

THE LINK BETWEEN FRUSTRATION, FEAR AND ANGER AMONG VIOLENT CRIME OFFENDERS AND LEVELS OF VIOLENT CRIMES IN UASIN GISHU COUNTY, KENYA

James K. Chumba 1

Department of Sociology and Psychology,
School of Arts and Social Sciences,
Moi University

ABSTRACT

Introduction: In Kenya, violent crimes and economic hardship have increased positively during the last ten years and yet little data is available to explicate this connection. Violent crimes pose a threat to the individuals and groups, and impacts negatively on social, economic and political developments of many countries. They also tend to be the most feared than any other criminal typology and the factors associated with it yet remain unclear. Most crimes often end up in violence. The study sought to determine whether frustration, fear and anger among violent crime offenders is linked to levels of violent crimes

Research methods: Descriptive research design was employed to collect data. From a target population comprising of 501 offenders, 217 prisoners were randomly sampled. Both key informant interview guide and structured questionnaire were administered to the representative sample. Data was collected and presented in percentages and links between variables established by use of Chi-square (χ^2) and Pearson Correlation analysis at 0.05 level of significance.

Results and analysis: The study found that there was a significant relationship between frustration and types of violent crimes ($p=0.004$); level of fear of economic hardship and types of violent of crimes ($p=0.000$) and anger and type of violent crimes ($p=0.010$).

Conclusion: The study concluded that economic hardship leads to violence and crime. Economic hardship creates feelings of hopelessness and anger, which may increase aggression and hostility. Economic deprivation also reduces social trust and facilitates frustration-aggression, which in turn leads to violence and crime. The above indicates that economic deprivation may affect community and family processes in such a way that violence increases.

Key words: Frustration, fear, anger, economic hardships, crimes, violence, violent crimes.

Author correspondence:

Author,

James K. Chumba; Holds a BA in Sociology, and a MA in Sociology from Moi University, Kenya.

Email: chumbasj@gmail.com

1.0 Introduction

The influence of economic hardship on types of violent crimes among prisoners in Kenya is an interesting area to study among sociologists and criminologists as a way of finding solutions to ameliorate the effects. This would need a thorough establishment of the level of violent crimes much more in counties. For this study, prisoners in Uasin Gishu County became a focal point of the study. Data on the correlation between economic hardship and violent crimes are elaborate across jurisdictions, especially on the specific pointers of economic hardship that amplify violent crimes (Fajnzyblber, Lederman & Loayza, 2002). Besides, data, in particular, reveal the types of violent crimes that intensify in times of economic hardship. In Kenya, violent crimes have increased in recent days and range from assault to severe cases of murder. This has been impelled by a sharp increase in death and injuries occurring as a result of violent crimes. Traditionally, according to Reid, Herzog, and Patterson; crime has been thought of as a lower-class phenomenon in which the poor who are unable to obtain their desired goods and services through the conventional means resort to illegal means to obtain them or engage in expressive crimes as a means of articulating their frustrations and annoyance against society (Reid, 2007, Herzog, 2005 and Patterson, 1990).

Further, close empirical relationships have been reported between crime and human capital acquisition (Lonnie, 2002), accessibility of firearms (Lafree, 2009), economic inequality (Lafree, 2009), ineffective families, substance abuse, and regional values (Siegel, 2007). Vold and Snipes, (2002) emphasized the association between economic hardship which places individuals on various social classes, and the likelihood of violent offending. Indeed, levels of violent crimes and levels of development of any nation are linked. Moreover, economic success cannot be realized if the wellbeing of Kenyans and their material goods are in jeopardy. Yet, these relations are complex and vary from country to country and also from one region to another even within the same country. Therefore, there is a need to comprehend why economic hardship boosts violent crimes more than other crime typologies, principally during periods of economic hardship.

