Environment of Crimes and Violence at Community Level and its Exclusionary Effects on Children

Asad Ullah , Mussawar Shah & Bushra Shafi

Abstract

What could be the exclusionary effects of general environment of crimes at community level and how unequal are these effects on children of different genders, religion, economic standings and family types is the theme of this paper. A total of 500 children (12-18 years old) were selected by systematic sampling technique, from seven shopping streets and seven high schools of the District Peshawar and interviewed. Likert scale was used as measurement tool. Association of variables was ascertained by using Chi-square test and Kendall's Tau-b statistics. Social exclusion in children was significantly and positively associated to prevalence of criminal threats in community (p=0.000; and Tb= 0.308), people of the area pose damage to each other (p=0.000; and Tb= 0.243), high crime rate in the area (p=0.000; and Tb= 0.183), bullying as harassment (p=0.000; and Tb= 0.261), poor control by law enforcing agencies (p=0.000; and Tb= 0.440), fear of crimes at residence (p=0.000; and Tb= 0.555), and increase in number of criminals day by day in the vicinity (p=0.000; and Tb= 0.194). The influence of environment of crime in social exclusion of children was universal in its influence on children from genders, and economic background. However, its effect was spurious for children from joint and nuclear families. Strengthening law enforcement through enabling enforcing agencies, strict implementation of the rules through community participation while controlling criminal threats, criminal acts and fear of crimes at community and family level were suggested policy recommendations.

Keywords

Social Exclusion, Crimes, Violence, Community, Children

Introduction

The Term Poverty As A Strong Ingredient of shaping human life embodies economic nature of disadvantage, grounded in application of a static set of indicators such as lack of income. (Department of Social Security, 1999). Understanding the concept of social exclusion helps to analyze the dynamic process that causes the conditions of disadvantage in broader social and economic context (Commins, 2004). It emphasizes on the process of causing detachment of individuals or groups from the bulk and caters for a broader range of competences that people enjoy or fail to enjoy for a more productive life. Social exclusion is a condition, when a number of people suffer from a combination of linked problems like unemployment, low skills, low income, poor housing, high crime environment, poor health and family breakdown with other combined factors to trap individuals/areas in a spiral of disadvantage (SEU, 1997; and DSS, 1999). It is

associated to the process of shutting out from one of social, economic, political and cultural system, necessary for integrating individuals in a society, usually shaped after denial to social relations, customs, where majority participates or sometime with physical incapability to participate as individual's un-controlling inabilities or lacking the decision power and integration to participate (Walker and Walker, 1997; and Gordon et al., 2000).

The phenomena of social exclusion could easily be explained through two major facets i.e. denial to participate (as external) and inability to participate (as internal). The problem of exclusion could not be confined to old people; rather it further aggravates through disadvantage, especially in children. It is an outcome of dysfunctional institution whereby a person is forced to indecent situation, with the only solution left over is the abundance of resources along with provision of rights for properly addressing and functioning of human rights (Marsh et al., 1999).

SEU (1998) report made it evident that people in deep exclusion are forced to leave home or released from prison and are faced with severe mental and physical illnesses. The report found such people associated with addicts and habitual criminals. These people were addicted to drugs; they were more likely to have remained unemployed, absentee, with convicted family member(s) of criminal offences, teenage father and HIV positive.

Youth violence represents a significant troubling behavioral outcome of living in poverty in the United States. Youth ages 12-17 are more likely to be victims of violent crime than adults. For black youth in 1994 the victimization rate was 136 per 1000 as compared to 118 per 1000 for white youth (Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics, 1997). Stressful events, individual beliefs, and economic disadvantage have been noted to increase the risk for aggression among urban children. In a study of almost 2,000 elementary school children over a two-year period (Guerra et al., 1995), life stress and neighborhood violence stress as well as beliefs of approving of aggression were related to low economic status. These factors predicted aggression in the total population as did low socio-economic status, cultural differences were noted among whites, African-Americans, and Hispanics.

Clear (2007) found that child socialization is function of supervision from parents, discipline and parent child relationship. Negligence in child care and inappropriate family environment are associated with crimes and social exclusion in children. Disadvantage of community in form of poverty and crimes, make the living area inappropriate to raise children. Such disadvantages amplify family's problems and support social exclusion.

