

Social Responsibility of Parents and Teachers in Prevention of Criminality and Crime: A Perceptual Analysis

Anil Kumar S^{1*}, Lancy D'souza², Rangaiah B³

ABSTRACT

Criminality is anti-social or deviant thinking, idea, influence, the concept of greed, revenge, and inhibition, responses to provocation developed or developing in mind but yet to be converted into action which would, as a result, be called a crime. The present study is an attempt to assess the extent of social responsibility of parents and teachers in the prevention of criminality and crime. For the present study, 15 government schools and 15 private were selected. From each school six teachers and ten parents of students studying in high school were selected. Hence, a total of 180 teachers and 300 parents were selected for the data collection. The researcher developed a structured questionnaire specifically for present study, to obtain the data on the awareness of social responsibility and role in the prevention of criminality and crime among the participants along with demographic details. The data collected was further statistically analysed in SPSS for descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Teachers and parents differed significantly in three factors of social roles and responsibility-awareness of roles, awareness of criminality & crime, patriotism and total scores where teachers had higher scores than parents. Age wise we find significant differences in factors of awareness & crime, patriotism and total social responsibility scores where we find that respondents in the age group of 51-60 had lower scores and others high. There was no gender difference across the factors and overall social responsibility scores, indicating that both males and females have scored similarly. Government school teachers had higher scores on most of the factors and in total scores, indicating higher social responsibility.

Keywords: *Social Responsibility, Crime, Criminality, Children*

Society in India is evolving day by day in terms of both quality and quantity of increased population, and correspondingly the problems and issues are multiplying. India, as per 2011 census, has a population of 1.21 billion. One of the main issues in Indian society is the rate of crime. The total cognizable crime in India both IPC and SSL crime was totalled 4831515 as per the report of National Crime Records Bureau (2016). Though most of the

¹ Research scholar, DOS in Criminology & Forensic Science, Maharaja's College, University of Mysore, Mysuru-570 005, India

² Professor, Dept. of Psychology, Maharaja's College, University of Mysore, Mysuru-570 005, India

³ Professor, DOS in Applied psychology, Pondicherry Central University, Pondicherry, India

*Corresponding Author

Received: December 02, 2021; Revision Received: December 27, 2021; Accepted: December 28, 2021

Social Responsibility of Parents and Teachers in Prevention of Criminality and Crime: A Perceptual Analysis

people are direct victims of crime in India, people come to know of increased crime in media. Every television channel air crime-related news and programs, and every newspaper carry crime related news. Thus, criminality affects and influences people in society, and there are always direct and indirect effects of criminality (Canter and Youngs, 2016).

Criminality is anti-social or deviant thinking, idea, influence, the concept of greed, revenge, and inhibition, responses to provocation developed or developing in mind but yet to be converted into action which would, as a result, be called a crime. In other words, Criminality is deviant or anti-social tendency, mind-set, thinking, feelings, thoughts gained or acquired or experienced which the individual will not immediately execute even though he/she wants to, due to their age (young), fear of parents, neighbours, relatives or society or due to social concern or thinking of the consequences like punishments.

There is no one “particular or benchmark cause” of crime. Crime is a multifaceted phenomenon found to be different across the cultures and time of the globe. Crime is an act or any act forbidden by law. Whoever commits any crime is punished as prescribed under the legal statutes.

An activity or activities may be lawful or legal in one nation and may be unlawful or illegal in another. (E.g. Consumption of alcohol in non-Islamic countries is not legal, and it is punishable. Wearing a helmet while riding a two-wheeler is mandatory in urban or metropolitan India, and it is not mandatory in rural areas). Hence, there is no simple definite answer for, what is crime? So there is no single definite answer for the reason for crimes. Different types of crimes have their distinctive causes of crimes.

Crimes are on the rise due to various reasons. One major factor is easy money. People such as politicians and anti-social elements are dividing the nation in the name of religion, caste, and creed due to the greed of amassing easy money to lead a luxurious life. Many youths irrespective of gender are indoctrinated and indulge either forcefully or wilfully and either for money to family or for religion. These days, this greed and fanatic/obsessive mind-set towards religions have gone deeply into the minds of all, especially youths, which is a disturbing trend nowadays. These changes are due to the impact of mass media especially TV, Movies and internet.

