Library Progress International *Print version ISSN 0970 1052*
Vol.43, No.2, Jul-Dec 2023: P.2095-2106 *Online version ISSN 2320 317X*

Original Article *Available online at www.bpasjournals.com*

Comparative Analysis Of Childhood And Present Economic Condition Of Convicted Economic And Property Offenders In Kanniyakumari District

Abish. J[1], Dr.G. Gnana Elpinston[2]

[1]PhD. Research Scholar, Reg. No. 21213111031001, 1,2Post-Graduate and Research Centre in Economics, Nesamony Memorial Christian College, Marthandam – 629 165,
Affiliated to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University Tirunelveli – 627 012,
Tamil Nadu, India.
Corresponding Email: mathewabi97@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Abish. J , Dr.G. Gnana Elpinston (2023). Comparative Analysis Of Childhood And Present Economic Condition Of Convicted Economic And Property Offenders In Kanniyakumari District. *Library Progress International,* 43(2), 2095-2106

Abstract: The increasing trend of crime rates has been playing a significant role in hindering India's growth. These alarming growths of crimes strongly prove the need to monitor and analyse the causes of criminal behaviour. Individuals experiencing cumulative economic hardships are more likely to develop low coping mechanisms, which can lead to criminal behaviour. Economic and property crimes are significantly associated with such behaviour. The uniqueness of the Kanniyakumari district, with its coastal communities, diverse religious populations and distinctive fusion of cultural influences, reflects broader challenges faced by Tamil Nadu. The present study aims to compare the economic condition of convicted economic and property offenders during their childhood and their present circumstances. The study exclusively considers 205 convicted economic and property offenders as respondents identified through the assistance of a several non-governmental organizations and various law firms in the Kanniyakumari district with the Cochran's sample size determination formula. Snowball sampling is adopted to reach these offenders.. Statistical tools such as descriptive statistics (mean sum and actual N), the Friedman test, McNemar's test, Wilcoxon signed rank test, Paired sample t-test and factor analysis were applied. The result indicates an improvement in tangible assets; however, the offenders continue to face challenges in meeting their basic needs. The government should address the issue of basic needs during childhood through targeted welfare programs and sustainable development to prevent crime at its roots.

Key words: Criminal Behaviour, Economic Condition, Economic and Property Crimes, Childhood

Introduction:

The occurrence of crime adversely affects the quality of life of individual victims, their families and as a whole society. By creating insecurity and a sense of fear, crime imposes a psychological cost. In addition, criminality tremendously increases the cost of living in society and reduces the pace of economic growth of the nation ***(Ohlan, 2019).*** In recent days, the number of crimes has been increasing creating many hardships for the improvement of the economic status of individuals and for the economy as a whole.

According to crime statistics published by the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB), a total of 58,24,946 crimes comprising 1,93,385 economic offenses and 8,39,252 property offences were registered in India in 2022, with Tamil Nadu alone accounting for 8.13 per cent of these cases ***(Crime statistics-2022, NCRB).*** The increasing trend of crime rates has been playing an influential role in hindering the growth of India. These alarming growths of crimes are insisting on a very strong need to monitor and analyse the reasons for crimes. Regulating criminal activities is the responsibilities of any government. The government spends lots of money

to control, regulate and manage the criminal justice system in the country ***(Sujin, 2021).*** The allocation of a substantial amount of Rs.1,85,776 crore by the Indian government to law enforcement in the fiscal year 2022–2023 emphasizes the importance that the government places on maintaining law and order ***(Ministry of Finance Report, 2023).***

Individuals experiencing cumulative economic hardships are more likely to develop low coping mechanisms, leading to criminal behaviour ***(Stattin, 1996).*** Adverse childhood experiences, including abuse, neglect and specifically economic hardships, significantly increase the risk of criminal behaviour later in life. Adverse childhood experiences create a cumulative stress effect, leading to poor adaptive mechanisms and heightened vulnerability to engaging in illegal activities ***(Felitti, 1998).***

Not all crime and offenders are directly influenced by economic conditions. But economic and property offenders are only concerned with their personal gain, even at the cost of irreparable and serious loss to society ***(Singh, 2020).*** In the words of Lin, a significant positive relationship was found between economic factors and property crimes while there is no relation between violent crime and economic factors ***(Lin, 2008).*** The economic and property offences are seven in number, namely criminal breach of trust, cheating, counterfeiting, dacoity, preparation and assembly of dacoity, robbery, burglary and theft ***(NCRB, 2022)***

Kanniyakumari district, situated at the southernmost tip of Tamil Nadu, encapsulates coastal communities, varied religious demographics and a unique confluence of cultural influences. Given its uniqueness, Kanniyakumari's crime patterns can be both reflective of Tamil Nadu's broader issues and indicative of specific challenges. Therefore, the present study tries to reveal and compare the economic condition of convicted economic and property offenders during their childhood and present days in the Kanniyakumari district.