Bradshaw et al. (2006) explained importance of fear of crimes and victimization in social exclusion of children. The two pronged approach, introduced by authors, focuses on securing child's rights during his childhood and then concentrating for their future life chances and developmental outcomes. It is stressed to Involve children in common social activities and decision making processes to safeguard their future development. The author stressed on role of law and enforcing agencies to control crimes and remove the fear from people minds.

The Fabian Society (2006) found behavioral and emotional problems are linked to indicators of social exclusion like discrimination and stigma. These behavioral problems are high in low income and welfare based families and may extend to disappointments, isolation, anger, law breaking, quarrels and disrespect for others etc.

The state of Pakistan in context of deprivations amongst children is below average, touching almost the alarming level. The most visible reason of this underdevelopment, with particular reference to gender, is the non-provision of benefits of economic growth ought to be trickled down to the needy masses. This factor resultantly gives birth to high mortality rate of almost 27% and with child mortality 19% high than nations of similar economic position. Moreover, 67% higher death rate has been noticed in girls as compared to boys within age bracket of 1-4 years. Illiteracy has adopted formidable shape of 24% with 32% higher in female and 16% in males. The school enrolments also depict a gender based discriminatory environment with some visible barriers to female education. The sociological studies conducted with respect to social exclusion in Pakistan identifies the social class as a major line of fragmentation within the social structure due to the prevailing feudalistic milieu in most part of the country, with further dividing factors like religion, class, caste and ethnicity. Social capital with specific relation to youngsters are facing a dire consequences in the situational aspects as reflected of community based division on ethnic grounds, where most of the benefits are only received by the upper class and the poor are forced to be at the back (SEU, 2002; and SPARC, 2011.

Material and Methods

The present study was carried out in Peshawar District to determine the relationship between social exclusion and access to material/economic resources. A sample size of 500 children (12-18 years) was drawn from randomly selected seven schools and seven shopping streets through systematic sampling procedure (Cooper and Pamela, 2010).

The conceptual frame work was designed with an independent variable (Environment of crimes at community level, Table-1), a dependent variables (Social Exclusion in children) and four background variables (gender, subjective poverty and Family type).

Table 1: Questionnaire Reliability

Background Variables	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables
Gender Subjective Poverty Family Type	Environment of crimes at community level	Social Exclusion in children

The interview schedule was constructed on dichotomous form of simple attitude scale, a sub category of rating scale. At uni-variate level frequencies and percentages were worked out, whereas, at bi-variate level dependent variable was indexed and cross tabbed with attitudinal statements of independent variable. At multi-variate level, both independent and dependent variables were indexed and cross tabbed, while controlling the background variables to test the spuriousness of their relationship for genders, religious affiliation, subjective poverty and family type. The variables qualified the reliability criteria for indexation i.e. Cronbach's alpha coefficient value of more than 0.7 (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1992). Chi-square test was used to test the association between the two variables. Statistical procedure devised by Tai (1978) was adopted for calculation of chi-square value as below.

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{r} . \sum_{j=1}^{c} . \frac{(O_{ij} - e_{ij})^2}{e_{ij}}$$

Where

x^2 = Chi-Square

O_{ij} = Observed frequencies in ith row and jth column

e_{ij} = expect frequencies corresponding to ith row and jth column

r = number of rows

c = number of columns

df = (r-1)(c-1) (Tai, 1978)

Wherever, the assumption for Chi-square was violated in the data, Fisher Exact Test was used instead of simple Chi-square. The relationship developed by the Fisher is given in equation below (Baily, 1982);

$$\text{Fisher Exact Test} = \frac{(a + b) ! (c + d) ! (a + c)! (b + d)!}{N! \, a! \, b! \, c! \, d!}$$

Where a, b, c and d were the observed numbers in four cells of contingency Table and "N" the total number of observations.

Where a, b, c and d were the observed numbers in four cells of contingency Table and "N" the total number of observations.

Kendall's Tau-b was used measure for calculating association for contingency tables. Kendall's tau-b is most appropriate measure of association for two levels response data, where marginal distribution is uneven in 2×2 tables with many ties.