Economic prosperity cannot be realized if the safety of Kenyans and their properties are in jeopardy. The causes of crime are as complex as the society itself (Neal, 2012). This study found it important in this background a real need to identify types of violent crimes and establish whether they are linked to economic hardship and how they can be addressed. East Africa region as a whole is a region of high crime rates due to several factors. Currently, Kenya is rated by the U.S Department of the state as critical in terms of both terrorism and crime hence making the U.S Embassy in Nairobi the fourth largest in the world. United Nations (2002) surveys in Kenya revealed that over half of the population worries about crime constantly and roughly 75% feel unsafe while at home (Aronson, 2010).

There is a strong connection between economic inequality and homicide rates (Lafree, 2009, Akers, 2000). In 2011, the Kenya police noted an increase in reported cases of crimes in the following categories; breakings, robbery, homicide, and other offenses at 14%, 15%, 18%, and 1% respectively (Kenya Police Annual Crime Report, 2011). The current economic hardship in Kenya such as difficulties in making ends meet, unemployment and underemployment, low wages and salaries, high cost of living among others may be linked to the many incidences of violent crimes such as murder and non-negligent manslaughter, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. These violent crimes are ever-increasing. The Kenya Police Annual Crime Report,

(2014) ranks Uasin Gishu County at 12 out of 47 Counties with 1872 incidents (cases) with a 209 crime index per 100,000 people. A few guidelines or frameworks exist to guide policymakers and program managers in developing and implementing the comprehensive response necessary to address criminal justice consequences of violence and to reduce the determinants of violent behavior within communities. Crime plays a negative role as far as the development of a nation is concerned (Cullen, Wright and Belvins, 2006). The study sought to determine whether frustration, fear and anger among violent crime offenders is linked to levels of violent crimes in Uasin Gishu County, Kenya.

2.0 Research Methods:

The descriptive research design was employed in which violent crime offenders formed the basis of analysis. According to Gay *et al.*, (2006), a descriptive research design entails the collection of the quantitative data to test the hypothesis or to answer questions regarding the subjects of the study. It is characterized by the systematic collection of information from the given population by administering questionnaires and interviewing. This design was appropriate because it is used when collecting information about people's attitudes, opinions, habits, or any of the variety of social issues (Kombo and Tromp, 2009). The study aimed at describing the influence of economic hardships on the types of violent crimes among the violent crime offenders at Eldoret G.K Prisons and Ngeria Farm Prisons. The study was conducted in Uasin-Gishu County which is located in the North Rift region of the former Rift valley province of Kenya. The target population is the entire set of possible cases for which the survey data is used to make inferences and it comprises of the eligible group that is included in research work (Kothari, 2013). Kombo and Tromp, (2006) defined the target population as the entire group a researcher is interested in; the group about which the researcher wishes to conclude. The study focused on adult violent crime offenders at Eldoret Main G.K and Ngeria Farm G.K Prisons in Uasin Gishu County of Kenya. The target population comprised a total of 501 offenders at the Eldoret G.K Prisons (n=383) and Ngeria Farm Prisons (n=118) as shown in table 1 below. Key informants including magistrates, prosecutors, and officers in charge of the prison facilities were used to support the responses given by the violent crime offenders. The population was suitable for the study since it comprised of violent offenders who provided the most relevant information for the study.

Table 1: Target Population

Respondents	Target Population	Gender	
		Men	Women
Eldoret G.K prison	1658	1426	232
Ngeria Farm GK prison	513	513	0
Total	2171	1939	232

Source: Prison Records (February, 2015)