Review of Literature:

The following are the previous studies that support the connection between the economic condition of the offenders and criminal behaviour. In the words of ***Forgusson (2004)*** there is a strong association between socio-economic deprivation in childhood and later involvement in crime in New Zealand. Research has identified a correlation between poor socio-economic status and an increase in crime rates. It identified a significant ($p<0.01$) linear relationship between childhood socio-economic status and later involvement in criminal activities. The study also spotted that the criminals from low socio-economic backgrounds experience greater family adversities and school difficulties.

Kazeem (2020) explains the influence of adverse childhood experiences and socio-economic status on Nigeria's criminal behaviour. It was highlighted that the adverse childhood experience has a significant and positive relationship with property crime, interpersonal crime and drug crime. Inmates with low socio-economic status had higher criminal records than those with high socio-economic status. Thus it was proved that childhood experiences have a crucial impact on criminal behaviour in Nigeria.

Gold (2020) explores the relationship between housing hardship and the delinquent behaviour of adolescents in the United States. Sixty per cent of the youth in the United States were experiencing housing hardship at their ages of 1 and 15 years. They are unable to pay even the housing rent. As a result, at the age of 15, 45.99 per cent of the youth who faced housing hardships engaged in delinquent activities and 53.66 per cent of youth reported for engaging in criminal activities faced housing hardship at their age of below 9 years. The multivariate results indicate that experiencing any housing hardship for the first time is associated with a 0.19 per cent increase in delinquent behaviour. Each additional hardship experienced for the second and third time is associated with an additional 0.18 per cent increase in delinquent behaviour. It proves that when the number of housing hardships increases, the association is stronger with the delinquent behaviour.

Objectives of the study:

The objective of the present study is threefold. Firstly, the study tries to explore the present socio-economic status of convicted economic and property offenders in the Kanniyakumari district. Secondly, it seeks to determine the severity of financial problems in the families of convicted economic and property offenders, shedding light on financial problems among other issues faced in the families. Lastly, it aims to compare the

childhood and present economic conditions of convicted economic and property offenders in Kanniyakumari district, offering details of changes in their financial status.

Methodology:

The purpose of the study is to compare the childhood and present economic adversities of convicted economic and property offenders in the Kanniyakumari district. The study solely on convicted economic and property offenders identified with the help of a few non-governmental organisations and various law firms in the Kanniyakumari district. A total of 438 convicted economic and property offenders were identified from various sources and 205 was determined using Cochran's sample size determination formula with a 5% margin of error and a 95% confidence level. Snowball sampling was employed to reach economic and property offenders. Spreadsheets and the statistical analysis program SPSS were used to process the data. The collected data were processed, classified and tabulated using SPSS. In this study, statistical tools such as percentage, descriptive statistics (mean sum and actual N), the Friedman test, McNemar's test, the Wilcoxon signed rank test, the Paired sample t-test and factor analysis were applied. Percentage analysis and descriptive statistics were used to understand the socio-economic status of convicted economic and property offenders in the Kanniyakumari district. The Friedman test was used to determine the severity of financial conflicts. Furthermore, McNemar's test, the Wilcoxon test, the Paired sample t-test and factor analysis were used to compare the childhood and present economic conditions of convicted economic and property offenders in the Kanniyakumari district. Both primary and secondary data were used in the research to achieve the desired results. Primary data were obtained directly from the convicted economic and property offenders through an interview schedule. Secondary data were collected from published sources such as articles, journals, books, newspapers, websites and other official records.

Results and Discussion

Socio-demographic Status of Convicted Offenders:

This section brings to light the socio-demographic condition, severity of family financial conflicts and childhood and present economic condition of convicted economic and property offenders in Kanniyakumari district. The type of first crime refers to the first economic or property crime committed by the respondents including theft, dacoity, robbery, criminal breach of trust (CBT) and cheating. Among the 205 sample respondents selected for the present analysis, 40.9 per cent respondents committed theft, 32.6 per cent respondents committed criminal breach of trust (CBT), 13.6 per cent of the respondents committed robbery, 11 per cent of the respondents committed cheating and 1.9 per cent committed dacoity as their first crime. The socio-demographic variables such as age, marital status, religion, caste category, education, occupation, dominant domicile, family structure, number of family members, number of earning members in the family and poverty status with respect to the type of first crime they committed are explained with the help of table 1.