Kendall's tau–b is expressed through formula below; (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1992).

$$T^b = \frac{Ns - Nd}{\sqrt{(Ns + Nd + Tx)\ (Ns + Nd + Tx)}}$$

Where;

T^b = Kendall's Tau-b

Ns = same order pairs

Nd = different order pairs

Tx = pairs tied on X

Results and Discussions

1. Uni-variate Analysis

1.1 Environment of Crimes at Community Level

Questions regarding crimes aspect of exclusion were asked and reported with numerical representation.

Incidents of threats were common in the area, was negated by majority of respondents i.e. 54.6% (Table 2), people posing damage to each other was negated by 68.2%, however, the existence of crime rate was high as indicated by 64.2% with negation to increase in number of criminals (72%) respectively. The eminent outcomes based on the findings of the study indicated little magnitude of tussle among community members in form of violence; however, the crime rate in the area was disclosed as high, with the number of criminals on the high. These factors are attributable to the low economic stature of the families, lesser access to services structure like police etc. and the attitude of the locals such as sticking to their native environment and not accepting any change in them. Such grim scenario is the outcome of income deprivation with non-access to education and job market and poor coordination among masses and agencies for crime control. These findings could be augmented by the inferences of Mayer (1998) who concluded that income deprivation, low education, unemployment, poor neighboring conditions and state of relations with the criminals are some of the factors of social exclusion.

Likewise, fear of crime at residence and neighbors was negated by 52.6% with no sign of exposure to any criminal assault (91%), however, bullying and harassment was found with low existence (38.8%) respectively. The findings mentioned above could be reflective of the facts that the existence of the antisocial behavior with their committers around could lead to the occurrence of criminal acts with higher probability. This situation usually arises when collective welfare approach is missing. State of conflict between collective welfare and personal interests creates a social dilemma, which has shown a trend of noncooperation amongst the individuals involved. This situation usually leads to robbing the interest of the general masses for personal gains and a subsequent exposure of deprived group to social exclusion (kerr et al., 2009). Children involvement in crime and antisocial behaviors is only meant for meeting out their some of the basic needs (Roker, 1998).

Moreover, while exploring the facts related to religious association, law enforcing agencies role and drug use were asked and found that 65.2% negated the friends involvement in drug use, 86.8% rejected the attacks on the basis of religion, moreover, the law enforcing agencies role in controlling criminal behavior was found dismal (56%). The overall environment could easily be interpreted on the basis of data that drug use was around but group association could not be traced .Moreover, religion as a tool of exploitation on economic and political basis had no roots also. However, the law enforcing agencies role of containing the anti-social activities was not encouraging. The existence of this social harmony based on religion could be attributed to the proper socialization in an institutionalized way which is always helpful in predicting deeds and behaviors of social units. Macionis (2005) has also linked the role of socialization to good and evil deeds at the family level. Harmony, if prevalent, minimizes the chances of mental and physical illnesses.However,antisocial peer group activities in the shape of running out of classes and leaving homes etc. breed deviance (SEU, 1998; and Willow, 2002).

Table 2 Frequency distribution and proportion of respondents showing variable responses to environment of crimes at community level

Attribute	No	Yes	Total
Incidents of criminal threat are common in your area	273 (54.6)	227 (45.4)	500 (100)
People of your area pose damage to each other	341 (68.2)	159 (31.8)	500 (100)
There are high crime rates in your area	179 (35.8)	321 (64.2)	500 (100)
The number of criminals are increasing day by day in your living vicinity	360 (72.0)	140 (28.0)	500 (100)
You have a fear of crime at your residence and neighbor	263 (52.6)	237 (47.4)	500 (100)
Have you ever been exposed to any criminal assault ?	455 (91.0)	45 (9.0)	500 (100)
You are exposed to bullying and harassment in your area of residence	331 (66.2)	169 (33.8)	500 (100)
Your friend(s) use drugs	326 (65.2)	174 (34.8)	500 (100)
There are attacks on the basis of religion in your area	433 (86.6)	67 (13.4)	500 (100)
Law enforcing agency have no control on criminals around you	280 (56.0)	220 (44.0)	500 (100)

Values in table present frequency while values in parenthesis represent percentage proportion of respondents

1.2 Bivariate Analysis

Association between social exclusion and Environment of crimes at community level was worked out by using cross tabulation technique. Findings on the aforesaid variable along with suitable reasons are presented and discussed below;

1.2.1   Association between environment of crimes at community level and social exclusion in children

Findings on experience of children regarding environment of crimes at community level and its association with social exclusion in them are given in Table 3 and discussed below.

