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Introduction
INTRODUCTION

Today crime has become a challenge in free society and has become one of the most acute social problems that influence the whole world. Every country wants to minimize this problem from its respective society but they are not getting success. Because there are some socio-economic and psychological reasons leading to this problem. Various studies have made it more clear that a man is not born a criminal one commits a crime because he suffers from some mental illness or distress. The social factors are poverty illiteracy, undesirable company, alcoholism, drug addiction, aloofness, splitting of family relations, Unemployment, and media etc, which are responsible for promoting the crime and criminal behaviours.

Every society is static as well as dynamic and it manifests its changes through organization and disorganization. An aspect of change i.e. disorganization is the causative factor of crimes and delinquency depending on the personality of a particular individual. According to “Durkheim” crime is a natural phenomenon of society and it is an integral part of all societies and hence no society is free from crime “Durkheim” further emphasis’s that almost every one in society is involved in some form of deviant behaviour at sometimes or other. According to this view, crime is a part of society and has to be considered normal. Crime of any sort is an endemic condition of society and hence it is appropriate to say that it is the “Backwardness of the culture” and it can be explained through etiological aspects. As "Tannenboum" said “Crime is the web and woof of society. It is not an accident not just an accident, the amount, the character, and the kind of crime are socially conditioned. The good people who set out to
remake the criminal, to better police force, to expedite criminal justice, to reform prison begin at the wrong end and too late. The story starts earlier, it starts within milieu in which the criminal grows up."

When crime is considered normal in society, the causative factor of crime is inherent in that society. However it is difficult to identify and particular aspect as the only causative factor of crime. In this context it is appropriate to quote Ramsay Clark.

"Crime is not a just sordid happening-it is human behaviour" A criminal behaviour as such is a reaction of human nature and human experience to the total situations such as social, economic, and political.

It is widely believed that in the primitive society there was no crime, except "wrong" which was knows as "tort" and the modern concept of crime has originated from the tort only. But ethnological research shows that even among primitive societies, there were acts of danger and threat to the groups in the form of violation of Taboos, customs and beliefs. According to "Steinmetz and Oppenheimer" there were crimes in primitive societies also. Such as treason, witch craft. offences against religion, incest. breaches of hunting rules, etc. All such violations were punishable. Hall, Hob house" Wheeler, and Ginsberg later followed this theory of origin of crime. Through the theory of origin of crime for "tort" is inadequate. It is not easy to deny its usefulness. Thus it was believed that there was little crime until groups with different cultures came into contact. Crime is the results of conflicts of moves and cultures of different group. The nature and identity of crime constantly changing from time to time in accordance with the changing pace of society.
The causal explanation of crime is as complex as its definition. A multitude factors come into play in the causation of crime but the more valid, organisation and causal aspects of crime are summarized by the report of U.S. President Commission on law enforcement.

"In a sense, social and economic conditions’ Cause crime, Crime flourishes, and always has flourished in city slums, those neighborhoods whenever crowding, economic deprivation, social disruption and racial discrimination are endemic. Crime flourishes in conditions of affluence where there is much desire for material goods and many opportunities to acquire them illegally. Crime flourishes when there are many restless, relatively foot loose young people in the population. Crime flourishes when Standards of morality are changing rapidly. Crime is thus the product of a combination of various causative factors. Such as nationality, race, geographical characteristics, social and communal hatreds, and psychological aberration, what is crime. It is also an act of omission or commission of law of society "Parimellee" defines Crime as :

"An act forbidden and punished by the law, which is almost always immoral according to the prevailing ethical standards".

Crime and punishment are old concept, which have existed with man from the time, Society has come into existence. "Tannenboum" (1943) wrote : Crime is eternal, as eternal as society. Tappan (1960) as a lawyer and sociologist defines. Crime as an intentional act or in violation of criminal law (Statutory and Case law committed without defiance of justification and sanctioned by the state as a felony or misdemeanor"

In a broad sense, crime is violation of rules and regulations as endorsed by the state or society from time to time. Members of society
have to act according to certain written or unwritten norms and laws. Maladjustment of an individual leads to the breach of these norms, resulting ultimately in crime which has its origin in the conflict of self seeking tendencies of individual with the established customs of society. According to "Durkheim", There is no society that is not confronted with the problem of criminality. Its form changes, his act thus characterized are not the same everywhere but everywhere and always, there have been men who have behaved in such a way as to draw upon themselves penal repression". Crime is also a ‘living concept’ or changing concept, as it is dependent upon time and place. What is regarded as crime by particular society at a particular period of time, may not be so at a different time and for different society crime has no universally coherent quality or property attached to it as such. It varies with laws and even conditions that evoke.