Table: 1: Socio-Demographic Status and the Type of First Crime of the Respondents

Socio-economic Variables	Type of First Crime					
	Theft	**Dacoity**	**Robbery**	**CBT**	**Cheating**	**Total**
Number of Offenders	84 (40.9)	4 (1.9)	28 (13.6)	67 (32.6)	22 (11.0)	205 (100)
Age						
21 to 29	7 (33.3)	0 (0.0)	5 (23.8)	9 (42.9)	0 (0.0)	21 [10.2]
30 to 38	12 (33.3)	1 (2.8)	1 (2.8)	14 (38.9)	8 (22.2)	36 [17.6]
39 to 47	29 (40.3)	3 (4.2)	15 (20.8)	21 (29.2)	4 (5.6)	72 [35.1]
48 to 56	32 (51.6)	0 (0.0)	4 (6.5)	19 (30.6)	7 (11.3)	62 [30.2]
57 and above	4 (28.6)	0 (0.0)	3 (21.4)	4 (28.6)	3 (21.4)	14 [6.9]
Marital Status						
Married	73 (42.0)	4 (2.3)	28 (16.1)	59 (33.9)	10 (5.7)	174 [84.9]
Unmarried	7 (35.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (25.0)	8 (40.0)	20 [9.8]

Socio-economic Variables	Type of First Crime					
	Theft	Dacoity	Robbery	CBT	Cheating	Total
Divorced	2 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	4 [2.0]
Separated	2 (28.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (14.3)	4 (57.1)	7 [3.4]
Religion						
Hindu	25 (37.9)	0 (0.0)	19 (28.8)	18 (27.3)	4 (6.1)	66 [32.2]
Muslim	5 (20.8)	2 (8.3)	0 (0.0)	3 (12.5)	14 (58.3)	24 [11.7]
Christian	54 (47.0)	2 (1.7)	9 (7.8)	46 (40.0)	4 (3.5)	115 [56.1]
Caste Category						
OC	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (100)	4 [2.0]
BC	80 (41.7)	4 (2.1)	25 (13.0)	65 (33.9)	18 (9.4)	192 [93.7]
SC	4 (44.4)	0 (0.0)	3 (33.3)	2 (22.2)	0 (0.0)	9 [4.3]
Education						
Primary	17 (32.1)	1 (1.9)	9 (17.0)	18 (34.0)	8 (15.1)	53 [25.9]
Secondary	30 (42.9)	0 (0.0)	8 (11.4)	24 (34.3)	8 (11.4)	70 [34.1]
Higher Secondary	13 (34.2)	1 (2.6)	11 (28.9)	7 (18.4)	6 (15.8)	38 [18.5]
Graduation	24 (54.5)	2 (4.5)	0 (0.0)	18 (40.9)	0 (0.0)	44 [21.5]
Occupation						
Self-employed	51 (44.0)	4 (3.4)	11 (9.5)	42 (36.2)	8 (6.9)	116 [56.6]
Daily Labour	33 (39.8)	0 (0.0)	17 (20.5)	25 (30.1)	8 (9.6)	83 [40.5]
Unemployed	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	6 (100)	6 [2.9]
Dominant Domicile						
Rural	43 (37.7)	0 (0.0)	17 (14.9)	38 (33.3)	16 (14.0)	114 [55.6]
Urban	41 (45.1)	4 (4.4)	11 (12.1)	29 (31.9)	6 (6.6)	91 [44.4]
Family Structure						
Nuclear Family	36 (37.5)	2 (2.1)	20 (20.8)	26 (27.1)	12 (12.5)	96 [46.8]
Extended Family	43 (43.0)	2 (2.0)	8 (8.0)	37 (37.0)	10 (10.0)	100 [48.8]
Single Parent	5 (55.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (44.4)	0 (0.0)	9 [4.4]
Poverty Status						
APL	8 (30.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	12 (46.2)	6 (23.1)	26 [12.7]
BPL	76 (42.5)	4 (2.2)	28 (15.6)	55 (30.7)	16 (8.9)	179 [87.3]

Source: Computed from primary data,

Note: The figures in () bracket indicates row-wise percentage, figures in [] bracket indicates column-wise percentage

Table 1 indicates the complex relationship between socio-demographic factors and types of first crimes. In the age-wise distribution of respondents, 65.3 per cent of respondents are from the 39 to 47 and 48 to 56 age categories. Theft is the most commonly committed crime among respondents in the 39 to 47 (40.3%), 48 to 56 (51.6%) and above 56 (28.6%) age groups. Criminal breach of trust is prevalent among younger respondents in the 21 to 29 (42.9%) and 30 to 38 (38.9%) age category. Age-wise distribution of respondents and their type of first crime indicates the age-specific pressures to commit crimes.