Incidents of criminal threats are common in your area was found highly significant (p=0.000) and positive(Tb= 0.308) with social exclusion. The obvious reasons for this result could be the neglected status of the excluded persons either on the basis of ethnic considerations or extreme poverty. Such situation usually restricts

people to participate in activities at community level. Ridge (2007) has also concluded on such lines than non-fulfillment of satisfaction of children while participating in social activities is the major outcome of frustration crime. Moreover, it also leads to the non-participation in the formal and informal social networks and negatively affects their academic outcomes. In addition, secluded persons had a behavioral tendency of leaving home, getting addicted to drugs or associated with habitual criminals (SEU, 1998). Similarly, a strongly significant (p=0.000) and positive (Tb= 0.243) association was discovered between people of living area pose damage to each other with social exclusion. People faced with restricted access to basic amenities of life would have high tendency of damaging each other and putting the community cohesion at stake. It could be due to the number of ethnic groups living in a slum like situation. Moreover, a non-consistent job market would be another obvious reason to this effect. Community safety is not intact whenever incidents of crimes, like burglary, theft, damages and violence, are practices of the day. Moreover, poverty and social exclusion are some of the other push factors for victimization amongst the excluded persons in a community with diverse ethnic background (Levitas, 2006). Unlike the above results attacks on the basis of religion was found non-significant but mild positive (Tb= 0.030) with social exclusion. Religion was found the main symbol of harmony in the study area. However, the division of community on ethnic consideration had potential basis for attacking each other. Moreover, squeezed economic activities with lesser level of participation could be the other reasons. Crimes are mostly taking place amongst the excluded persons at the community level on the basis of ethnicity, color etc. This opportunity breeds a situation alike for all types of crimes. Furthermore, the distant location from the job market and volatile job market with little assurance of consistency in its economic activities are some other associated factors (Levitas, 2006).

On the other side, high crime rates in the area was found highly significant (p=0.000)and positive (Tb= 0.183) with social exclusion. Poor socialization of children at the family, either due to the negligence on part of the parents, social segregation on the basis of ethnicity and extreme poverty could be the probable reasons for committing crimes, despite a sound religious cover. Child socialization is the function of supervision from parents (Clear, 2007) with association to discipline based on child parent relationship. Negligence for child care at family level is the other associated factors with the social exclusion amongst children. Poor indicators of a quality life also threaten the social fabrics of a community (Levitas, 2006).

Table 3: Association Between Environment of Crimes at Community Level and Social Exclusion in Children.

Environment of Crimes at Community Level	Attitude	Socially Exclusion			Statistics χ^2 (P-Value) T^b
		Socially Excluded	Socially Included	Total	
Incidents of criminal threat are common in your area	No	191 (38.2)	82 (16.4)	273 (54.6)	x^2= 47.58 (0.000) T^b = 0.308
	Yes	89 (17.8)	138 (27.6)	227 (45.4)	
People of your area pose damage to each other	No	219 (43.8)	122 (24.4)	341 (68.2)	χ^2 = 29.42 (0.000) T^b= 0.243
	Yes	61 (12.2)	98 (19.6)	159 (31.8)	
There are attacks on the basis of religion in your area	No	245 (49)	188 (37.6)	433 (86.6)	χ^2 = 0.444 (0.505) T^b= 0.030
	Yes	35 (7)	32 (6.4)	67 (13.4)	
There are high crime rates in your area	No	122 (24.4)	57 (11.4)	179 (35.8)	χ^2 = 16.72 (0.000) T^b= 0.183
	Yes	158 (31.6)	163 (32.6)	321 (64.2)	
You are exposed to bullying and harassment in your area of residence	No	216 (43.2)	115 (23)	331 (66.2)	χ^2 = 34.05 (0.000) T^b= 0.261
	Yes	64 (12.8)	105 (21)	169 (33.8)	
Law enforcing agency have no control on criminals around you	No	211 (42.2)	69 (13.8)	280 (56.0)	χ^2 = 96.77 (0.000) T^b= 0.440
	Yes	69 (13.8)	151 (30.2)	220 (44.0)	
You have a fear of crime at your residence and neighbor	No	216 (43.2)	47 (9.4)	263 (52.6)	χ^2 = 153.7 (0.000) T^b= 0.555
	Yes	64 (12.8)	173 (34.6)	237 (47.4)	
Have you ever been exposed to any criminal assault?	No	251 (50.2)	204 (40.8)	455 (91.0)	χ^2 = 1.431 (0.232) T^b= - 0.053
	Yes	29 (5.8)	16 (3.2)	45 (9.0)	
The number of criminals are increasing day by day in your living vicinity	No	180 (36)	180 (36)	360 (72.0)	χ^2 = 18.78 (0.000) T^b= 0.194
	Yes	100 (20)	40 (8)	140 (28.0)	