Gupta, (2000) asserts that there are various methods of determining sample size. The sampling frame of the study consisted of violent crime offenders drawn from convicted offenders at Eldoret G.K Prisons and Ngeria Farm Prisons. From prison records a list of violent offenders in Eldoret G.K prisons and Ngeria farm G.K prisons respectively were drawn which formed the sampling frame. The study obtained 501 violent crime offenders from both prison institutions. Sampling technique is the procedure a researcher uses to gather people, places, or things to study (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). First, Uasin Gishu County, Eldoret, and Ngeria Farm G.K

prisons and key informants were purposively selected. Secondly, stratified sampling of offenders was done to obtain the violent crime offenders followed by a stratified sampling of male and female violent offenders. This was done to ensure that these subgroups in the population were represented in the sample in proportion to their numbers in the target population (Kombo and Tromp, 2009). Finally, simple random sampling was employed to select the respondents who participated in the study using the lottery method to select both men and women who participated in the study (Kothari, 2006). This was conducted by having a frame of all men and women violent crime offenders. Numbers of men and women were written using the inmate's register. Men and women violent offenders from each institution were then requested to pick chips of paper written 'Yes' or 'No' as per their proportion required of each and those who picked chips of paper written 'Yes' were selected for the study. This means that all cases in the population stood a chance of being selected and would be available for inclusion and participation. The sample size of the study was calculated using the formula below as recommended by Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000) formula for determining the sample size in social research. The formula is used as follows;

$$n = \frac{X^2 N p(1-p)}{d^2(N-1) + x^2 p(1-p)}$$

X^2 =Table values of chi-square at $df = 1$ for desired confidence level ($0.5=3.841$)

N = Population size

p = Population proportion (assumed to be 0.5)

d =degree of accuracy (expressed as a proportion)

n = sample size

Substituting for $N=501$, we have,

$$n = \frac{3.841 \times 501 \times 0.5(1-0.5)}{0.0025(250-1) + 0.025(1-0.5)} = 217$$

The sample size for this study was therefore 217 respondents.

Table 2 Sample Size and Sampling Procedures

Respondents	Violent Offenders	Sampling Procedure	Sample Size
Eldoret G.K prison	383	$383/501 \times 217$	166
Ngeria Farm prison	118	$118/501 \times 217$	51
Total	501		217

Source: Prison Records as at 2nd February 2015

The study was conducted through surveys and key informant interviews. The survey was used to collect data through the officers in charge of prisons where the data collection instruments were administered to the offenders. Key informant interview was used to collect data from violent crime offenders since they did not have time to fill the questionnaire and that in the prison setting small items like pens are given precautions they deserve. The study adopted content validity which entails ensuring that indicators reflect the meaning of an idea brought

forward by the researcher (Drost, 2004). This was done by asking the opinions of supervisors on how research questions should be formulated. The study employed the use of test re-test method to test reliability. This was done by administering questionnaires to two different respondents at different times. Twenty violent crime offenders were used to administer the test re-test method. This involved identifying a group of respondents to administer the first test, then afterward another group was administered the same questionnaire. Pearson Product Moment Correlation of $r = 0.86$ was obtained and showed a strong relationship between the two sets of 50 questions in the questionnaires. A correlation of between 0.5 and 1.0 represents a strong association between scores (Hopkins, 2000; Kombo and Tromp, 2009). This ensured that questionnaires measured what they were supposed to measure.

Data analysis in the study relied on descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentages presented in tables and cross-tabulations. It was analyzed by the use of Chi-square and Spearman's Rank Order Correlation analyses at 0.05 level of significance to determine associations between categorical and ordinal variables of the study respectively. This was run using the SPSS program. Lastly, cross-tabulation was used to establish patterns among variables. The analyzed data was presented in tables. Due to the sensitivity of the information collected from some respondents, confidentiality was assured. The researcher assured all the respondents that their responses were purely for academic purposes. The respondents were given numbers hence anonymity was maintained throughout the research process. A research permit was sought and given from the National Commission for Science, Technology, and Innovation (NACOSTI), and the Commissioner of Prisons. No force in collecting the data was used and a good rapport was maintained with respondents throughout the process. There were informed consent and voluntary participation.

3.0 Results & Analysis

3.1 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

The study sought to find out the demographic characteristics of respondents. These factors included gender, age, education level and marital status of the respondents.