Dreze and Khera (2004) conducted a study in the year 2004 titled “Crime, Gender, and Society in India: Insights from Homicide data.” In this study an analysis of inter-district variations in murder rates in India in 1981 was presented. One plausible explanation is that low female-male ratios and high murder rates are joint symptoms of a patriarchal environment.

Attempting to reduce and deter crime and criminals is known as crime prevention. It could be applied to the efforts carried out by governments and other agencies to reduce the crime by enforcing the law and maintaining criminal justice, and the preventive methods work in reducing the crime rates. However, integral aspects of culture, traditions, and socialization also should be considered in prevention of criminality by strict regulation of traditional underpinnings.

Crime prevention is an attempt to reduce victimization and to deter crime and criminals. It is applied correctly to efforts made by Governments to reduce crime, enforce the law and

Social Responsibility of Parents and Teachers in Prevention of Criminality and Crime: A Perceptual Analysis

maintain criminal justice. It also means anticipation, deterrence, stoppage, and avoidance of crimes. Primary prevention address individual and family level factors correlated with later criminal participation. Individual-level factors such as attachment to school and involvement in pro-social activities decrease the probability of criminal involvement. Family level factors such as consistent parenting skill similarly reduce individual-level risk. Secondary prevention uses techniques focusing on at-risk situations such as youth who are dropping out of school or getting involved in gangs. It targets social programs and law enforcement at neighbourhoods where crime rates are high. Tertiary prevention is used after a crime has occurred in order to prevent successive incidents. Such measures can be seen in the implementation of new security policies following acts of terrorism such as the September 11, 2001 attacks and Mumbai attack of November 2008.

As mentioned previously, the drastic increase in crime rate is more worrisome among researchers and administrators. We all agree that the present family and educational systems were partially or fully responsible for the present situation in our country. The awareness and understanding the role of parents and teachers in the prevention of criminality and crime will have lasting effects in preventing crimes in our future generations. This study is aimed to assess the social responsibility of parents and teachers in the prevention of criminality and crime.

METHOD

Sample

For the present study purpose, the convenience sampling method was employed, in which the selection of the sample was neither random nor systematic but instead is governed by availability. Sample for the present study consisted of both parents and teachers from government and private schools and was selected using convenience sampling method. There are 250 government and private schools in Mysore city, Karnataka. For the present study, 15 government schools and 15 private were selected. From each school, six teachers and ten parents of students studying in high school were selected. Hence, a total of 180 teachers and 300 parents were selected for the data collection.

Tools employed

- 1. Demographic Data Sheet:** The demographic sheet was developed by the researcher to collect the personal details of participants such as age, gender, education, and other personal details.
- 2. The social responsibility of parents and teachers in the prevention of criminality and crime:** The researcher developed a structured questionnaire specifically for present study, to obtain the data on the awareness of social responsibility and role in the prevention of criminality and crime among the participants. Thirty-two questions are included in the final version of the questionnaires based on the pilot study and alpha values. The items are positively worded. The following dimensions were constructed in the final scale, namely Awareness of roles, Awareness of Criminality and Crime, Patriotism, Respect for Women, Religious Tolerance, Avoidance of Destructive Behaviour, and Self-regulation. The Cronbach Alpha was found to be .91 indicating the reliability for the social responsibility scale.

**Social Responsibility of Parents and Teachers in Prevention of Criminality and Crime:
A Perceptual Analysis**

Procedure

The data collection process followed certain vital facets. Firstly, the researcher met the higher authorities like Principals, Vice principals, headmasters or Secretaries of the respective educational institutions and sought permission to carry out the data collection. Secondly, with the permission of the higher authorities in the respective educational institutions, the respective willing teachers were met and intimated about the study and administration of questionnaires. Through students, the willingness of parents sought, and the willing parents ‘informed consent’ forms were obtained. After obtaining the ‘Informed Consent’ from the parents, the questionnaires were distributed and later collected. The data collected was further statistically analysed in SPSS for descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. One way MANOVA followed by Post hoc tests and effect sizes were calculated.