Values in table present frequency while values in parenthesis represent percentage proportion of respondents

Albeit bullying as harassment has a significant and positive (p=0.000; and Tb= 0.261) association with social exclusion. Any community with extreme poverty or its division on ethnic grounds would have high propensity to commit any type of crime and other activities of deviance. A volatile situation would reflect beating, bullying and cheating as a common practices as indicated from the above inferences. Dissatisfaction from social participation in informal and formal social network is the major causes of social exclusion with high probability of decline in academic outcomes (Ridge, 2007). Association of law enforcing agencies have no control on criminals was highly significant (p=0.000) and positive (Tb= 0.440) with social exclusion. Children well-being and rights, if not protected, may take them to extreme pole of social exclusion. The law enforcing agency's inefficiency in containing the crimes could be due to their poor performance, low agility as a force or deficiency in containment mechanisms. Therefore, aforementioned factors provide breeding grounds for criminals. A two pronged policy as devised by (Bradshaw et al., 2004) needs to be activated; where on one side it could work for protection towards safeguarding the child rights and well being, and on the other side giving them maximum opportunities for participation in the development activities at the community level.

Similarly fear for crime at the residence and neighbors have highly significant and positive (p=0.000; and Tb= 0.555) association with social exclusion. The main attributable factors could be the unstable and rusting environment prevalent around, as an outcome of high unemployment and non-cohesion among themselves on ethnic grounds. These are some of the basic reasons for behavioral unpredictability. The Fabian Society, (2006) has also linked the behavioral and emotional disorder as strong indicator of social exclusion, which is associated with social stigma of anti-social acts. Unlike, ever exposure to any criminal assault was found non-significant and negative (Tb= -0.053) with social exclusion. Perhaps all antisocial activities are not confronted in the physical presence of the others, but tried to be kept confidential. This is perhaps the influence of religion which always disowns such activities. Moreover, intimacy of the relationship also requires confidentiality. Religion is always regulating and influencing the human behavior. It has profound effects on criminals, deviants' and normal citizens of the society. It works as a model towards reformation instead of disintegration. It also includes teaching over smooth relations with neighbors and avoiding any criminality (Guerra et al., 1995). Contrary to the above, the number of criminals increasing day by day in the vicinity has a strong association (p=0.000) and positive (Tb= 0.194) relationship with social exclusion. Criminals if spared uncheck could multiply in its number. The main reason for this criminality could be poor socialization of children, neglected status due to exclusion or non-availability of basic needs of life along with poor

performance of law enforcing agencies. Clear (2007) and Bradshaw et al., (2004) has also related the family environment with the rising criminals as the outcome of low income, unemployment and poor socialization of children with some negligible role of poor performance on part of law enforcing agencies.

1.3. Multi-variate analysis based on indexation of dependent and independent variables

This section carries results on multi variate analysis of the indexed variables (both independent and dependent) keeping gender, religion, family type and income of the respondents under control to determine the spuriousness in the relationship worked out at bi-variate level. These findings are discussed as follows.