Regarding marital status, 84.9 per cent of the respondents are married and their first crime was theft, showing the family-related contributing factors to committing crime. Religion-wise data shows that 56.1 per cent of crimes were committed by Christian respondents, followed by Hindus (32.2) and Muslims (11.7) and caste-wise distribution shows that 93.7 per cent of the respondents belong to the OBC category, followed by 4.3 per cent SC and 2 per cent from the OC category.

In terms of education attainment, almost all crimes were committed by respondents who had completed secondary education or below, except dacoity and robbery. Regarding occupational status, self-employed

respondents are the most prevalent, followed by daily labourers and it is the same across all crime types except robbery. This finding reflects the financial instability and precarious living conditions. A total of 55.6 per cent of the respondents predominantly reside in rural areas, a pattern observed across all the types of crimes except dacoity. Notably, a high proportion (48.8) of respondents belong to extended families, followed by 46.8 per cent are from nuclear families, which reveals the family-related pressure to earn money through crime. Regarding poverty status of the respondents, 87.3 per cent of the respondents belong to the below poverty line, a factor associated with all types of crimes and this proves the role of poverty fostering criminal behaviour. Overall, table 1 identifies various contributing factors to criminal behaviour, such as age, marital status, education, occupation, dominant domicile, family structure and poverty status. Household income, expenditure, savings, interest for loan/debt, investment and total debt conditions of the respondents are explained in the Table 2 with their mean, sum and actual N.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Household Economic Indicators and the Type of First Crime

Household Economic Indicators	Statistics	Type of First Crime				
		Theft	Dacoity	Robbery	CBT	Cheating
Household Income in Rupees	**Mean**	40845.24	58000.00	38285.71	39507.46	39681.80
	Sum	3431000.00	232000.00	1072000.00	2647000.00	873000.00
	N	84.00	4.00	28.00	67.00	22.00
Expenditure in Rupees	**Mean**	33696.43	47500.00	29535.71	29532.84	21963.60
	Sum	2830500.00	190000.00	827000.00	1978700.00	483200.00
	N	84.00	4.00	28.00	67.00	22.00
Savings in Rupees	**Mean**	2951.19	5375.00	2946.43	3074.63	3913.64
	Sum	247900.00	21500.00	82500.00	206000.00	86100.00
	N	84.00	4.00	28.00	67.00	22.00
Interest on loan/Debt, Investment and others	**Mean**	4197.62	5125.00	5803.57	6900.00	13804.50
	Sum	352600.00	20500.00	162500.00	462300.00	303700.00
	N	84.00	4.00	28.00	67.00	22.00
Total Debt	**Mean**	572857.14	850000.00	637142.86	553656.72	327273.00
	Sum	48120000.00	3400000.00	17840000.00	37095000.00	7200000.00
	N	84.00	4.00	28.00	67.00	22.00
Earning Members in Family	**Mean**	2.36	4.00	2.18	2.33	1.55
	Sum	198.00	16.00	61.00	156.00	34.00
	N	84.00	4.00	28.00	67.00	22.00

Source: Computed from primary data

Table 2 presents household economic indicators such as income, expenditure, savings, total debt and interest for loans/debts, investment and other financial aspects in relation to the type of first crime committed by respondents. The table demonstrates that the income corresponds to its expenditure, savings, interest on loan/debts, investment and other financial factors. A similarity is observed between income, expenditure, savings and total debt across different types of crimes. The mean values for income, expenditure, savings and total debt is high among dacoity respondents and the sum of income, expenditure, savings and total debt are highest among theft respondents. In contrast, the mean value for interest for debt/loan, investment and others is high among cheating respondents and the sum of interest on debt/loan, investment and other financial aspects is higher among criminal breach of trust respondents. It is also observed that income, expenditure, savings and total debt align with the number of earning members in the family. The sum and mean of earning members in the family are high among dacoity and theft respondents, which are reflected in their income, expenditure, savings and total debt.