RESULTS

Table 1

Mean scores for Teachers and Parents group participants and the study variables

	Teachers (n=180)		Parents (n = 300)		F	p	(η ²)
	M	SD	M	SD			
Factor 1	34.11	5.53	32.23	6.43	11.72	<.006	.02
Factor 2	28.27	4.43	26.68	5.07	12.22	<.006	.02
Factor 3	10.60	2.13	9.83	2.43	12.38	<.006	.02
Factor 4	10.51	1.92	10.19	2.23	2.61	.10	.05
Factor 5	11.28	1.51	11.19	1.94	0.26	.60	.01
Factor 6	10.91	1.41	10.59	1.54	5.19	.02	.01
Factor 7	7.80	1.04	8.00	1.10	3.94	.04	.01
Overall	113.60	12.27	108.73	15.15	13.35	<.006	.03

Note: F1: Awareness of roles, F2: Awareness of Criminality and Crime, F3: Patriotism, F4: Respect for Women, F5: Religious Tolerance, F6: Avoidance of Destructive Behaviour, and f7: Self-regulation.

When the results for the dependent variables were considered separately (Table 13), four differences reached statistical significance, using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .006. Factor 1, $F(1, 478) = 11.72, p < .006$, partial eta squared (η^2) = .02; Factor 2, $F(1, 478) = 12.22, p < .006$, partial eta squared (η^2) = .02; Factor 3, $F(1, 478) = 12.38, p < .006$, partial eta squared (η^2) = .02; Overall social responsibility, $F(1, 478) = 13.35, p < .006$, partial eta squared (η^2) = .02. An inspection of the mean scores indicated that teachers reported better factor 1 ($M = 34.11, SD = 5.53$), than parents ($M = 32.23, SD = 6.43$). On the factor 2 teachers had higher values ($M = 28.27, SD = 4.43$), than parents ($M = 26.68, SD = 5.07$). On the factor 3 teachers had higher values ($M = 10.60, SD = 2.13$) than parents ($M = 9.83, SD = 2.43$). On overall social responsibility teachers had higher values ($M = 113.60, SD = 12.27$), than parents ($M = 108.73, SD = 15.15$).

Table 2

Mean scores for various Age group participants and the study variables

	31-40(n=128)		41-50 (n=197)		51-60 (n=155)		F	p	(η ²)
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD			
Factor 1	33.22	5.73	33.64	5.86	31.91	6.80	3.59	.028	.01
Factor 2	27.50	4.66	27.93	4.51	26.25	5.41	5.42	<.006	.02
Factor 3	10.07	2.39	10.53	2.31	9.63	2.28	6.51	<.006	.02

**Social Responsibility of Parents and Teachers in Prevention of Criminality and Crime:
A Perceptual Analysis**

Table 2

Mean scores for various Age group participants and the study variables

	31-40(n=128)		41-50 (n=197)		51-60 (n=155)		F	p	(η ²)
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD			
Factor 4	9.90	2.25	10.42	2.04	10.50	2.08	3.32	.037	.01
Factor 5	11.49	1.64	11.26	1.73	10.96	1.96	3.07	.047	.01
Factor 6	10.62	1.61	10.85	1.41	10.59	1.51	1.63	.197	0.1
Factor 7	8.07	1.18	7.92	1.00	7.80	1.09	2.30	.102	.01
Overall	110.90	13.55	112.60	13.41	107.67	15.61	5.27	<.006	.02

Note: F1: Awareness of roles, F2: Awareness of Criminality and Crime, F3: Patriotism, F4: Respect for Women, F5: Religious Tolerance, F6: Avoidance of Destructive Behaviour, and f7: Self-regulation.

One-way MANOVA analyses confirmed that there was a multivariate effect: $F(7, 471) = 2.54, p < .01$; Wilks' Lambda (Λ) = .92; partial eta squared (η^2) = .03. When the results for the dependent variables were considered separately (Table 14), three differences reached statistical significance, using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .006. Factor 2, $F(2, 477) = 5.42, p < .006$, partial eta squared (η^2) = .02; Factor 3, $F(2, 477) = 6.51, p < .006$, partial eta squared (η^2) = .02; and overall social responsibility, $F(2, 477) = 5.27, p < .006$, partial eta squared (η^2) = .02; Tukey post-hoc test showed that 41-50 years group were significantly high on factor 2 than 51-60 ($p < .01$), 51-55 ($p < .01$). Tukey's analyses showed that 41-50 years age group were significantly high on factor 3 than 51-60 ($p < .01$) and 31-40 years ($p < .01$). For the overall social responsibility Tukey analyses showed that 41-50 years age group were significantly high than 51-60 ($p < .01$) and 31-40 years ($p < .01$).

