

Frustration Tolerance among Convicted Women of Northern India

Abstract

The observations based on trends and pattern of female criminality made to accept that women commit a small share of all crimes. Women's crimes are fewer, less serious and more rarely professional than men's are. Thus, this is a basic issue which has emerged in the present world. In view of such conditions, the investigator got the direction to find out the influence of some psychological variables compelling the women to commit the crime. The study was conducted on the women who were convicted and belonged to three states of Northern India i.e. Punjab, Delhi and Uttar Pradesh. Frustration Tolerance and family environment of convicted women have been explored as causes of committing the crime.

Keywords: Frustration Tolerance, Convicted Women, Home Environment.

Introduction

Female criminality was relatively neglected and was treated in certain specific ways until the late twentieth century. The observations based on trends and pattern of female criminality made to accept that women commit a small share of all crimes. Women's crimes are fewer, less serious and more rarely professional than men's are. Thus, this is a basic issue which has emerged in the present world. The crime among women is increasing and taking different forms and dimensions. The female criminality in developed countries is acquiring an alarming situation with the increase in number of young women being drawn into an organized crime. However, in developing countries deprivation and destitutions is playing major role in deviating the women into crimes. The motives behind the criminal activities of women vary with the culture of different countries or regions. Generally, In Pakistan, women are not considered as murderers. There exists mainly male-dominant society in Pakistan because of which women are portrayed as victims instead of murderers. In contrast to this, sometimes these innocent, sensitive women become murderers. They commit murder as a result of psycho-social reasons like revenge, disappointment in relationships, for protecting themselves, property related issues and domestic violence (Walayat, Hasan & Ajmal, 2013). Considering the African American convicted women, the motives experienced by them are both conscious and unconscious for pathological pleasure and the motives experienced through some pain like coping with poverty (Carol, 2003)

Involvement of women in gangs is increasing day by day which is risk factor for their violent behavior. These gang women have low level of frustration tolerance, high level of disregard for others and aggression (Mackenzie & Johnson, 2003). Poverty, abuse in childhood, instability in relationships and influence of peers are some of the risk factors of female offenders (De Vogel & De Vries Robb , 2013; Blanchette & Brown, 2006; Chesney - Lind & Shelden, 2004). Involvement in drugs also leads to the violence among the female adolescents. The motives behind their indulgence in crimes are loss or victimization in their early childhood and lack of support and supervision of parents (Ryder, 2003)

The convicted women can be categorized in violent and non-violent female offenders. Violent female offenders exhibit the characteristics of emotional instability, low frustration tolerance and impulsivity in comparison to the non-violent female offenders and violent male offenders (Henning, Jones & Holdford, 2003; Leenaars, 2005). Now, its gravity has increased. In India, 1.7 percent female criminality was reported in 1971, which increased to 2.2 percent in 1981 and 3.4 percent in 1991. The further increase of 5.4 percent has been reported in 2002. Its alarming figure in the recent past has attracted the attention of our social and political system, which has to find the direction and plan in a determined manner to check its faster growth.



S K Bawa

Professor & Dean,
School of Education,
Central University of Punjab,
Bathinda

In view of such conditions, the investigator got the direction to find out the influence of some psychological variables compelling the women to commit the crime. Thus, the present study was conducted

1. to examine the level of frustration tolerance among convicted women
2. to explore the type of family environment of convicted women
3. to find out the influence of family environment on frustration tolerance of convicted women.

It was hypothesized that

1. The level of frustration tolerance is low among convicted women
2. Convicted women do not have congenial home environment
3. There is no difference in frustration tolerance of convicted women in relation to their home environment.