Severity of Financial Conflicts among Families of Convicted Offenders:

This part of the study highlights the dominance of money-related issues with some other conflict variables in families, such as decision-making conflicts, issues arising from father's drinking habits and relationship problems. Friedman test is applied to examine the following hypothesis:

H_{01}: There is no significant difference in the mean ranks of the types of disturbances in respondent families.

Table 3: Friedman Test for Types of Disturbances in Family

Disturbances in Family	Mean Rank	Rank	Chi-square Value	P Value
Money matter	2.682927	1	19.346	0.000**
Decision making	2.302439	4		
Fathers drinking habit	2.534146	2		
Relationship problem	2.480488	3		

Source: Computed from primary data

The Friedman test results reveal significant insights into the disturbances in the families of the convicted economic and property offenders. Based on the mean rank, money matters (2.68) is the most important disturbance in families, followed by fathers drinking habits (2.53), relationship problems (2.48) and decision-making (2.30). The results highlight that financial adversities and money-related issues are prevalent in most of the respondent's families, which pushes them towards criminal activities to acquire wealth. Moreover, the chi-square value (19.346) and p-value (0.000) indicate a statistically significant difference among the disturbances in families. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected with a 1 per cent level of significance. The Friedman test revealed that the financial issues in the respondent's families are more severe than other issues such as decision-making, the father's drinking habit and relationship problems. The respondents are significantly affected by the money-related issues in their families that created the tendency to seek more money to get satisfaction and happiness that they lack, pushing them toward illegal activities.

Comparison of Childhood and Present Economic Condition of Convicted Offenders:

This part of the study compares the childhood and present economic conditions of the respondents. Five hypotheses are tested using various statistical tools including McNemar's test, the Wilcoxon signed-rank test and Paired sample t-test. McNemar's and the Wilcoxon test are applied to examine the differences in housing ownership, debt condition, land ownership and Vehicle ownership from childhood to the present. The paired sample t-test is used to assess differences in basic needs related to the household's economic condition over time. The below table 4 is going to test the following hypothesis:

H_{02}: There is no significant difference between housing ownership during childhood and at present

Table 4: McNemar's Test for Ownership of Housing Compared with Childhood and Present Situation

Ownership of Housing	Owned	Rented	Total	Chi-square	Sig
Childhood	151 (73.7)	54 (26.3)	205 (100)	24.03846	0.000**
Present	177 (86.3)	28 (13.7)	205 (100)		

Source: Computed from primary data

Table 4 shows that 73.7 per cent of the respondents had their own houses during childhood and 26.3 per cent lived in rented houses. At present 86.3 per cent of the respondents own houses while 13.7 per cent of the respondents live in rented houses. In total, 12.6 per cent of the respondents who lived in rented houses during childhood have moved to their own houses. A considerable percentage of the respondents have experienced an improvement in housing ownership in recent years.

McNemar's test was conducted to compare housing ownership during childhood and the present. The test revealed a significant shift in housing ownership. The chi-square value is 24.038, with a p-value of 0.000 which is below 0.01. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected at the 1 per cent level of significance. Furthermore, the results of this analysis indicate that the respondents housing ownership was at a good standard both during childhood and at present. The percentage of respondents living in rented houses has decreased from 26.3 per

cent during childhood to 13.7 per cent at present. This situation prompts the researcher to explore further the housing conditions and basic needs of respondents in their households which are analysed using the paired sample t-test and factor analysis. Table 5 explains the debt situation during childhood and at present, analysed using McNemar's test to test the hypothesis.

H_{03}: There is no significant difference in debt condition during childhood and at present

Table 5: Mcnemar's Test for Debt Compared with Childhood and Present Situation

Debt	Yes	No	Total	Chi-square	Sig
Childhood	199 (97.1)	6 (2.9)	205 (100)	13.36	0.000**
Present	186 (90.7)	19 (9.3)	205 (100)		

Source: Computed from primary data

The above table explains the debt situation of the respondents during their childhood and at present. It shows that 97.1 per cent of the respondents had a debt problem during their childhood and 90.7 per cent of the respondents have the same debt issue at present. Comparatively, 6.4 per cent of the respondents have been relieved from debt at present. McNemar's test results in the table indicate a significant change in debt status from childhood to the present among the respondents. The test reveals a notable shift in their debt condition. The chi-square value is 13.36 with a p-value of 0.000, which is below 0.01. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected at the 1 per cent level of significance. The McNemar's test result show significant changes in debt from childhood to the present. However, an important observation is that more than 90 per cent of the respondents still have debt issues. Thus shows the prevalence of debt issues among the respondents and suggests a possible link between financial struggles and engagement in illegal activities. The table 6 presents the status of land ownership during childhood and at present. McNemar's test is used to analyse the following null hypothesis.