1.3.1 Association between environment of crimes at community level and social exclusion in children (controlling gender of the respondents)

In boys, the relationship between environment of crimes at community level and social exclusion in children was positive (Tb=0.254) and highly significant (p=0.000).The relationship between these variables was positive (Tb=0.385) and highly significant (p=0.000) as depicted in (Table 4) amongst female also. Therefore, the results of boys and girls were non-spurious for above mentioned variables, as indicated by their similar significance and Kendall's Tau-b coefficient value. Criminality at community and society level had common influencing factors with strong relationship to social exclusion irrespective of gender considerations. Levitas et al. (2007) has also related social exclusion matrix with the environment of crimes amongst children. Thenon-participatory behavior amongst the deprived classes is usually outfitting the peer group activities in unpredictable direction. It may include avoiding establishing liaison with friends. Moreover, criminal victimization in Pakistani society is the outcome of poor performance on part of law controlling agencies with high fear of victimization and crimes in the socially excluded children(Willow, 2002; SPARC, 2011; and Bradshaw et al., 2004).

Table 4Association between environment of crimes at community level and social exclusion in children (controlling gender of the respondents)

Gender	Environment of Crimes at Community Level	Socially Exclusion			Statistics χ^2 (P-Value) T^b Female
		Socially Excluded	Socially Included	Total	
Male	Peaceful environment	206 (50.2)	95 (23.2)	301 (73.4)	χ^2 = 26.5 (0.000) T^b= 0.254
	Violent environment	44 (10.7)	65 (15.9)	109 (26.6)	
	Total	250 (61)	160 (39)	410 (100)	
Male	Peaceful environment	26 (28.9)	28 (31.1)	53 (60)	χ^2 = 13.33 (0.000) T^b= 0.385
	Violent environment	4 (4.4)	32 (35.6)	36 (40)	
	Total	30 (33.3)	60 (66.7)	90 (100)	

Values in table present frequency while values in parenthesis represent percentage proportion of respondents

Association between environment of crimes at community level and social exclusion in children (controlling family type of the respondents)

In children from joint family, the relationship between environment of crimes at community level and social exclusion in children was low positive (Tb=0.237) and highly significant (p=0.000), also, in children from nuclear family, the relationship between these variables was low positive (Tb=0.249) and highly significant (p=0.000), however, for children from single parent family the relationship of said variables was moderate positive (Tb=0.568) and highly significant (p=0.000), as depicted in Table 5. Therefore, the result of joint and nuclear family group was non-spurious for above mentioned variables, as indicated by almost similar Kendall's Tau-b coefficient value, however, for single parent family this relationship, with respect to other two groups, was spurious. It is conclusive from present findings that, environment of crimes at community level is instrumental in causing social exclusion among children; however, it is particularly unforgiving for single parent children than rest of family types. This probably is because of the absence of any particular parent that could participate and shoulder the responsibility of decision making for controlling the behavior of their offspring's. Moreover, the economic deprivation due to the absence of any particular parent had led to the mounting pressure for remaining single gender to strive hard for earning outside. Thus giving little time for it (parent) to focus on molding and remolding the behavioral pattern amongst their children and proved victim to social

exclusion with high chances of participation in criminal activities. Levitas et al.(2007)and Willow (2002)have proved from their research endeavors that domestic violence, bullying and stalking had direct relationship to the fear of non-participation, emergence of criminal tendencies and social exclusion. High rate of crime and criminal victimization in Pakistani society is the outcome of social exclusion and poor performance of law enforcing agencies (SPARC, 2011; and Bradshaw et al.,2004).

Table 5Association between environment of crimes at community level and social exclusion in children (controlling family type of the respondents)

Family Type	Environment of Crimes at Community Level	Socially Exclusion			Statistics χ^2 (P -Value) T^b
		Socially Excluded	Socially Included	Total	
Joint	Peaceful environment	110 (50.7))	53 (24.4)	163 (75.1)	χ^2 = 12.176 (0.000) T^b = 0.237
	Criminal environment	22 (10.1)	32 (14.7)	54 (24.9)	
	Total	132 (60.8)	85 (39.2)	217 (100)	
Nuclear	Peaceful environment	112 (46.9)	59 (24.7)	171 (71.5)	χ^2 = 14.81 (0.000) T^b= 0.249
	Criminal environment	26 (10.9)	42 (17.6)	68 (28.5)	
	Total	138 (57.7)	101 (42.3)	239 (100)	
Single Parent	Peaceful environment	10 (22.7)	11 (25)	21 (47.7)	χ^2 = 14.17 (0.000) T^b= 0.568
	Criminal environment	0 (0)	23 (52.3)	23 (52.3)	
	Total	10 (22.7)	34 (77.3)	44 (100)	

