

**Influencing Factors behind the Criminal Attitude:
A Study of Central Jail Peshawar**

Intikhab Alam¹, Anwar ul Mujahid² &
Shahid Iqbal³

Abstract

This study was carried out in District Peshawar Central jail, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan to know about reasons behind committing crimes by sampled respondents. The study main aim was to enlist the types of crimes by looking into the criminal record and measuring the association between socio economic factors with criminal attitude. From the adult prisoners a sample size of 196 was randomly drawn including the age group 18-64. To see association between independent variable namely economic aspects with criminal attitude bi-variate analysis were used. The findings of the study depict that large family size 9-12 members, 48.8 were in 10000 PKR monthly income, primary and middle level education were found in 34.5% respondents. Joint family was common 70.5%, majority respondents 62.5% having farming as a profession,. Due to drugs 58.5% respondents were in jail, illiteracy was common 88.8% respondents. At bi-variate level, due to parents imprisonment several time was found significant ($p= 0.013$), criminal activities carried out by relatives was found ($p=0.006$), larger family size was influencing factors for crimes ($p=0.001$), use of drugs by parents ($p=0.001$), criminal attitude was created in joint family ($p=0.026$) In addition, joblessness ($p=0.000$), small earnings ($p=0.000$), unjustifiable economic distribution ($p=0.000$), avoiding merit in jobs ($p=0.000$), due to illiteracy ($p=0.000$) and committing gang activities ($p=0.000$) were found significantly related to criminal attitude. The study established that low economic status of family having large size are exposed to criminals were some of the influencing factors for involvement in wrong doings. Relinquishing interaction with criminals by the elders by involvement in health activities, in absence of father senior member of the family should look after, creation of more economic activities in the bazaar, developing a fair cheaper justice system at door step and provision of employment to unemployed to unemployed are some of the suggestions in the light of study.

Keywords: Influencing factors, Socio-economic, Criminal attitude, Low income

Introduction

¹Department of Rural Sociology, University of Agriculture, Peshawar, KP

²Lecturer Department of Sociology, Bacha Khan University, Charsadda, KP

³Center for Disaster Management, University of Peshawar, Peshawar, KP

(Encarta Microsoft Corporation, 2003) has defined crime is any punishable offence which are liable to be dealt with law and which threaten very basis of the society network. The history of the term crime come from Latin word "Crimen" (crimines), which specifies in implication in committing wrongdoings in the society. To ensure smooth business of the society Negative sanctions are strictly followed by the state..(Williams, 1997;) have described that criminal behavior creates anti-social, moral behaviour which disturb social network of the society.(Grisso, 2007).

Young generation is considered as future assets of the society throughout the world. The involvement of youth in criminal activities threatens the future of the world at large. Efforts have been made to pinpoint causes of youth involvement in criminal activities. The scholars have identified several factors which are responsible in the involvement of criminal activities are overcrowded families, broken families, association between parents and children. (Demuth & Brown, 2004; Derzon & Lipsey, 2000).

A universal fact with reference to criminal behavior is related to unemployment, family environment and relationship, drug addicts are noted as influencing factors in development of criminal tendencies. William and Sickles, (2002) and Lochrien, (1999) have mentioned that education and awareness can play positive role in the rehabilitation of criminal in the society.

(Derzon & Lipsey, 2000; and Grogger, 1998) have described that poverty, illiteracy, association with criminal, large family, Lack of attention paid by parent at sibling level size are some of the factors responsible with criminal tendencies.. These factors include risk of causing a criminal attitude amongst the youth mostly devoid of attentions being paid at socialization promoted criminal behavior in the society. Youth are considered as future assets world over, if these youth deprived of proper socialization will be future criminals. Tommovic, (1979) has reported that criminals are products of society injustices like poverty, marital life problems, and exploitation. Criminal act are being arisen in the matrix of socio-personal organization with major exposure to deviance experiences and behavior disorders. It is usually dependent upon the traits of social process wherein major failure is being met on part of the persons having little control of the relevant social system. It could be either socio-economic or social ailment. Crime as an act is always measured through breaking of laws under the criminal code which is established by the society and written in the shape of laws.