H_{04}: There is no significant difference in ownership of land during childhood and at present

Table 6: Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test for Ownership of Land Compared with Childhood and Present Situation

Period	N	Wilcoxon Signed - Rank Test		
		Median	Z Value	P Value
Childhood	205	1	-5.099	0.000
Present	205	1		

Source: Computed from primary data

The above table shows the observed z value for land ownership during childhood and the present as -5.099, $p<0.01$. The median for land ownership during childhood and present is 1. This identical median value suggests that the changes in land ownership over time are not substantion. However, the p value of 0.000 indicates that the change in land ownership at present is statistically significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected at the 1 per cent level of significance. The McNemar's test in table 6 indicates that while there have been some changes in land ownership over time, the overall quantity of land owned hasn't changed significantly. The results reveal that although ownership patterns have have shifted, the amont owned (cents) remains low. This may indicate an unsatisfactory shift in land ownership among the respondents. Dissatisfaction with land ownership may also contribute to engagement in illegal activities **(Hoeve, 2014).** Table 7 examines vehicle ownership during childhood and at present, comparing the changes using McNemar's test. It also tests the following hypothesis.

H_{05}: There is no significant difference in ownership of Vehicles during childhood and at present

Table 7: Mcnemar's Test for Ownership of Vehicles Compared with Childhood and Present Situation

Period	Yes	No	Total	Chi-square	Sig
Childhood	4 (2)	201 (98)	205 (100)	160.006	0.000**
Present	166 (81)	39 (19)	205 (100)		

Source: Computed from primary data

Table 7 explicitly presents the ownership of vehicles among respondents during childhood and at present. During childhood, only 2 per cent of the respondent's families owned Vehicle, while the remaining 98 per cent did not. However, at present, 81 per cent of the respondents own a vehicle whereas 19 per cent do not. This significant increase in vehicle ownership among respondents is tested using McNemar's test, with the results displayed in Table 7. The chi-square value is 160.006 and p value is 0.000, which is lower than 0.01. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, confirming a significant difference in vehicle ownership from childhood to the present among the respondents. An important finding from table-7 explains that 98 per cent of the respondent's families lacked access to vehicles during their childhood, revealing the poor economic conditions they experienced. Moreover, the deficiency of basic needs is linked to criminal behaviour **(Fergusson, 2004).** Table 8 examines the condition of basic needs among respondents during childhood and at present. Basic needs such as proper housing, toilet facilities, food security, clothing, drinking water, cooking facilities, health care access, vehicle ownership and home appliances are compared using the paired sample t test to test the following null hypothesis.

H_{06}: There is no significant difference in basic needs during childhood and at present

Table 8: Paired Sample 'T' Test for Basic Needs Compared with Childhood and Present Situation

Period	N	Paired Sample 't' Test			
		Mean	SD	t- Value	P Value
Childhood	205	15.0439	5.10027	-1.783	0.076
Present	205	15.7561	6.61245		

Source: Computed from data

The table shows that the observed t-value for the basic needs of the respondents during childhood and present is -1.783. The mean value during childhood is 15.0439 (SD=5.10027), while in the present it is 15.7561 (SD=6.61245). Here, the mean value for childhood is lower than that for the present. However, the p value is 0.07, which is greater than 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted, proving that there is no significant difference in basic needs between childhood and the present. This finding reveals that respondents face continues to challenges in meeting their basic needs, which is a major push factor for their involvement in crime. The study also establishes that there is a significant difference in housing ownership, debt condition, land ownership and vehicle ownership between childhood and the present. However, the persistent issue of fulfilling basic needs remain the same.

To gain further clarity on basic needs, factor analysis was performed and the results are discussed in Tables 9, 10, 11 and 12. Table 9 presents the results of the Cronbach's alpha test and table 11 provides the KMO and Bartlett's test results which determine whether facor analysis can be performed.

Table 9: Reliability Statistics for Factors of Basic Needs during Childhood and Present

Particulars	Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items
Factors of deficiency of Childhood and Present housing resources	0.936	16

Source: Computed from primary data

The table shows that the calculated Cronbach's alpha score is 0.936. Therefore, it can be concluded that the variables have a high level of internal consistency. The high Cronbach's alpha score indicates that factor analysis can be performed.