Values in table present frequency while values in parenthesis represent percentage proportion of respondents

3.1.1 Association between environment of crimes at community level and social exclusion in children (Controlling income)

In children from families with insufficient income, the relationship between environment of crimes at community level and social exclusion in children was positive (T^b=0.374) and highly significant (p=0.000), also, in children from families with insufficient family income, the relationship between these variables was positive (T^b=0.193) and significant (p=0.002), as depicted in Table 6. Therefore, the result of rich and poor family group was non-spurious for above mentioned variables, as indicated by almost similar Kendall's Tau-b coefficient value. It is conclusive from present findings that criminal environment at community level had direct ramifications of social exclusion for all categories of children irrespective of

their income financial background. These findings are in support to the Levitas et al. (2007) and Willow (2002) that criminal environment both at community and family level had strong negative effects on children like non-adjustment in peer activities and contacting friends.

Table 6: Association between environment of crimes at community level and social exclusion in children (controlling sufficiency of income)

Sufficiency of Income	Environment of crimes at community level	Social Exclusion			Statistics χ^2 (P-Value) T^b
		Socially Excluded	Socially Included	Total	
Insufficient	Peaceful environment	82 (33.7)	82 (33.7)	164 (67.5)	χ^2 = 33.92 (0.000) T^b= 0.374
	Violent environment	9 (3.7)	70 (28.8)	79 (32.5)	
	Total	91 (37.4)	152 (62.6)	243 (100)	
Sufficient	Peaceful environment	150 (58.4)	41 (16)	191 (74.3)	χ^2 = 9.53 (0.002) T^b= 0.193
	Violent environment	39 (15.2)	27 (10.5)	66 (25.7)	
	Total	189 (73.5)	68 (26.5)	257 (100)	

Values in table present frequency while values in parenthesis represent percentage proportion of respondents

Conclusions

The study showed that the existence of the crimes at the community level due to poverty had proven to be the major factor of failure in practical life and low participation along with non-conformity to social norm which were some of the obvious causes of social exclusion in children. The division of respondents on the basis of gender, religion, family type and income, while indexing both independent and dependent variables, indicated the social exclusion in children was positively associated with environment of crimes at community level. The data strongly supported the theory and upkeep the domains of resource, participation and quality of life, as outlined under B-SEM model, were decisive in determining and explaining social exclusion in children. However, it was established by this study that exclusionary effects due to environment of crimes were particularly visible in children from single parent families than on other family types.

Recommendations

Strengthening law enforcement through enabling enforcing agencies, strict implementation of the rules through community participation while controlling criminal threats, criminal acts and fear of crimes at community and family level, could reduce the fear of crimes and enhance the participation at community and family level as well.

References

Baily, K. D. (1982) Methods of Social Research.2nd Ed. New York. Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Bradshaw, J., Hoelscher, P. and Richardson, D. (2006)Comparing child well-being in OECD countries: concepts and methods. Innocenti Working Paper No. 2006-03. UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre, Florence.

Bradshaw, J., Kemp, P., Baldwin, S. and Rowe, A. (2004)The drivers of social exclusion: A review of the literature for the Social Exclusion Unit in the Breaking the Cycle series, London: SEU/ODPM.

Clear, T. R. (2007) Imprisoning communities: How mass incarceration makes disadvantaged neighborhoods worse. Oxford University Press, USA.

Commins, P. (2004) Poverty and social exclusion in rural areas: Characteristics, processes and research issues. SociologiaRuralis, 44, 60-75.

Cooper, D. R. and Pamela. S. S. (2010) Business Research Methods. Islamabad. National Book Foundation.

DSS (Department of Social Security). (1999) Opportunity for All: Tackling poverty and social exclusion, Cm 4445, London: The Stationery Office.

Fahmy, E., Ruth, L., David, G. and Demi, P. (2009)Understanding the risks of social exclusion across the life course: Working age adults without dependent children. A Research Report for the Social Exclusion Task Force, Cabinet Office. University of Bristol.

Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics.(1997) America's Children: Key national indicators of well-being, Washington, DC.