Sakharov (1977) determined that regional crime rate differences in the USSR were primarily by the prevalent mode of production, & secondarily by a complex of economic, demographic, cultural, & other factors. Data were gathered by interviews with 6,000 convicts, analysis of the circumstances surrounding 4,000 crimes, & consideration of personal data for 15,000 delinquents. Four kinds of delinquents were considered: premeditated murderers, hooligans, thieves of social property, & thief's of personal property. The data pertained to two regions,

identified as A & B. Region A was primarily industrial, region B predominantly rural. Results show that the majority of convicts in both regions (61.5% in region A; 61.2% in region B) were engaged in physical labor; of those, 46.5% in region A & 42.1% in region B were manual laborers. Physical labor background was particularly conspicuous for respondents convicted of murder, hooliganism, & aggravated battery. Comparative data showed that the higher the mechanization of labor, i.e., the less physical the work, the less likely was deviant behavior. Results confirmed theoretical concepts of social causality of deviant behavior, clarify the role of specific social factors in generating deviance, chart new paths in the study of social causes of criminality, & encourage further study of the phenomenon.

Objectives of the study:

- To study types of crimes committed by sampled respondents.
- To see the relationship between economic factors with adult criminal attitude.
- To study the economic factors responsible for criminal attitude.
- To suggest policy recommendations in the light of the present study.

Methodology:

The present study was conducted in Central Jail Peshawar has been chosen as universe. The main reasons for selecting central jail Peshawar was population of the jail in the whole province. The population of the study includes all adults' prisoners in the central jail in the year 2011-12 due to involvement in different criminal activities.

The total adult's male prisoners were 360. From this a sample size of 196 respondents were chosen randomly to study different reasons influencing criminal attitude. Sample was drawn as per criteria devised by Sekaran (2010), A well-structured interview schedule was developed by and data was collected from the prisoners of the central jail Peshawar. at Univariate level frequency and percentage was used, while to see association between economic factors and criminal attitude χ^2 -test statistics were used as outlined by Tai (1978).

$$(\chi^2) = \sum \sum \frac{(f_{ij} - F_{ij})^2}{F_i F_j}$$

Where

(χ^2) = Chi-square for two categorical variables

f_{ij} = the observed frequencies in the cross-classified category at *i*th row and *j*th column

F_{ij} = the expected frequency for the same category, assuming no association between variables under investigation

The formula simply directs one to take squared summation of the frequencies for each cell, divided by the expected frequency. The resulting frequency is distributed as chi-square with relevant degree of freedom. The degree of freedom is calculated as follows;

Df = (r-1) (c-1) where

Df = Degree of freedom

r = the number of rows

c = the number of columns

Results and discussion

Economic causes of criminal tendency

Table-15 indicated that majority 93.5 percent considered that non provision of education due to poverty was responsible for committing crimes. Reduction in criminal tendencies could only be contained through the provision of education (William and Sickle, 2001). Furthermore, 92.50 percent respondents termed that unemployment leads to become criminal. Crime as a resultant factor of poverty, low educational level and non-provision of employment (Derzon and Lipsey, 2000).

In addition 91 percent respondents believed that de voidance of merit in allocation of job was major cause of criminal behavior as indicated by the Calhoun et al., (1989) that one of the causative factors of committing crimes is the violation of norms of social group with respect to merit and equality. Moreover, 82 percent respondents replied that uneven economic distribution leads to criminal tendency as reported by Derzon and Lipsey (2000). Similarly, 81.5 percent respondents termed low level of income leads towards the emergence of criminal behavior. Socio-economic and political organization have a greater role in containing the behavior of the individuals. More is the opportunity of job available little would be the chances of criminality (Shukly, 1981). Only 47 percent respondents replied that high level income leads criminal behavior. However, 45 percent believed that their parents were poor due which they become criminal and 31.5 percent respondents considered that large family size was the major cause of criminal tendency. This was also reported by Balkan and Berger (1979) that criminal behavior is the outcome of aggressive and violent behavior based on self-destruction and it is usually eminent amongst the large families. However, 23 percent respondents believed that it is only way to fight against poverty.