Table 10: Factors of Basic Needs During Childhood and Present – KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	.704

Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	3850.706
	df	120
	Sig.	<.000**

Source: Computed from primary data

The table shows that the KMO is 0.704, which is greater than 0.50 indicating that factor analysis is suitable for the data. Bartlett's test of sphericity tests the hypothesis that the correlation matrix is an identity matrix, which would suggest that the variables are unrelated and therefore, unsuitable for structure detection. Since the p-value is less than 0.01, it indicates that the variables are related, confirming that factor analysis can be performed.

Table 11: Factors of Basic Needs During Childhood and Present – Rotated Factors Matrix with Communality

Rotated Component Matrix	Component			Communalities h^2
	1	2	3	
Inadequate clothing during childhood	.811	.209	.121	.818
Lack of home appliances and vehicles during childhood	.805	.280	.115	.761
Lack of access to health care during childhood	.797	.084	.269	.603
Food insecurity during childhood	.746	.216	-.001	.716
Lack of access to clean drinking water during childhood	.716	.283	.171	.622
Inadequate cooking facilities during childhood	.685	.204	.488	.749
Lack of proper housing during childhood	.680	-.014	.596	.715
Lack of toilet facilities during childhood	.664	.063	.563	.740
Food insecurity at present	.142	.916	.192	.884
Lack of access to clean drinking water at present	.188	.914	-.033	.917
Inadequate clothing at present	.110	.838	.274	.896
Lack of home appliances and vehicles at present	.231	.769	.228	.790
Lack of access to health care at present	.294	.639	.239	.872
Inadequate cooking facilities at present	.257	.595	.551	.724
Lack of proper housing at present	.197	.451	.801	.552
Lack of toilet facilities at present	.222	.550	.752	.697
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.				

Source: Computed from primary data

The table represents the matrix of common factor coefficients or factor loadings. Three factors were extracted. The ratios with the highest loadings in each factor were grouped, meaning that closely related to a group are boxed together.

The rotated factor loadings for 16 statements were classified into three factors. These factors were named based on their group characteristics. The names of the factors and corresponding variables are presented in the table.

Table 12: Factors of Basic Needs During Childhood and Present – Rotated Factors Matrix Communality, Eigen Values, Percent of Variance, and Factor Name

Factors	Factors Considered	Factor Loadings	Eigen Values	Percent of Variance	Cumulative per cent of Variance	Factor Name
1	Inadequate clothing during childhood	0.811	8.434	52.711	52.711	Childhood Resource Deficiency
	Lack of home appliances and vehicles during childhood	0.805				
	Lack of access to health care during childhood	0.797				
	Food insecurity during childhood	0.746				
	Lack of access to clean drinking water during childhood	0.716				
	Inadequate cooking facilities during childhood	0.685				
	Lack of proper housing during childhood	0.68				
	Lack of toilet facilities during childhood	0.664				
2	Food insecurity at present	0.916	2.521	15.755	68.466	Present Resource Deficiency
	Lack of access to clean drinking water at present	0.914				
	Inadequate clothing at present	0.838				
	Lack of home appliances and vehicles at present	0.769				
	Lack of access to health care at present	0.639				

Factors	Factors Considered	Factor Loadings	Eigen Values	Percent of Variance	Cumulative per cent of Variance	Factor Name
	Inadequate cooking facilities at present					
3	Lack of proper housing at present	0.801	1.101	6.883	75.35	Present Housing and Sanitation Deficiency
	Lack of toilet facilities at present	0.752				

Source: Computed from primary data

Three factors were extracted based on the Eigen values. The cumulative percentage of variance explained in the table above shows that the three factors extracted together account for 75.35 per cent of the total variance from the information contained in the original 16 variables.

Based on the rotated factor matrix, eight items loaded onto the first factor. This factor includes variables such as inadequate clothing, lack of home appliances, lack of access to health care, food insecurity, lack of access to clean drinking water, inadequate cooking facilities, lack of proper housing and lack of toilet facilities during childhood with factor loadings 0.811, 0.805, 0.797, 0.746, 0.716, 0.685, 0.680 and 0.664 respectively. Thus factor is labelled as childhood resource deficiency and explains 52.711 per cent of the variance.

Six items were loaded onto the second factor, which includes variables such as food insecurity, lack of access to clean drinking water, inadequate clothing, lack of home appliances and lack of access to health care in the present with factor loadings 0.916, 0.914, 0.838, 0.769 and 0.639 respectively. This factor is labelled as present resource deficiency and explains 15.755 per cent of the variance.