Table 3

Mean scores for Male and Female group participants and the study variables

	Males (n=310)		Female (n = 170)		F	p	(η ²)
	M	SD	M	SD			
Factor 1	32.45	6.44	33.92	5.57	6.23	.013	.01
Factor 2	26.89	5.02	27.98	4.60	5.46	.020	.01
Factor 3	10.05	2.40	10.24	2.25	0.73	.393	.01
Factor 4	10.38	2.12	10.18	2.12	0.93	.335	.01
Factor 5	11.06	1.85	11.52	1.64	7.45	.007	.01
Factor 6	10.72	1.50	10.67	1.49	0.13	.714	.01
Factor 7	7.82	1.04	8.10	1.14	7.18	.008	.01
Overall	109.41	14.68	112.65	13.43	5.67	.018	.01

Note: F1: Awareness of roles, F2: Awareness of Criminality and Crime, F3: Patriotism, F4: Respect for Women, F5: Religious Tolerance, F6: Avoidance of Destructive Behaviour, and f7: Self-regulation.

A one-way between-groups multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed to investigate group differences in social responsibility (Table 15). Eight dependent variables were used: factor 1, factor 2, factor 3, factor 4, factor 5, factor 6, factor 7, and overall social responsibility. There was a statistically significant difference between males and females on the combined dependent variables, $F(7, 472) = 2.64, p < .01$; Wilks' Lambda (Λ) = .96; partial eta squared (η^2) = .03. When the results for the dependent variables were considered

**Social Responsibility of Parents and Teachers in Prevention of Criminality and Crime:
A Perceptual Analysis**

separately (Table 15), no significant difference found, using a Boneferroni adjusted alpha level of .006.

Table 4

Mean scores for Private and Govt. School participants and the study variables

	Private (n=240)		Govt. (n = 240)		F	p	(η ²)
	M	SD	M	SD			
Factor 1	31.61	6.43	34.53	5.61	24.35	<.006	.04
Factor 2	26.38	5.10	28.17	4.52	16.53	<.006	.03
Factor 3	9.68	2.49	10.56	2.11	17.29	<.006	.03
Factor 4	10.11	2.30	10.51	1.91	4.19	0.041	.01
Factor 5	10.95	1.86	11.50	1.68	11.50	<.006	.02
Factor 6	10.61	1.61	10.80	1.37	1.87	0.171	.01
Factor 7	7.79	1.04	8.06	1.11	7.51	<.006	.01
Overall	107.16	14.86	113.95	12.91	28.57	<.006	.05

Note: F1: Awareness of roles, **F2:** Awareness of Criminality and Crime, **F3:** Patriotism, **F4:** Respect for Women, **F5:** Religious Tolerance, **F6:** Avoidance of Destructive Behaviour, and **F7:** Self-regulation.

When the results for the dependent variables were considered separately (Table 16), six differences reached statistical significance, using a Boneferroni adjusted alpha level of .006. Factor 1, $F(1, 478) = 24.35, p < .006$, partial eta squared (η^2) = .04; Factor 2, $F(1, 478) = 16.53, p < .006$, partial eta squared (η^2) = .03; Factor 3, $F(1, 478) = 17.29, p < .006$, partial eta squared (η^2) = .03; Factor 5, $F(1, 478) = 11.50, p < .006$, partial eta squared (η^2) = .02; Factor 7, $F(1, 478) = 7.51, p < .006$, partial eta squared (η^2) = .01; Overall social responsibility, $F(1, 478) = 28.57, p < .006$, partial eta squared (η^2) = .05. An inspection of the mean scores indicated that Govt. school participants reported better factor 1 ($M = 34.33, SD = 5.61$), than private school participants ($M = 31.61, SD = 6.43$). On the factor 2 Govt. school participants had higher values ($M = 28.17, SD = 4.52$), than private ($M = 26.68, SD = 5.07$). On the factor 3 Govt. school participants had higher values ($M = 10.56, SD = 2.11$) than private ($M = 9.83, SD = 2.43$).