Table-Economic causes of criminal tendency

Statements	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
Unemployment leads to commit crimes.	185(92.50)	59(2.50)	8(40)
Low level of income leads to commit crimes	163(81.5)	25(12.5)	10(50)
Large family size leads to commit crimes.	63(31.5)	116(58)	19(9.5)
High income leads to commit crimes.	94(47)	69(34.5)	35(17.5)
It is the only way to fight against poverty.	46(23)	149(74.50)	3(1.50)
Parents were poor which leads to commit crimes.	90(45)	105(52.50)	3(1.5)
Economic distribution.	164(82)	29(14.5)	5(2.5)
De voidance of merit in allocation of job.	182(91)	13(6.5)	3(1.5)
Non provision of education due to poverty.	187(93.5)	6(3)	5(2.5)

Source: Survey 2012

Criminal attitude

Table-16 disclosed that majority 89.5 percent respondents believed that the effective system of social sanction does not allow to breed criminals. However, majority 87 percent respondents considered that committing gang activities is emerging as a significant trend in society for earning. Moreover, majority 85.5 percent respondents replied that a viable and transparent judicial setup can leads to contaminant of criminal's tendency. Unemployment, poverty and family disorganization are some of the determinant factors lead in towards criminal tendencies. This situation is usually based on a disorder of socio-personal relationship with dysfunctional social control (Tommovic 1979 and; Calhoun et al., 1989) due to unethical, immoral and gang activities beyond the bound of respectabilities. In addition, 82 percent respondents termed that unawareness

about the criminal act leads to criminal tendency. Moreover, 79 percent respondents believed that Punishment to criminal act could serve as a social deterrent. Crime is a learned behavior, committing it in ignorance is of no acceptable excuse and punishment could serve to be reconstructive and reformative (Sutherland, 1940). A considerable majority that is 78.5 percent respondents viewed a family dispute was an inevitable way to commit criminal activities. Moreover, 77 percent respondents believed that stickers and rigid law is instrumental in containing criminal tendency. These findings are in line to Stott and Wilson (1977) results that criminality and control were finally matched in cultural perspective and a relationship between strict administrative measure under the stringent law could minimize the occurrence of crimes.

Similarly, 74 percent respondents termed that avoidance to criminal activities is embodied to social compliance. Moreover, 71 percent respondents considered that criminal tendency is the outcome of socially learned behavior as disclosed by Sutherland (1940) also. Only 22 percent respondents considered that criminal attitude is a genetic transformation of character. This finding is the reflection of Cessaro Lambroso (1990) assumption that character is fixed on genetic factors.

Table-15 Criminal attitude

Statements	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
Unawareness about the criminal act.	164(82)	12(6)	22(11)
A family dispute is an inevitable way to commit criminal's activities.	157(78.5)	41(20.5)	0
Criminal's attitude is genetically transformation of a character.	44(22)	146(730)	8(4)
Criminal's tendency of the outcome of socially learned behavior.	142(71)	33(16.5)	23(11.5)
Avoidance to criminal's activities is embodied to social compliance.	148(74)	34(17)	16(8)
Stickers and rigid law is instrument in containing criminal's tendency.	154(77)	39(19.50)	5(2.5)
Punishment to criminals act could serve as a social deterrent.	158(79)	34(170)	6(30)

A viable and transparent judicial setup can leads to contaminant of criminal's tendency.	171(85.5)	27(13.5)	0
The effective system of social sanction does not allowed to be breed criminals.	179(89.5)	18(9)	1(.5)
committing gang activities is emerging and significant tend in society for earning	174(87)	19(9.5)	5(2.50)

Source: Survey 2012

Economic**Table showing relationship between economic aspect of life and criminal attitude**