Methodology

The study was conducted on the women who have been convicted and belonged to three states of Northern India i.e. Punjab (143), Delhi (96) and Uttar Pradesh (100). Frustration Tolerance of the subjects was measured with frustration tolerance scale by S.N. Rai. Mean, SD, Q₁ and Q₃ values were calculated. The three groups were formed on the basis of Q₁ and Q₃ scores. The subjects, who scored less than 5 were grouped as less frustration group (LFT), those who scored between 5 and 8 were termed as moderate frustration group (MFT). The subjects who scored more than 8 were grouped as high frustration group (HFT). To reveal the type family environment of convicted women, family environment scale by Harpreet Bhatia and N.K. Chadha was employed. Mean, SD and quartiles were calculated. The subjects, who scored less than 227 were grouped in poor family environment group (PFE), those who scored between 227 and 266 constituted moderate family environment group (MFE) and who scored more than 266 were grouped as good family environment group (GFE).

Findings

Frustration Tolerance (in Terms of Attempts)

It has been observed from the table -1 that 28% convicted women have high frustration tolerance, 24% of them have low level of frustration tolerance but 47% convicted women can tolerate frustration of moderate level. It indicates that majority of the convicted women have moderate level of frustration tolerance.

The convicted women of Punjab, Delhi and Uttar Pradesh were compared on level of frustration tolerance in terms of attempts. It was found that 80% convicted women of Punjab, 4% of Delhi and 16% women convicts of Uttar Pradesh have less frustration tolerance when measured in terms of attempts, whereas 26% convicted women of Punjab, 47% of them from Delhi and 27% women convicts of Uttar Pradesh have high frustration tolerance.

Variance in Frustration Tolerance (Attempts) of Convicted Women of Northern India

When frustration tolerance of convicted women of Punjab, Delhi and Uttar Pradesh was studied, it revealed that there is a significant difference in the frustration tolerance of convicted women of Punjab, Delhi and Uttar Pradesh. It indicated that convicted women of Uttar Pradesh have more frustration tolerance than women convicts of Delhi and Punjab. The convicted women of Punjab have very less frustration tolerance than women convicts of Delhi and Uttar Pradesh as shown in table 4.

The results revealed the significant difference in the frustration tolerance of convicted women of Punjab & Delhi, Delhi & Uttar Pradesh and Punjab & Uttar Pradesh. The convicted women of Uttar Pradesh have more frustration tolerance than convicted women of Delhi and Punjab. It also indicated that convicts of Delhi have more frustration tolerance than women convicts of Punjab. The results revealed that convicted women of Punjab have less frustration tolerance than women convicts of Delhi and Uttar Pradesh.

Frustration Tolerance (in Terms of Time)

The results indicate that 4.42% convicted women have less frustration tolerance (time), 62.83% of them have moderate level of frustration tolerance (time) and 32.75% convicted women can tolerate frustration at high level. The findings indicated that majority of the convicted women have moderate level of frustration tolerance in terms of time taken by them.

When convicted women of Punjab, Delhi and Uttar Pradesh were compared on level of frustration tolerance in terms of time, it was found that 54% convicted women of Punjab and 46% women convicts of Uttar Pradesh have less frustration tolerance in terms of time whereas 16% convicted women of Punjab, 50% women convicts of Delhi and 34% of them from Uttar Pradesh have high frustration tolerance.

Variance in Frustration Tolerance (time) of Convicted Women of Northern India

There is a significance difference in the frustration tolerance of convicted women of Punjab, Delhi and Uttar Pradesh. The results indicate that convicted women of Uttar Pradesh have more frustration tolerance than women convicts of Punjab and Delhi. The results explored the significant differences in the frustration tolerance measured in terms of time of convicted women of Punjab & Delhi, Delhi & Uttar Pradesh and Punjab & Uttar Pradesh. The results show that the convicted women of Uttar Pradesh have more frustration tolerance than women convicts of Delhi and Punjab. It also indicates that convicts of Delhi have more frustration tolerance than convicted women of Punjab and women convicts of Punjab have less frustration tolerance than convicted women of Delhi and Uttar Pradesh.