It is important here to differentiate the concept of social deviance from the concept of criminality. Social deviance is an infringement of social norms. According to the Definition given by Blackstone (1970)" A crime is an act committed or omitted in violation of pubic law either forbidding or commanding it”. A criminal is, therefore, a logical deviant who undergoes the criminal prosecution and carries with him the social stigma. The law enforcing institutions in society may not take action against all kinds of anti-social action, moral waywardness, social deviancy and social dysfunction. Whatever be the degree of immorality of indecency of an act. It is not considered as crime unless the act is against the existing laws of society.

The above descriptions indicate that crime is due to social disorganization, relative deprivation and social conflict. "Sutherlands" Theory says that the criminal and causes of criminality are basically dependent on the process of learning reaction to different cultural setting. Which means when a person is called a criminal, he is
addicted to crime in this process. By putting forward such a view, Sutherland has broken a new ground. Criminality is due to the adverse reaction of individuals to the social and psychological condition of human society. In this opinion:

"-------- The differential association theory was an attempt to show how cumulative learning processes determine which individuals do and which do not engage in crime. Thus opportunity to commit an offence is always a necessary condition of crime" Sutherland also says that a majority of criminals are person with lower class background. They commit due to bad association and lack of proper control from parents. Besides this, criminals are product of slum community generally. Hence, all these factors i.e. lack of parental control, peer group influence, slum neighborhood, etc. Induce persons to learn crime for their gain or survival. Further, Sutherland, in his book white collar crime", refutes theories which view poverty as the cause of white colour crime. And suggest that low level of intelligence and psychological disturbances are also to be considered as causes of white collar crime. In other words, white collar crime is not because of socio-genic problems, but is due to low intelligence quotient and psychological disorders. Thus the general theories of criminal behaviours which make their data from poverty and the conditions pertaining to it are inadequate and invalid to explain the behaviour of white collar crime to conclude crime in general is a reaction to a different social setting in society. As "Schur" interprets Sutherland’s theory.

"At any rate, Sutherland’s findings made it quite clear to him that not all crime could be attributed to either poverty on the one hand or mental illness, on the other. He recognized that the common understanding of business men, according to which law violation could often be justified or even approved, and the prevalence of the
illegal behaviour in certain social circles had to be taken into account in formulating a theory of a crime causation.”

Thus criminal behaviour is the results of interactional explosion of all above situation. This is a deviant person gets addicted to crime for his livelihood and his survival in society. It is a principle of learning process of illegal models of behaviour, immoral and unethical code of conduct, to follow crime as an occupation. This criminal behaviour can be acquired just like any other pattern of behaviour in society, as criminality is a part and parcel of society. We know that society is a place of person to mould his personality either to become a criminal or non-criminal. Criminal behaviour is a form of social adoption; it is an attempt by an individual to adjust him to the social norms, albeit in socially illegitimate ways. No aberrant behaviour is crime until it has been defined so by recognized procedures of society. In this sense criminal behaviour defers from non criminal behaviour. The group prohibits the former, even through both are acquired in society. According to "Sutherland", criminals acquire patterns of criminal behaviour in the same way as the non-criminal acquires patterns of lawful behaviour in the social process, this process of learning consists of motives, attitudes, rationalization of deeds and techniques of committing offences. "Defluer and Quinny" as interpret Sutherland’s theory.

“In composite form of the theory of deferential association postulates the criminal behaviour has as its necessary, sufficient conditions, a set of criminal motivations, attitudes and techniques, the learning of which takes place when there is exposure to criminal norms in excess of exposure to criminal norms in excess of exposure to corresponding anti criminal norms during symbolic interaction of primary group”.
To explain criminal behaviour, He further says that the learning process of criminal behaviour is highly structured.

"The learning of criminal behaviour patterns is not random, but is structured according to person's selective posture to situations in which both the criminal and anti criminal behaviour patterns are present. Rates of criminal behaviour can thus be explained by Sutherland's concept of differential social organization."