S.No	Attribute	Response	Criminal Attitude			Statistics
			High	Medium	Low	
1	Unemployment leads to commit crimes.	Agree	162(82.7)	12(6.1)	11(5.6)	$\chi^2=64.811$ (P=0.000)
		Disagree	0(0.0)	5(2.6)	0(0.0)	
		Don't know	2(1.0)	4(2.0)	0(0.0)	
2	Low level of income leads to commit crimes	Agree	142(72.4)	9(4.6)	11(5.6)	$\chi^2=36.816$ (P=0.000)
		Disagree	13(6.6)	11(5.6)	0(0.0)	
		Don't know	9(4.6)	1(0.5)	0(0.0)	
3	Large family size leads to commit crimes.	Agree	61(31.1)	1(1.0)	1(0.5)	$\chi^2=39.538$ (P=0.000)
		Disagree	94(48.0)	11(5.6)	10(5.1)	
		Don't know	9(4.6)	9(4.6)	0(0.0)	
4	High income leads to commit crimes.	Agree	78(39.8)	10(5.1)	5(2.6)	$\chi^2=3.282$ (P=0.512)
		Disagree	58(29.6)	8(4.1)	2(1.0)	
		Don't know	28(14.3)	3(1.5)	4(2.0)	
5	It is the only way to fight against poverty.	Agree	37(18.9)	7(3.6)	1(0.5)	$\chi^2=6.736$ (P=0.150)
		Disagree	125(63.8)	14(7.1)	9(4.6)	
		Don't know	2(1.0)	0(0.0)	1(0.5)	
6	Parents were	Agree	80(40.8)	8(4.1)	2(1.0)	$\chi^2=5.455$

	poor which leads to commit crimes.	Disagree	81(41.3)	13(6.6)	9(4.6)	(P=0.244)
		Don't know	3(1.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	
7	Economic distribution.	Agree	144(73.5)	9(4.6)	10(5.1)	$\chi^2=30.828$
		Disagree	18(9.2)	9(4.6)	1(0.5)	(P=0.000)
		Don't know	2(1.0)	3(1.5)	0(0.0)	
8	De voidance of merit in allocation of job.	Agree	157(80.1)	14(7.1)	10(5.1)	$\chi^2=34.839$
		Disagree	5(2.6)	7(3.6)	0(0.0)	(P=0.000)
		Don't know	2(1.0)	0(0.0)	1(0.5)	
9	Non provision of education due to poverty.	Agree	156(79.6)	18(9.2)	11(5.6)	$\chi^2=10.982$
		Disagree	3(1.5)	3(1.5)	0(0.0)	(P=0.027)
		Don't know	5(2.6)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	
10	Unjust distribution of economic resources	Agree	159(81.1)	16(8.2)	11(5.6)	$\chi^2=17.199$
		Disagree	5(2.6)	5(2.6)	0(0.0)	(P=0.000)
		Don't know	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	
11	Rigid social stratification does not allow a man to earn respectfully	Agree	150(77.3)	16(8.2)	11(5.6)	$\chi^2=4.754$
		Disagree	9(4.6)	3(1.5)	0(0.0)	(P=0.314)
		Don't know	5(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	
12	Committing gang activities is emerging and significant trend in society for earning	Agree	154(77.0)	14(7.1)	9(4.6)	$\chi^2=20.450$
		Disagree	9(4.6)	7(3.6)	1(0.5)	(P=0.000)
		Don't know	4(2.0)	0(0.0)	1(0.5)	

Relationship between economic aspect of life and criminal attitude

Production, distribution and consumption of goods and services are the basic pillars of an economic system prevalent in a society. Macro and Micro considerations are the two main focuses of economic system in relation to

measuring different indicators leading to the high standard of life or widespread poverty. A social system is congenial with sound social and economic fabrics operating in normal pace and positive direction. Per capita income and availability of basic necessities of life like health, education, employment and other related aspects are the important ingredients of economic development where stability and consistency in economics and behavior rest in. In a society with little openings of moving upward or downward would be rigid in social structure and the dynamics of change would be restricted. Social change is only predictable whenever the process of structural and functional modifications could be manifested through the interpretation of life standard improvement and prosperity in a society. Employment and income are the two economic indicators which has a direct relationship to social uplift of life with the availability of amenities. However, some obstructing factors like injustice, in-merit and non-provision of education with big family size are some of the impediments in the smooth transmission of the growth to the people living at the tail. A relationship between unemployment leads to commit crimes was found highly significant ($P = 0.000$) with criminal attitude. It is apparent from this result that employment has the basic needs of the individuals need to be provided to all segments of society irrespective of their social standings in the ladder of social hierarchy. The provision of this opportunity is indicative of the existence of a number of social openings in the job market. A society devoid of such opportunities put tremendous pressure upon its members whereas little is around for the people to achieve due to high rate of unemployment. This situation is directly responsible for the creation of some anti-social behavior pushing the individual towards deviance from social norms and thus fill pray to commit crimes. Studies have suggested a number of situational compulsions arising from poverty in the events of unemployment and vulnerability to exploitation may lead to the rise of crimes in a society. Moreover, factors associated with poverty like low education and non-availability of employment in the market is one of the big issue pertaining to disturbance at the community level (Grisso, 2007; and Derzon and Lipsey, 2000). In addition, low level of income leads to commit crime was also found highly significant ($P = 0.000$) with criminal attitude. Likewise, large family size leads to commit crime was also highly significant with criminal attitude. It could be deduced from these findings that income is a major source of livelihood which indicates the level of standard of life of the individuals by fore seeing into the utilization of resources and services. Large family size is always found a big hurdle to the development both structural and functional in nature. Human resource is a social capital is a major focus of any development paradigm addressed in the larger whole. A society incapable of containing family size would have little chances of