3.1.1 Gender of the Respondents

The study sought to establish the gender of the violent crime offenders. The study results were as shown in table 3 below

Table 3: Gender of Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Men	186	86
Women	31	14
Total	217	100

Source: Research Data (2015)

The study found that 86% and 14% of the violent crime offenders were men and women respectively. This suggests that more men than women are more likely to be violent crime offenders. Elsewhere, males have been observed to be dominant actors with respect to violence (Hatty, 2005 in Hale *et al.*, 2006). Traditionally, men are providers in families and therefore feel the most tension when they experience shortage in their households, joblessness and stumpy incomes. Thus, powerlessness to provide may disturb and eventually compel men to use alcohol in order to cope with the hardship but frequent use of alcohol amplifies dependence

and abuse of other drugs. Moreover, greater addiction on these drugs drains the already meager resources, worsens conflicts, loneliness and anger, which enhances violence to freshen the thoughts of disappointment connected to these social problems.

3.1.2 Age of the Respondents

The study sought to establish the age of the violent crime offenders. The study results were shown in table 4 below:

Table 4: Age of Respondents

Age bracket	Frequency	Percentage
18-28	99	45.6
29-39	77	35.3
40-49	32	14.7
50-59	6	2.8
60-69	3	1.4
Total	217	100

Source: Research Data (2015)

The study found that age categories of offenders that ranged between 18-28, 29-39, 40-49, 50-59 and 60-69 years comprised of 46%, 35%, 15%, 3% and 1% respectively as shown in table 4. This implies that violent crime offenders were generally younger males with over 70% often being under the age of 40 years. Majority, 54% were in their prime reproductive years and leaned towards larger families and yet most of the offenders are unemployed and involve chiefly persons with less experiences in dealing with economic hardship while the much older persons have probably mastered the skills of surviving with joblessness, inflation and lower incomes. Offending ages out with time and is highest among the middle and the younger age groups, particularly in rural areas. During this age category, offenders are inclined to have larger families with many dependents to feed, educate and to care for, which augments crimes among younger males of this age category. Equally, crimes are common elsewhere among younger males (Shoemaker, 1996).

Table 5: Age Gender Patterns of the Respondents

Age * Gender Cross Tabulation				
		Gender		Total
Age		Male	Female	
18-28 Years		85	14	99
		85.90%	14.10%	100.00%
29-39 Years		68	9	77
		88.30%	11.70%	100.00%
40-49 Years		27	5	32
		84.40%	15.60%	100.00%
50-59 Years		4	2	6
		66.70%	33.30%	100.00%
60-69 Years		2	1	3
		66.70%	33.30%	100.00%
Total		186	31	217
		85.70%	14.30%	100.00%

The study results revealed that of those respondents who were aged 18-28 years, 86% were male while 14% were female, 29-39 years, (88% male and 12% female), 40-49 years, (84% male and 16% female), 50-59 years, (67% male and 33% female) and 60-69 years, (67% male and 33% female) as indicated in table 5 above. This implies that the level of violent crimes is dominant among the younger population irrespective of their gender. As both men and women grow older there is a tendency to be less involved in illegal activities.

3.1.3 Educational Level of the Respondents

The study sought to establish the education levels of the violent crime offenders. The study results were shown in table 6.

Table 6: Educational Levels of Respondents

Level of Education	Frequency	Percentage
Primary	111	51.2
Secondary	78	35.9
College	19	8.8
University	7	3.2
Others	2	0.9
Total	217	100

Source: Research Data (2015)

The study found that 51% and 36% of violent offenders had attained primary and secondary education respectively while college and university education comprised of 9% and 3% respectively as shown in table 6. Those with less education are less likely to neither secure permanent employment nor earn consequential incomes to meet their financial requirements. This might trigger them to employ other alternative means of attaining basic needs which at times ends up in committing violent acts.