The hypothesis of the present study stated that convicted women do not have low level of frustration tolerance. It stands partially accepted because women convicts of Uttar Pradesh have high

frustration tolerance whereas convicted women of Punjab have less frustration tolerance. Chandra (1990), Davin (1994) have explored that women criminals are high on introgression, blame avoidance, evading frustration, need persistence and group conformity. The independent offenders are more psychologically disturbed than the co-offenders.

Family Environment of Convicted Women

The findings indicate that 25% of the convicted women have good family environment, 50% of them have moderate and 25% of them have poor family environment. The results showed that majority of the convicted women have moderate level of family environment as shown in table 10.

It has been observed from the table 10 that 72.09% of convicted women of Punjab have good family environment and only 11.63% convicted women of Delhi and 16.28% women convicts of Uttar Pradesh have good family environment. On the other hand, 42.17% convicted women of Delhi have poor family environment, 34.94% women convicts of Delhi and only 22.89% convicted women of Punjab have poor family environment. Majority of them have moderate level of family environment.

Variance in Family Environment of Convicted Women of Northern India

To know the family environment of convicted women of Punjab, Delhi and Uttar Pradesh, It has been revealed that family environment of convicted women of Punjab is better than the family environment of convicts of Delhi & Uttar Pradesh.

Sharma (1985) found in the dynamics of mass murder, one has to appreciate the culture and the background in which this person was born and brought up. Gilfus (1989) found that family violence and social deprivation motivate women towards crime while women's commitments to care taking relationships limit the scope of women's participation in crime. Sommers and others (1994) predict that an adequate understanding of female offending should consider the impact of neighbourhood, peer and addiction factors that affect both male and female participation in criminal violence. McKay (1994) in his study family and environmental influences on the prevention of anti-social behaviour found that environmental stress was significant. Genteel (1994) stressed the issue of immediate family relationship of convicts. Hislop (1995) found that female child molesters were not significantly different from a matched control group in terms of history of number of male sex partners, income, family origin pathology or severity of sexual abuse history. Redriquez and others (1995) explored that out of dating, cohabitation, marriage and divorce, cohabitation was found to be the only relationship in which women out numbered men as homicide offenders. Shepard (1995) predicted that a significant relationship exists between the 'pile up' of family life events and teen suicide attempts. Saxena and Rani (1996) perceived that happiness was higher among nuclear families as compared to those from joint families. House (2001) found that social and environmental stressors such as poverty, racism, unemployment, poor education, delinquency, violence, pregnancy and substance use are key

factors that have impact on mental health. Laque (2002) explored the life experiences of female sex offenders and investigated that negative family influence has a strong impact on convicts.

The hypothesis of the study stated that convicted women do not have congenial family environment. The findings of the present study partially supported the hypothesis. Thus, the hypothesis stands partially accepted. The results of the study revealed that majority of the convicted women have moderate level of family environment, whereas, 72% convicted women of Punjab have good environment and 42% of convicted women of Delhi have poor family environment.

Conclusions

Based on psychological influence, it can be concluded that

1. Majority of the convicted women have moderate level of frustration tolerance.
2. Convicted women of Uttar Pradesh have more frustration tolerance than women convicts of Delhi and Punjab. The convicted women of Punjab have very less frustration tolerance than women convicts of Delhi and Uttar Pradesh.
3. There are significant differences in the level of frustration tolerance among women convicts of Punjab & Delhi and Punjab & Uttar Pradesh .
4. Majority of the convicted women have moderate level of their family environment.
5. There is a significant difference in family environment of convicted women of Punjab, Delhi and Uttar Pradesh. However, the family environment of convicted women of Punjab is better than the family environment of women convicts of Delhi and Uttar Pradesh.