advancement as compared to the controlled family size. The major attributable reasons could be the division of labor in unjustifiable mode along with unequal treatment to the inmates at family level due to big family size. These findings are also been supported by some scholars like Dermouth and Brown, (2004) that big family size with broken homes and absence of intimacy and relationship between children and parents are some of the leading factors towards criminal activities (Hoffman and Johnson, 1998). Furthermore, the number of siblings could also predict the possibility of crimes with the assumption that increase in number of sibling would certainly bring an increase into the occurrence of anti-social events (Johns et al., 1980; and Farring et al., 1996). However high income leads to commit crimes, parents were poor also lead to committing of crimes was found non-significant with the criminal attitude. It is eminent here that high income is perhaps contributing towards the justifiable utilization of resources in addressing the various needs and felt needs of the individuals both at macro and micro level. It further augment the institutional control which lead to a comprehensive cover and in return bring social conformity to the prevalent social systems. It was further disclosed that poverty on part of the parents had little effects towards making their offspring more prone to commit crimes. The major attributable factors could be the availability of various social safety networks like Zakat and Usher system which helps the needy in mitigating the level of economic distance amongst the poor and making them as contributing entities while participating in the main stream society. A direct correlation between poverty and crime rate was determined but with little effect by a study Glaser (1979). Moreover, the mode of production with complex economic and cultural factors was found to be the breeding aspects of criminality (Sakharov, 1977). On the other hand devoid of merit in a location of job was found highly significant ($P = 0.000$) with criminal tendencies. Societies where issues are addressed on merit would have high level of stability as indicated by the above inference. Merit if prevalent is leading to a healthy environment based on high sense of competition and allocation of jobs, provided in the job market. Structural dysfunctionality always creates uncertainties and lacunas in functioning attributes. Similarly non provision of education due to poverty was found highly significant ($P = 0.000$) with criminal attitude. The probable reason for this inference could be the provision of basic facilities like education without any prejudice for all. Poor and rich both ought to participate in getting education without any inclination towards a particular class. It could be attributable to a lenient social stratification system where access to all communities is ensured in regard to provision of education. Education serves as criminal deterrent in controlling the anti-social activities (William and Sickles, 2001). An egalitarian treatment at community base intervention for the youth

reduces the risk of criminalities (Grisso, 2007). Thus a system of social stratification with little inclination to cost and class was found to be overshadowed by a highly competitive mechanics in the study area. Likewise, unjust distribution of economic resources was found highly significant with criminal attitude. It is due to a demand in the study area for just division of resources on the basis of abilities and the market tendencies towards the need and fulfillment of needs through merit. However, rigid social stratification does not allow a man to earn respectfully was found non-significant with criminal attitude. The main inference derived from this relationship is the non-existence of rigid social stratification rather a highly competitive environment for individual to participate and earn with all respects. On the other hand committing gang activities is emerging a significant trend in society for earning was highly significant ($P = 0.000$) with criminal attitude. It could be attributed from the relationship that crime in an organized manner is helpful to the committers in their earning. Furthermore, the rigid social stratification is forcing an individual to perform in deviance to prevalent social norms due to non-availability of opportunities for the individuals to participate (Carlhan, 1989; Tommovic, 1979). Regional crimes with unjustifiable existence of mode of production with culture as influencing factor is another indicator of arise in the criminal tendencies (Sakharov, 1977).