On the factor 5 Govt. school participants had higher values ($M = 11.50, SD = 1.68$), than private ($M = 10.95, SD = 1.86$). On the factor 7 Govt. school participants had higher values ($M = 8.06, SD = 1.11$) than private ($M = 7.79, SD = 1.04$). On overall social responsibility Govt. school participants had higher values ($M = 113.95, SD = 12.91$), than private school participants ($M = 107.16, SD = 14.86$).

DISCUSSION

MAJOR FINDINGS

- Teachers and parents differed significantly in three factors of social roles and responsibility-awareness of roles, awareness of criminality & crime, patriotism and total scores where teachers had higher scores than parents.
- Age wise we find significant differences in factors of awareness & crime, patriotism and total social responsibility scores where we find that respondents in the age group of 51-60 had lower scores and others high
- There were no gender differences across the factors and overall social responsibility scores, indicating that both males and females have scored similarly.

Social Responsibility of Parents and Teachers in Prevention of Criminality and Crime: A Perceptual Analysis

- Government school teachers had higher scores on most of the factors and in total scores, indicating higher social responsibility.

The present study intended to study the social responsibility of the parents and teachers contributing to the prevention of criminality and crime among children. The study expected no differences between teachers and parents in the social responsibility scores, however, the study found that there was a significant difference between teachers and parents in factor 1, 2 and 3 and also there was a significant difference overall social responsibility scores. The moral and ethical issues are cropping up in the society as morals and ethics are depleting, and unethical means have become the norm of the day, it is expected parents and teachers to be more responsible socially and create better environments among families and school and educational settings. There are many incidents of killing or bullying or harassing by students in India as well as across the world (Deccan Herald; 2007; Srivatsava 2007). Till a certain point of time parents have complete responsibility and schools will have the same responsibility of not only imparting education but also to inculcate social values and tolerance among children as a social responsibility. Earlier in Indian schools there used to be a specific hour for moral education, and today it is missing as a result of over workload of teachers, though teachers are expected to be aware of social and emotional wellbeing of their wards and even parents have become more and more permissive and pampering of the children could be seen where sense of responsibility is not being inculcated among children that may lead to a many issues. Social responsibility could be equated with moral education and character building as they all are amalgamated firmly with each other. Social responsibility is a matter of great concern to the parents, teachers, and students themselves (Krumboltz, Ford, Nichols, & Wentzel, 1987).

The present study found age differences for factor 2, 3, and overall social responsibility scores. The scrutiny of table 14 indicated that the middle group with the range of 41 to 50 years had scored more on the social responsibility scores followed by age group 31 to 40 years. Moreover, low scores are made by people with the age range of 51 to 60 years, consistently.

This is indeed a fascinating outcome and useful indicator of maturity and responsibility of the middle range aged participants in comparison to the young and old age range people. Social selectivity theory states that how individuals perceive time has a strong influence on the selection of their goals and depends on the individual's chronological age (Reed & Carstensen, 2012). While younger individuals have more future-oriented goals that involve the gathering of information for their accomplishment in the long term (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Finkenauer, & Vohs, 2001), older individuals perceive that their time is becoming limited. Even Abraham Maslow (1970) opines that during the middle age particularly after 40 years a person becomes more esteem oriented, and responsible towards society and work towards society for the betterment of society and recognition. Self-esteem needs are related to early middle age, which is around 45 years of age (Ojha & Pramanick, 2009).