References

1. Allen, T. Earl. "An Assessment of Factors Related to the Continued Criminal Behaviour of Female Felons (Women Offenders, Rural Women)." *Dissertation Abstracts International*. 54. (1994): 3210.
2. Andreescu, U. "Beyond Myth, Toward Reality: Homicidal Violence in Appalachia in the 1990s." *Dissertation Abstracts International*. 62. 1 (2000) : 338.
3. Atri, P. K. *Readings in Crime and Criminology, New Delhi: Anmol Publications Pvt. Ltd., 1998.*
4. Bajpai. "A Study in Motive Behind Criminal Victimization." *Indian Journal of Criminology*, 16. 2 (1988): 116-188.
5. Bajpai, Anju; and Bajpai, P. K. "Female Criminality in India." *New Delhi: Rawat Publications, 2000.*
6. Blanchette, K; and Brown, S. L. "The assessment and treatment of female offender: An integrative perspective." *West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons. 2006.*
7. Carol, B. J. D. "Now think about that? Understanding aggression of African American women on probation and parole." *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64. 3 (2003): 1074.
8. Chesney-Lind, M., and Shelden, R. G. "Girls, Delinquency, and Juvenile Justice." 2004. CA: Thompson Wadsworth, Belmont.

9. De Vogel, V; and De Vries Robbé, M. "Working with women: Towards a more gender-sensitive violence risk assessment." In L. Johnstone and C. Logan (Eds.), London: *In Managing Clinical Risk: A guide to effective practice.*
10. English, K. "Self-reported Crime Rates of Women Prisoners." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 19.4 (1994) 357-382.
11. Fabian, J. Matthew "Adult Criminal Behavior and Morality: Analysis of Reasoning of Offenders and Non-Offenders." *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61. 8 (1999): 3360.
12. Fagan, Abiligail. "The Cycle of Violence Expanded: Assessing the Impact of Gender and Type of Perpetrator on the Relationship between Adolescent Violent Victimization and Adult Offending and Drug Use." *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62. 2 (2001): 783.
13. Feng, Hullin. "Predicting Recidivism of Female Parolees Released from the Utah State Prison from 1990 to 1993." *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58. 1 (1997): 298.
14. Freud. "Criminology and Penology." Allahabad: Central Law Publications, 2003.
15. Kapur, Promilla. "The Changing Status of the Working Woman in India." Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., 1974.
16. Kirby, Patricia Lee. "The Feminization of Serial Killing: A Gender Identity Study of Male and Female Serial lists Using Covert Methods of Murder." *Dissertation Abstracts International*. 59.7 (1998): 727.
17. Kramer, Ruth. "Alcohol and Victimization Factors in the Histories of Abused Women Who Came to Courts: A Retrospective Case Control Study." *Dissertation Abstracts International*. 50.10 (1989): 3372.
18. Henning, K. et al. Holdford, R. "Treatment needs of women arrested for domestic violence: A comparison with male offenders." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18 (2003): 839-856.
19. Leenaars, P.E.M. "Differences between violent male and violent female forensic psychiatric outpatients: Consequences for treatment." *Psychology, Crime & Law*. 11. (2005): 445-455.
20. Mackenzie, Andrew, and Sara L. Johnson. "A profile of women gang members in Canada." *Correctional Service of Canada, Research Branch*, 2003.
21. Ryder, Judith A. "Antecedents of violent behavior: Early childhood trauma in the lives of adolescent female offenders." *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56. 6 (2003): 4485-4485.
22. Walayat, Saba, S. Salma Hasan, and M. AsirAjmal. "Why Do Pakistani Women Kill?" *Pakistan Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology* 11.1 (2013): 22-28
23. Zanone, Charles F. "Predictors of Criminality and Personality Subtypes among Women Prisoners." *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59. 8 (1999): 4525.