"............ multi-group type of social organization alternative and in consistent standards of conducts are possessed by various group, so that an individual who is a member of one group has a high probability of learning to use legal means for achieving success, while an individual in another group learns to accept the importance of success and to achieve it by illegal means started another way there are alternative educational process in operation varying with the groups, so that a person may be educated in either conventional or criminal means of achieving success..........."

Therefore, the likelihood that a person will engage in criminal behaviour upon his relative exposure to various kinds of norms and, similarly the extent to which categories of person engage in criminal behaviour is related to the structure of criminal and anti criminal behaviour patterns in an area or portion of society.

Thus crime like any other human behaviour, can be acquired by an individual while following a particular pattern of that group, say criminal gang, the reciprocal inter personal influences may be readily apparent.

In this process of following crime as a carrier or an occupation, some individual become professionals. A professional criminal exhibits
certain characteristic features such as crime for gain, skill and status followed by specific culture.

In the words of Sutherland a professional thief is:

“One who steals professionally

1. He makes a regular business of stealing. He devotes his entire working time and energy to larceny and he may steal on three hundred and sixty five day a year.

2. Every act of his is carefully planned. The selection of spots, securing of property, making a getaway, disposing of the stolen property, and fixing cases in which he may be pinched (arrested) are all carefully planned.

3. The professional criminal (thief) has technical skill and methods which are different from those of other criminal, Manual skill is important in some of rackets is the ability to manipulate people. The manipulation depends upon his approach front, wits and in many instances his skillful talk. The professional burglar or sticking man (robber). On the other, uses violence or threat of violence even though he may occasionally use soothing language in order to quiet people.

4. The professional thief is generally migratory and may work in all the cities.

The professional criminal engages themselves in crime regularly for their livelihood”.
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Generally, they have certain characteristics such as thieving as regular work, skill, consensus, status, common culture, and organization. Professional criminal avoid associating themselves with situation. They have their own philosophy of life to justify their actions and try to boost their self image by defending their superiority in their specialized types of offences. Professional criminals thus rationalize their behaviour by the conduct of their victims, describing them as rich, greedy and careless. By and large professional criminals have their own culture, i.e., a code of conduct and a specific language. Consequently, their differential association from larger society results in a sub culture.

Professional crime is a behaviour system and a sociological entity. Within this circle of offenders, there is a group of criminal who relapse into crime because of one of other mental characteristics. But the professional offenders are not impelled by any mental drives but are vocationally oriented taking crime as a source of gain. It is reported by Reckless.

"The uniform crime reports of 1963 described a new system of accounting for the repetitive, serious offenders not the misdemeanant ( Petty offender) cases. The reports show a total of 56,000 serious adult offenders in the united states who are known to be repeaters, according to finger print information, The 56,000 repeaters by 1963 has a recorded total of 2,66,000 finger printed arrestor (almost five per case on the average). The majority (75%) of those offenders with two or more arrests to their credit displayed a crime career span of ten years - from first to last arrest".

Professional criminals commit crime repeatedly for economic gain as they find it very lucrative. The main contributing factor to crime is gain for money without hard work. The report of Chicago city
council committee on crime has also identified professional crime as follows:

While this criminal group is not by any means completely organized, it has many of the characteristics of a system, it has its own law, its own history its traditions and customs, its own method and techniques; its highly specialized modes of defense. These professional criminals have interurban, interstate and sometimes international connections. This complex of techniques, status, consensus and differential association, which have been described, previously may be regarded as organization. more specifically the organization of professional thieves consists in part of the knowledge, which becomes the common property of the profession. Every thief becomes an information bureau. For instance, each professional thief known personally to a large proportion of the other thieves, as a result of their migratory habits and common hangouts.

An organized crime is classified into three categories as given below like the professional crime because the features of both are interconnected and interrelated. The classified of an organized crime by Pace and Styles is as follows:

1. The common physical crimes such as burglary, robbery etc, when one or more person are involved in the planning, execution or disposition of the spoils of a crime.

2. Those crimes that are socially destructive such as embezzlement, consumer fraud and other crime classed in the “White collar” category.

3. The traditional 'syndicated' or confederated groups who are organized for the total purpose of pursuing illegal activities. It is
the letter category that we normally refer to as organized crime, but the first two categories also be identified as being of an organization nature in specific instances and considered in the police report.