Conclusions

The study concluded that low social status along with unemployment, low income and large families were further adding to the emergence of criminal tendency due to ineffective command and control of the elders upon the siblings. Due to low income the relative families were incapable to invest more into their kids' education, which led to the creation of anti-social and criminal tendencies. Moreover, non-existence of merit in the allocation of jobs, non-availability of education and non-access to it due to poverty, unjust distribution of economic resources, and committing of gang activities were some other factors discovered as emerging trends in the study area for earnings. It could be detected from the inferences of the study that poor background with large family size, and frequent interactions of the criminals were some of the attributing actors, having strong propensities to committing crimes.

Recommendations

Status allocation is always a social phenomenon exhibited in all the social systems. Higher in the ladder of social stratification, more would be the chances of social conformity. Low status is negatively affecting the tendencies and abilities of the individuals. More opportunities in the job markets could give birth to more chances of moving upwards and could reduce the distress of marginalization,

which in turn, could reduce the chances of criminal tendencies. Furthermore, unhappy life due the stress of low status could also be contained.

Unemployment, low income and large families were found to be responsible for generating criminal attitude. Provision of employment on priority basis through the establishment of cottage industry may subsequently increase the income level and could reduce the distress of unemployment. Moreover, switching over to small family size could further add strength to the family economy as little expenditures would incur on the maintainability of the small family.

References

- Balkan, S., & Berger, R. J. (1979). The changing nature of female delinquency. In *Becoming female* (pp. 207-227). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Calhoun, C., Light, D., & Keller, S. (1989). *Sociology* (5thed.) Alfred A. Knopf: New York.
- 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.
- Derzon, J.H., and Lipsey, M.W, (2000). The correspondence of family features with problem, aggressive, criminal and violent behavior. Unpublished manuscript. Nashville, TN: Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt University.
- Glaser, D. (1979). Economic and sociocultural variables affecting rates of youth unemployment, delinquency, and crime. *Youth & Society*, 11(1), 53-82.
- Grisso, T. (2007). Do childhood mental disorders cause adult crime?. *Am. J. Psychiatry* 164: 1625-27.
- Grogger, J. (1998), `Market Wages and Youth Crime, *Journal of Labor Economics*, vol.15,no. 4, pp,756-791.
- Hoffmann, J. P., & Johnson, R. A. (1998). A national portrait of family structure and adolescent drug use. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 633-645.
- Farrington, D (1996) *Understating and Preventing Youth Crime*, York Publishing Services, ork(www.jrf.org.uk/knowledge/findings/socialpolicy/sp93.asp)
- Jones, M.B., Offord, D.R., & Abrams, N. (1980). Brothers, sisters and antisocial behaviour. *British Journal of zychiatry*, 136, 139-145.
- Lochner, L. (1999). Education, work, and crime: theory and evidence. Rochester center for economic research working paper, (465).
- Lombroso, C. T. (1990). Early myoclonic encephalopathy, early infantile epileptic encephalopathy, and benign and severe infantile myoclonic epilepsies: a critical review and personal contributions. *Journal of clinical neurophysiology: official publication of the American Electroencephalographic Society*, 7(3), 380-408.
- Sakharov, A. B. (1977). On the Conception of the Causes of Crime in Socialist Society. *Soviet Law and Government*, 15(4), 37-54.

- Sekaran, U. Bougie (2010). Research methods for business: A skill building approach.
- Tai, S. W. (1978). Social Science Statistics, its elements and applications. Goodyear Pub.Co..
- Shukla, K. S. (1981). Role of the Police in Juvenile Justice. *Indian Journal of Criminology & Criminalistics*, 1(2).
- Stott, D. H., & Wilson, D. M. (1977). The Adult Criminal as Juvenile-A Follow-up Study of Glasgow Juvenile Delinquents Into Adulthood. *Brit. J. Criminology*, 17, 47.
- Sutherland, E. H. (1940). White-collar criminality. YB, 138.
- Tomovic, V.A. (1979). Definitions in Sociology: Convergence, Conflict and Alternative Vocabularies. Diliton Publication, Inc: St Catherines, Ontario. United States Library of Congress: American Memory.
- West, D., & Farrington, D. (1973). Who becomes delinquent? London: Heinemann Educational.
- Williams, J., & Sickles, R. C. (2002). An analysis of the crime as work model: Evidence from the 1958 Philadelphia birth cohort study. *Journal of Human Resources*, 479-509.