Table -1
Level of Frustration Tolerance (attempts) of Convicted Women

Level	N	%	Q
LFT	82	24	Q ₁ <5
MFT	161	47	Between 5&8
HFT	96	28	Q ₃ >8

Mean = 6.70 SD = 3.25

Table-2
Level of Frustration Tolerance (attempt) of Convicted Women of Punjab, Delhi, Uttar Pradesh (Percentages)

States	LFT		MFT		HFT	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Punjab	66	80	52	32	25	26
Delhi	03	04	48	30	45	47
Uttar Pradesh	13	16	61	38	26	27
Total	82	100	161	100	96	100

Q₁ = <5 Q₃ = > 8

Table 3
Summary of ANOVA of Frustration Tolerance (attempts) of Convicted Women

ANOVA	SS	df	MS	F
Between means	542.86	2	271.43	29.93
Within groups	3046.72	336	9.067	P<.01
Total	3589.58	338		

Table 4
Difference in Level of Frustration Tolerance (attempts) of Convicted Women of three States

	Punjab	Delhi	Uttar Pradesh	Level of Significance
Mean	5.34	7.02	8.35	Punjab vs. Delhi t = 4.07 P<.01
SD	3.21	2.93	2.76	Delhi vs. Uttar Pradesh t = 3.264 P<.01
N	143	96	100	Punjab vs. Uttar Pradesh t = 7.56 P<.01

Table 5
Level of Frustration Tolerance (time) of Convicted Women

Level	N	%	Q
LFT _T	15	4.42	Q ₁ <5
MFT _T	213	62.83	Between 5&8
HFT _T	111	32.75	Q ₃ >8

Mean = 7.05 SD = 2.55

Table 6
Level of Frustration Tolerance (time) of Punjab, Delhi, Uttar Pradesh (Percentage)

States	LFT _T		MFT _T		FTT _T	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Punjab	08	54	117	55	18	16
Delhi	00	00	41	19	55	50
Uttar Pradesh	07	46	55	26	38	34
Total	15	100	213	100	111	100

Q₁ = <5 Q₃ = > 8

Table 7
Summary of ANOVA of Frustration Tolerance (time) of Convicted Women

ANOVA	SS	df	MS	F
Between means	454.1653	2	227.08	43.39
Within groups	1758.379	336	5.233	P<.01
Total	2212.544	338		

Table 8
Difference in Level of Frustration Tolerance (Time) of Convicted Women of three States

	Punjab	Delhi	Uttar Pradesh	Level of Significance
Mean	5.90	7.07	8.68	Punjab vs. Delhi t = 4.60 P<.01
SD	1.84	2.04	2.97	Delhi vs. Uttar Pradesh t = 4.38 P<.01
N	143	96	100	Punjab vs. Uttar Pradesh t = 8.96 P<.01

Table 9
Level of Family Environment of Convicted Women

Level	N	%	Q
PFE	83	25	Q ₁ <227
MFE	170	50	Between 227 & 266
GFE	86	25	Q ₃ >266

Mean = 246.42 SD = 28.27

Table 10
Family Environment of Convicted Women of Punjab, Delhi, Uttar Pradesh (Percentages)

States	PFE		MFE		GFE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Punjab	19	22.89	62	36.47	62	72.09
Delhi	35	42.17	51	30.00	10	11.63
Uttar Pradesh	29	34.94	57	33.53	14	16.28
Total	83	100	170	100	86	100

Q₁ = <154.5 Q₃ = >211

Table 11
Summary of ANOVA of Family Environment of Convicted Women

ANOVA	SS	df	MS	F
Between means	49472.73	2	24736.36	37.652
Within groups	220739.6	336	656.963	P<.01
Total	270212.3	338		

Table 12
Difference in Family Environment of Convicted Women of three states

	Punjab	Delhi	Uttar Pradesh	Level of Significance
Mean	259.93	240.92	232.05	Punjab vs. Delhi t - 5.72 P<.01
SD	26.44	23.14	26.69	Delhi vs. Uttar Pradesh t = 2.46 P<0.05
N	143	93	100	Uttar Pradesh vs. Punjab t = 8.03 P<.01