Crime of any short can be classified as “professional crime” because the activities of planning execution receivers of stolen property and legal protection are common to any crime. A study of crime reports and arrests brings out this fact of the traditional methods. Followed by professional criminal and their violations. Even Donald R. Gressey’s observations about organized crime show the proximity between professional crime and organized crime. The figure from Pace and Style ‘Organized crime show the proximity between professional crime and organized crime. The figure from pace and Style “organized crime” illustrates that organized crime is professional in nature and every professional crime is an organized crime in planning and execution. The two are not watertight compartment but interrelated by their structural planning and careful execution.

Today’s Hi-tech world and use of computer network has given rise to cyber crimes and other computer related unlawful activities. Cyber crimes are harmful acts committed for or against a computer network. Undeterred by the prospect of arrest or prosecution, the cyber criminals operate around the computer network and thus are a menace to E-mail or E-commerce user. There cyber crimes cover a wide range of illegal activities which include frauds, hackers, viruses, pornography, harassment, stalking, data diddling etc. These offences call for need it recognize the fact that criminal law must continue to evolve if it is to address itself adequately to new development information technology because of the cyber crimes international potential, there is a need for an effective anti-cyber space international law for preventing cyber-crimes.
Objective of the study

This research work has been undertaken to study the relationship between various social factors and criminal behaviour, and to look in to the methods of treatment provided to the inmates inside the jails for reformation and rehabilitation. As such the study mainly concentrates on the following objectives :-

1- To study the Socio-economic and family background of the criminal.

2- To study the primary crimes related attitudes of inmates in two prisons.

3- To study the factors that determines causation of crime.

4- To study the role of prison management for the welfare and treatment of the inmates.

5- To suggest suitable measure for prevention of crime and treatment of offenders.

It is thus clear that the main objective of the study is to examine the different situations in family, neighborhood, occupational group, associated group and recreational group that have stimulated and provoked our respondent to commit different types of crime. It may be said that the conceptual framework of our research is to analyses the various situation to which criminal behaviour responds. Different situation emerging in different social units like family, associational group etc. have been analyzed considering their structural and functional dimensions.
Theories of Crime

Various theories have been developed to understand the criminal behaviour and prison management system. These theories have relevance for the present study therefore these are discussed to draw some meaningful conclusion.

Many studies have been attempted and theories developed to explain the etiology of crime. "Martin and Fitzpatrickl" have classified these attempts in four main categories: (a) theories that search the cause in social system, (b) those which explain it in terms of the defects in the operating milieu, (c) those which emphasize the role of the family and (d) those which trace the cause of crime only in the individual.

Social System Approach

Theories which relate crime with the social and cultural system emphasize the relationship of general characteristics of cultural and social systems with the crime. Theories of Robert Merton, Albert Cohen, Richard Cloward Ohlin, Donalf Taft, Thorston Sellin etc. can be included in this approach.

Robert Merton, Richard Cloward and Ohlin agree that delinquent behaviour arises due to socially induced stresses. Merton explains his theory on the basis of disfunction between cultural and social systems of society. According to him, deviancy is the result of reaction towards activity or change generated in the actor. Merton thinks that an unique situation arises when disjunction between goals and means causes strain, which in turn, leads to the weakening of man's commitment to the culturally prescribed goals or institutionalized means, that is, to a state of anomie and it is this state which leads to antisocial behaviour. To explain his theory,
Merton makes explicit three things. First, there are the cultural goals—the wants or aspirations that men are taught by their culture. Secondly, there are the norms prescribing the means that men may legitimately employ in the pursuit of these goals. These two are the parts of cultural structure. Thirdly, it is the actual distribution of facilities and opportunities for achieving the cultural goals in a manner compatible with the norms. These are institutionalized means and are a part of social structure. The strain, frustration, depression etc. is not the result of anyone of these but is the result of relationship among all these factors. Thus a disfunction between goals and institutionalized means can arise either because of escalation of the goals or because of the contraction of the definition of legitimate ways of achieving them. Though Merton has tried to analyse deviant behaviour, yet his theory is incomplete in as much as it analyses only the role of situation and not of personality.