The current study found that there were no gender differences across the factors and overall social responsibility scores, indicating that both males and females have scored similarly. Usually, women tend to exhibit a higher level of socially responsible behaviour as compared to their male counterpart (Entwisle, Alexander, Cadigan, & Pallas, 2000). A meta-analysis study conducted by Eagly and Crowley (1986) revealed that men are more likely to help

Social Responsibility of Parents and Teachers in Prevention of Criminality and Crime: A Perceptual Analysis

others compared to females. A study conducted by Afriani, Baharudin, Siti Nor, and Nurdeng(2012) found gender differences in social responsibility scores. However, in the present study there were no gender differences in the social responsibility scores. According to Lin and Hyde (2001), this inconsistency in the finding may be explained by the fact that psychosocial differences among males and females are heterogeneous and interact with situational and cultural factors.

The present study expected no differences between types of school in social responsibility scores of the teachers. However, the study, on the contrary, it found that there were significant differences in most of the factors and overall social responsibility scores. The significant differences were found between private school teachers and government school teachers in factors 1,2,3,5,7 and overall social responsibility scores. Government school teachers have found to have higher scores compared to private school teachers. Private schools could be more focused on teaching, and completion of the syllabus, getting ranks, getting right public image by focusing more on academic aspects, whereas government schools teachers as a policy may have to focus other extracurricular aspects.

This study has concerted on the social responsibility of the teachers and parents on the prevention of criminality and crime. **“Guru Brahma, Guru Vishnu, Guru Devo Maheshwaraha, Guru SaakShaath ParahBrahma ThaSmai Shree GuruveY Namaha”** Sanskrit proverb meaning, teachers are the gods and the creators. It is important to remember that the little child depends more on his teacher than the advanced student does on his professor. A teacher plays a pivotal role in shaping the future of a student and thus society. We should have competent teachers who are interested in the education process with a sense of contribution to the betterment of society and nation. And in turn all the good contributors are attributed for creating a better society or being part of it. If the schooling is not proper then our future of the society will be in dark. In other words, it's like reaping what we have sowed.

This study provides a wide scope and vision in the field of **“Preventive Criminology”** in the new horizon that still provides a wide vision in the prevention of criminality and crime and the possibility of making society a better place to live.

REFERENCES

- Afriani, A., Baharudin, R., Siti Nor, Y. and Nurdeng, D (2012). The Relationship between Parenting Style and Social Responsibility of Adolescents in Banda Aceh, Indonesia. *Pertanika J. Soc. Sci. & Hum.* 20 (3): 733 – 750.
- Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Bad is stronger than good. *Review of General Psychology*, 5, 323–370.
- Canter, D., & Youngs, D. (2016) *Crime and society, Contemporary Social Science*, 11:4, 283-288.
- Deccan Herald 2007 Two boys gun down classmate. Bangalore, India: *Deccan Herald*; 2007. p.1. 12th December.
- Dreze, J., & Khera, R. (2000). Crime, gender, and society in India: Insights from homicide data. *Population and development review*, 26(2), 335-352.
- Entwisle, D. R., Alexander, K. L., Cadigan, D. and Pallas, A. (2000). The schooling process in the first grade: *Two samples a decade apart. America Educational Research Journal*, 23, 587-613.

**Social Responsibility of Parents and Teachers in Prevention of Criminality and Crime:
A Perceptual Analysis**

- Krumboltz, J., Ford, M., Nichols, C., & Wentzel, K. (1987). The goals of education. In R. C. Calfee (Ed.), *The study of Stanford and the schools: Views from the inside: Part II*. Stanford, CA: School of Education.
- Lin, M. C., & Hyde, J. S. (2001). Gender, mathematics and science. *Educational Research*, 18, 17-27.
- National Crime Records Bureau (2016). ncrb.gov.in › CII › NEWPDFs › Crime in India - 2016 Complete PDF 291117
- Ojha, H., & Pramanick, M. (2009), Effects of Age on Intensity and Priority of Life Needs *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*. 35(1), 131-136.
- Reed, A. E. & Carstensen, L. L. (2012) The theory behind the age-related positivity effect. *Frontiers In Psychology*, 3, 3-39
- Srivatsava, P. (2007). Are we playing without kids minds. *Sunday times of India: Mysore*, 13.

Acknowledgement

The author appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Kumar A.S, D'souza L. & Rangaiah B (2021) Social Responsibility of Parents and Teachers in Prevention of Criminality and Crime: A Perceptual Analysis. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 9(4), 2365-2373. DIP:18.01.223.20210904, DOI:10.25215/0904.223