Two items were loaded onto the third factor by the variables, namely lack of proper housing and lack of toilet facilities at present with factor loadings 0.801 and 0.752 respectively. This factor is labelled as present housing and sanitation deficiency and explains 6.883 per cent of the variance. This classification of factors emphasises the critical distinction between challenges faced in childhood and those in the present. Childhood adversities related to basic needs appears to be more prominent compared to the present challenges.

Conclusion

The study "Comparative Analysis of Childhood and Present Economic Condition of Convicted Economic and Property Offenders in Kanniyakumari District" provides crucial insights into the socio-demographic factors contributing to crime, the severity of financial issues in offender's families, the status of economic improvement and the inadequate fulfilment of basic needs from childhood to the present. The findings of the Friedman test indicate that financial issues are the most significant family problems compelling individuals toward crime to meet their needs. Furthermore, comparison of economic indicators between childhood and the present reveals tremendous positive changes. Housing ownership, debt situation, land ownership and Vehicle ownership have significantly improved. Regarding the respondent's debt conditions there has been slightly improvement with 6.4 per cent of respondents having overcome their debt issues. However, more than 90 per cent of respondents still face financial instability due to ongoing debt problems in their families. Additionally, the results of the paired sample t-test indicate no significant change in the respondent's basic needs from childhood to the present. Moreover, factor analysis reinforces this finding by categorising childhood and present resource deficits into three factors: childhood resource deficiency, present resource deficiency and the present housing and sanitation deficiency. The prominence of basic needs deprivation during childhood, such as inadequate clothing, food insecurity and lack of access to healthcare and sanitation, points to the formative role of economic hardship in shaping later criminal behaviour. Although there has been substantial improvement in tangible assets, basic needs remain a challenge. The results suggest that the government should

address childhood deprivation through targeted welfare programs and sustainable development initiatives to prevent crime at its roots.

Reference:

1. Ansari, S.,Verma, A.,& Dadkhah, K. M.(2015). Crime rates in India: A trend analysis. International criminal justice review, 25(4), 318-336.
2. Augustus. (1931). Crime and Religious Beliefs in India. The Criminologist. Calcutta
3. Barnett, H. (1976). The Economics of Crime: A Comment. Review of Social Economy, 34(1), 86-87.
4. Buonanno, P. (2003). The Socioeconomic Determinants of Crime. A Review of the Literature, No 63, Working Papers, University of Milano-Bicocca, Department of Economics
5. Crime Statistics India Report (2022). NCRB, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India.
6. Ehrlich, I., (1975) 'On the Relation between Education and Crime', in Juster, F.T. (ed.) Education, Income and Human Behaviour. McGraw-Hill, New York: 313-337.
7. Felitti, V. J., Anda, R. F., Nordenberg, D., Williamson, D. F., Spitz, A. M., Edwards, V., & Marks, J. S. (1998). Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults: The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) Study. American journal of preventive medicine, 14(4), 245-258.
8. Fergusson, D., Swain-Campbell, N., & Horwood, J. (2004). How does childhood economic disadvantage lead to crime?. Journal of child psychology and psychiatry, 45(5), 956-966.
9. Finance Report (2023). Ministry of Finance, Government of India.
10. Gold, S. (2020). Is housing hardship associated with increased adolescent delinquent behaviors?. Children and youth services review, 116, 105116.
11. Kannan,S. (2017). Economics of Criminal Behaviour: An overview of Convicted Property Offenders in Tamil Nadu. International Journal of Management Research and Social Science.
12. Karpavičius, T., Stavytskyy, A., Giedraitis, V. R., Ulvidienė, E., Kharlamova, G., & Kavaliauskaitė, B. (2024). What determines the crime rate? A macroeconomic case study. Economies., 12(9), 1-19
13. Kazeem, O. T. (2020). Adverse childhood experiences, socio-economic status, and criminal behaviour: a cross-sectional correctional survey. Adversity and resilience science, 1, 319-327.
14. Khan, N., Ahmed, J., Nawaz, M., & Zaman, K. (2015). The socio-economic determinants of crime in Pakistan: New evidence on an old debate. Arab Economic and Business Journal, 10(2), 73-81.
15. Singh, P. K. (2020). Bail in Socio-economic Crimes and Criminal Justice in India. Athens JL, 6, 209.
16. Stattin, H., & Magnusson, D. (1996). Antisocial development: A holistic approach. Development and psychopathology, 8(4), 617-645.
17. Sujin, K. N. (2021). Crimes and criminal behaviour in Kerala: An economic analysis (Doctoral dissertation, St. Joseph's College (Autonomous)).