Although Merton has a good deal to say on the sources of strains and on the variety of possible responses, he has relatively little to say about the determinants of these responses. On the other hand, Sutherland emphasizes only the illegitimate means. "Cloward and Ohlin" attempt to remedy this deficiency by offering the concept of legitimate and illegitimate opportunities. On the basis of this they have tried to build their theory of 'delinquent sub-culture', with major emphasis on relative availability of illegal alternatives or opportunities. According to this theory both legitimate means and illegitimate means are not freely available to all the members of society. In a nutshell Cloward's theory can be summarized as follows: the disparity between what the people are led to want and what is actually available to them is the source of a major problem of adjustment. Faced with limitations of legitimate avenues of access to these goals and unable to revise their aspirations downward, they experience intense frustrations resulting into exploration of non-conformist alternatives.
Though "Cloward and Ohlin" have tried to explain delinquent behaviour on the basis of their theory of differential opportunity yet this theory has ambiguity and is not useful for operational purposes. Schrag has also criticized it on the grounds that this theory seems far from fulfilling the foremost logical requirement of a scientific explanation. Besides, it does not answer the question how a young person who belongs to the lower classes does not become involved in activities of delinquent gangs.

"Donald Taft" has tried to correlate crime with characteristics of society's culture which in itself is deeply-rooted criminogenic. "Thörsten Sellin" has studied crime in terms of cultural conflict. It is the conflict of meanings, social values, interests and social norms. Albert Cohen has studied cultural conflict in terms of class conflict in relation to criminal behaviour. Cohen's theory revolves around the supposition that since middle class goals are unattainable and therefore meaningless to the working class boy, he reacts with a peculiar reversal process, so that the content of the delinquent sub-culture constitutes an inversion, so to speak, of middle class values, by which he formulates the negativistic, malicious and non-utilitarian values which are not accepted by the society. This theory has been severely criticized. Martin and Fitzpatrick9 have pointed out that this theory assumes a sharp break between the value system of the middle and working classes. It uses cultural inversion to explain the formation of the delinquent sub-culture without answering as to why inversion occurs.

Social Milieu Approach

Criminologists like Sutherland, I Clifford Shaw, Cyril Burt, Frederic Tbrasher, and Charles Booth search the etiology of crime in the operating milieu of the actor. These authors emphasis the role of various social deprivations as the causes of crime. Besides, they also view delinquency as a learned behaviour.
One of the studies on crime was made by "Sutherland" in connection with group influence on the individual. The essence of his theory of Differential Association is that delinquent behaviour is learnt in interaction with persons in a pattern of communication, and that the specific direction of motives, drives, rationalizations and attitudes whether in the direction of anti-criminality or criminality is learnt from persons whose attitudes are favourable to violation of legal codes. A person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favourable to violation of law over definitions unfavourable to violation of law.

Like other theories, this theory is also widely criticized. Cressey has pointed out that this theory over-simplifies the process of learning of criminal behaviour. Some kinds of criminal behaviour are exceptional to this theory such as criminals of financial trust, naive check forgers,18 irrational and impulsive behaviour, murderers, non-professional shoplifters and no11career type of criminals. Jeffery believes the theory fails to explain the origin of criminality, since criminality has to exist before it can be learned from someone else. Besides this, this theory also fails to account for the differential rates of crimes associated with age, sex, urban areas and minority groups.

Writers like Charles Booth, Mary Carpenter, R.H. Walsh, Joseph Fletcher,"' John Clay etc. have claimed that crime increases in economically bad years and decreases in economically good years. All these scholars, taking nation as a unit of study, tried to correlate crime with economic conditions (specially on the basis of two variables-prosperity and distress). It was Cyril Burt, who taking family as a unit of study, found that delinquency was related with highly distressed class.
The scholars of other sub-group of this approach like Mckay and Shaws emphasize the significance of the nature or quality of association in particular region and conclude that in high-rate areas, crime and delinquency have become more or less traditional aspects of the social life and that these traditions of delinquency are transmitted through personal and group contacts.

This approach is not able to answer as to why in an "area, inhabited by persons with same economic status, one individual commits a crime but the other conforms to the norms of society. Besides, it is also unable to explain all types of crime.

Family Approach

The theories of this group attempt to define criminal behaviour as the result of malfunctioning or defective structure of the family. These theories can be reviewed by classifying them into three categories:

(i) Theories which have studied the structural problems of family organisation, such as broken families or families where mothers are employed outside the home.