Gordon, D., Adelman, L., Ashworth, K., Bradshaw, J., Levitas, R., Middleton, S., Pantazis, C., Patsios, D., Payne, S., Townsend, P. and Williams, J. (2000)Poverty and social exclusion in Britain, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Guerra, N.G., Huesmann, L.R., Tolan, P.H., Van-Acker, R., and Eron, L.D. (1995) Stressful events and individual beliefs as correlates of economic disadvantage and aggression among urban children. Journal of Consulting, and Clinical Psychology. 63: 518-528.

Kerr, N.L., Ann C. Rumble., Ernest S. Park., Jaap W. Ouwerkerk., Craig D. Parks., Marcello Gallucci., Paul A.M. and van Lange. (2009) How many bad apples does it take to spoil the whole barrel?: Social exclusion and toleration for bad apples. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology. 45: 603–613

Levitas, R. (2006)The concept and measurement of social exclusion, in C. Pantazis., D. Gordon. and R. Levitas. (eds.) Poverty and social exclusion in Britain: The Millennium Survey, Bristol: The Policy Press: 123-60.

Levitas, R., Christina, P., Eldin, F., David, G., Eva, L. and Demi, P. (2007)The multi-dimensional analysis of social exclusion. Bristol institute of Public Affairs, Bristol.

Macionis. J. J. (2005) Sociology (10thed), New Jersey. Pearson Prentice Hall.

Marsh, A., Gordon, D., Pantazis, C. and Heslop, P. 1999. Home Sweet Home? The impact of poor housing on health, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Mayer, S. E. (1998) What Money Can't Buy: Family Income and Children's Life Chances. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, UK.

Nachmias. C. F. and David Nachmias. (1992) Research Methods in Social Sciences. 4th Ed. St Martin's Press Inco. New York. USA.

Ridge, T. (2007) Negotiating child poverty: Children's subjective experiences of life on a low income. In H. Wintersberger, L. Alanen, T. Olk and J. Qvortrup (Eds.), Childhood, Generational Order and the Welfare State: Exploring Children's Social and Economic Welfare, Vol. 1 of COST A19: Children's Welfare, University Press of Southern Denmark: Denmark.

Roker, D. (1998)Worth more than this: Young people growing up in family poverty, London: The Children's Society.

Saunders, P. (2007) Towards New Indicators of Disadvantage Project: Bulletin No. 2: Deprivation in Australia. Social Policy Research Centre Newsletter No. 96, May 2007: 7-10.

SEU (Social Exclusion Unit).(1997)Social Exclusion Unit: Purpose, work priorities and working methods, London: SEU.

SEU.(1998)Rough sleeping, London: SEU.

SPARC.(2011)The state of Pakistan's children. Retrieved on 24th October 2012, fromwww.sparcpk.org.

Sutton, L., Smith, N., Dearden, C. and Middleton, S. (2007)A child's-eye view of social difference. Joseph Rowntree Foundation: York, UK.

Tai, S. W. (1978) Social Science Statistics, it Elements and Applications. California, Goodyear Publishing Company.

The Fabian Society.(2006) Narrowing the gap: The Fabian Commission on Life Chances and Child Poverty, London: The Fabian Society.

Van der Hoek, T. (2005)Through Children's Eyes: An Initial Study of Children's Personal Experiences and Coping Strategies Growing up Poor in an Affluent Netherlands. Innocenti Research Centre: Florence, Italy.

Vinson, T. (2007)Dropping off the edge: the distribution of disadvantage in Australia. Richmond, Vic; Curtin, ACT: Jesuit Social Services, Catholic Social Services Australia.

Walker, A., and Walker, C. (1997)Britain Divided: The Growth of Social Exclusion in the 1980s and 1990s. Child Poverty Action Group.

Willow, C. (2002)Bread is free: Children and young people talk about poverty. Save the Children UK: London.

The author Mr. Asad Ullah is Assistant Professor at the Department of Rural Sociology, Agriculture University Peshawar.He can be reached at asadpsh76@gmail.com

The author Prof. Dr. Mussawar Shah is the Chairman Department of Rural Sociology, Agriculture University Peshawar. He can be reached at mussawar61@gmail.com

The author Dr. Bushra Shafi is an Assistant Professor at the Department of Rural Sociology, Agriculture University Peshawar. She can be reached at drbushrashafi@gmail.com