced location from the family and use of intoxicants were some other contributing factors to the development criminal tendencies amongst the youth of the study area. Control over big family size, avoiding intoxicant behavior by the parents, at least in the presence of their kids, and role allocation to other senior member of the family for taking care of the family affairs in absence of the father while posted away from the family for his job.

References:

1. Bandura, Albert.(1986). *Social Foundation of Thought and Action; A Social Cognitive*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ; Prentice Hall.
2. Edwin, H, Sutherland.(1940). *Principles of Criminology*. Rowman and Littlefield Publisher, Inc.
3. Sarwat Inayat,(2006). *Female Criminality, Women and Crime*, Bookbiz publisher, Lahore.
4. Demuth, S., & Brown, S. (2004). Family structure, family processes, and adolescent delinquency: The significance of parental absence versus parental gender. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 41(1), 58-81.
5. Derzon, J.H., and Lipsey, M.W, (200). The correspondence of family features with problem, aggressive, criminal and violent behavior. Unpublished manuscript.Nashville, TN: Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt University.
6. Grisso, T. 2007. Do childhood mental disorders cause adult crime? *Am. J. Psychiatry* 164: 1625-27.
7. Grogger, J. (1998), `Market Wages and Youth Crime, *Journal of Labor Economics*, vol.15,no. 4, pp,756-791.
8. Horney, J. 1990. Adult patterns of criminal behavior. (www.uplink.com.au/lawlibrary/Documents/Docs/Doc34.html).
9. Jones, M.B., Offord, D.R., & Abrams, N. (1980). Brothers, sisters and antisocial behaviour. *British Journal of zychiatry*, 136, 139-145.
10. Sekaran Uma, 2003. *Research Methods For Business. A Skill Building Approach*. 4th Edition. John Wiley & Sons, U S A. P.295.
11. Wilson J.Q., and J. Petersilia 1995. *Ideas about the legacy of criminal behavior*. ICS Press. Pp. 650.
12. Nachmias Chava F. and D. Nachmias. 1992. *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*, 4th ed. Biddles Ltd, Guildfold and King Lynn, London, UK.