(ii) Theories which have studied the functional problems in families-namely, patterns of family relationships which fail to socialize the child adequately.

(iii) Theories which have studied families which socialize the child into a tradition of crime or delinquency, or what might be called the under-roof delinquent culture.

This approach has also been found as defective because fundamentally, most of the authors of this group believe that the
behaviour of the individual can be accounted in terms of the internal structure of this little system (the family) without reference to larger social system within which it is embedded. This approach also ignores the role of other factors such as assimilation, urbanization, industrialization in the stability of the family life.

Individual Approach

Contrary to those scholars who find the cause of crime in social system, there are some scholars of the positivistic and psychoanalytic school who trace the cause in the individual. "Lombroso" was the first in this sphere, who explained criminal behaviour in terms of the physical characteristics of offenders and concluded that criminals were born. Ferri also supported the view that individuals committed crimes due to inherited "atavistic" or physical anomalies. Though Goring refuted this view, he felt that inferior physique and mental retardation were responsible for individual's criminal behaviour. Hooton31 and Sheldon Glueck too held the same biological opinion.

On the basis of Freudian33 theory, some other theories have been developed which stress the functional aspect of mental illness and personality maladjustment as a particular characteristic of delinquents. The central idea of this theme is that delinquent behaviour is the product of psychic adjustment arising out of conflicts among the Id, ego and superego.

Healy and Bronner point out that delinquent behaviour results out of emotional disturbances. This emotional disturbance is the result of frustration which is aroused by dissatisfaction of psychic needs. They conclude that delinquents find substitutive satisfactions for their psychic needs in aggessive or escape behaviour which society considers immoral or illegal. Though individual approach makes use of scientific methodology to trace the etiology of crime, yet it has many
defects. Personality is not the outgrowth of only hereditary factors but it is the result of many other factors. Body-build, skin colour and other anatomical factors may be very important in human behaviour, but the evidence indicates that they operate indirectly through cultural definitions and meanings as these affect society's reaction to the possessor of such characteristics, and in turn as he himself is affected by cultural definitions and social reaction.

Theoretical View

From the above discussion it is clear that no single approach is able to explain all types of crimes. The neat balance may be possible when we study the individual and the family in reference to cultural and social milieu. It is significant to note that even when theories of delinquency causation do unite two, three or even four levels of analysis, only particular and selected sections of each of the levels integrated are linked and other 'useful sections are omitted. We may thus use the multiple factor approach in studying crime. Burt35 has also pointed out that crime is assignable to no single universal source, nor yet to two or three; it springs from a wide variety, and usually from a multiplicity of alternatives and corietging influences. This approach is widely used now-adays (or the explabation of individual's criminal behaviour.

Multiple factor approach heralds the revolt against the practice of stressing one cause for all crimes. Instead it endeavours to produce an extensive list of the causes of crime. This idea that crime is the result of multifarious influences has persisted to the present, although the specific factors said to be important in crime have shifted from time to time, progressively becoming more social in nature. Also, there has been an emphasis on concentration of multifarious factors in the crime of individual offenders rather than on multifarious factors
producing high crime rates. One of the scholars who believes in multiple factor approach in crime is David Abrahamsen. According to him, criminals act of a person is the sum of a person's criminal tendencies plus his total situation, divided by his mental and emotional resistance to temptations.

However, several serious methodological and theoretical objections have been made regarding this approach. The best criticism of the multiple factor approach is given by Cohen in three principal points. Firstly, persons using the multiple factor approach confuse explanation by means of a single factor. Secondly, the 'evil-causes-evil fallacy' usually characteristic multiple factor approach although it is not peculiar to it. The fallacy is that the results which we do not like (crime) must have antecedents which we do not like (alcoholism, psychopathic personality, biological inferiority etc.). Thirdly, 'factors' are confused with 'causes' and each factor is assumed to contain within itself a fixed amount of crime-producing power.

In spite of this criticism, we have used this multiple factor theory for analyzing crime in our study. This is because we accept the sociological theory which maintains that crime is the result of various social elements operating in social environment. These important elements are culture, social control, primary and secondary groups, social processes, Socialization, social change, social disorganization, status, role and personality of the individual.

For the purposes of our study we have framed our reference to all those elements of social environment, which mould the life of an individual.