Table 7: Education Gender Patterns of the Respondents

Education * Gender Cross Tabulation				
Education		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Primary		94	17	111
		84.7%	15.3%	100.0%
Secondary		69	9	78
		88.5%	11.5%	100.0%
College		17	2	19
		89.5%	10.5%	100.0%
University		4	3	7
		57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
Others		2	0	2
		100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Total		186	31	217
		85.7%	14.3%	100.0%

Source: Research Data (2015)

Study findings revealed that of those who had attained primary education 85% and 15% were male and female respectively while for secondary education 89% male and 11% female, college education 90% male and 10% female, university education, 57% male and 43% female and on other levels of education all were males as shown in table 7. This shows that irrespective of the gender, the lower the level of education, the higher the likelihood that a person will commit a violent crime.

3.1.4 Marital Status of the Respondents

The study sought to establish the marital status of the violent crime offenders. The study results were as shown in table 8.

Table 8: Marital Status of the Respondents

Marital status	Frequency	Percentage
Married	96	44.2
Single	97	44.7
Separated	17	7.8
Divorced	5	2.3
Widow/ widower	2	0.9
Total	217	100

Source: Research Data (2015)

With regard to marital status, the married, single, separated, divorced and widowed or widower parents comprised of 44%, 45%, 8%, 2% and 1% respectively as indicated in table 8. A high number of single parents imply greater difficulties in making ends meet in their households, especially if they have more dependents and less social ties and economic networks. Women who are separated or divorced or cohabiting report a higher lifetime prevalence of all forms of violence (WHO, 2005).

Table 9: Marital Status Gender Patterns of the Respondents

Marital Status * Gender Cross Tabulation		Gender		Total
Marital Status		Male	Female	
Married		79	17	96
		82.3%	17.7%	100.0%
Single		85	12	97
		87.6%	12.4%	100.0%
Separated		15	2	17
		88.2%	11.8%	100.0%
Divorced		5	0	5
		100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Widow/Widower		2	0	2
		100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Total		186	31	217
		85.7%	14.3%	100.0%

The study results indicated that of those who were married 82% and 18% were male and female respectively, single 88% male and 12% female, separated 88% male while 12% female and for divorced and widowed all were males as shown in table 9. This shows that male counterparts who are not in stable marriages (widowed, divorced and separated) are more likely to commit violent crimes as compared to those who are married and single unlike females in the same state. This may be attributed to lack of socio economic support from marital partners resulting in financial difficulties and the fear, anger and frustration associated with loneliness.

Table 10: Occupation Status of Violent Offenders

Type of Occupation	Frequency	Percentage
Employed	25	11.5
Self –Employed	192	88.5
Total	217	100
Terms of Engagement		
Permanent and Pensionable	5	20
Annual Contracts	5	20
3 month Contract	3	12
Casual	13	52
Total	217	100

Source: Research Data (2015)

The study observed that 12% and 88% of the offenders were employed and self-employed respectively in various organizations such as public and private sectors as shown in table 10. Those who were employed were working in both government and private sector where they earn salaries. Self-employment entailed farming, small scale businesses and transport among others. Since a high level of offenders were either unemployed or in self-employment, they earned low incomes and therefore experience greater challenges in meeting their daily demands in their households, especially those of foodstuffs, school fees, clothing and medical bills among others. With limited incomes, frustration that results can trigger anger, hostility and violence during hard times, more especially among those abusing alcohol and other drugs.

3.2 Frustration, Fear and Anger and the Type of Violent Crime

In the second objective, the study sought to determine whether frustration, fear, and anger influence the type of violent crimes among offenders. The study results were presented as follows;

Table 10: Cross Tabulation of Frustration and Type of Violent Crime

Frustration * Type of Crime Cross tabulation			Types of violent crimes					Total
Frustration	Frustrated	Count	Murder	Robbery	Rape	Assault	Domestic violence	
		% within Frustration						
		27	34	7	41	17		126
		21.40%	27.00%	5.60%	32.50%	13.50%		100.00%
	Not frustrated	Count	14	20	13	36	8	91
		% within Frustration	15.40%	22.00%	14.30%	39.60%	8.80%	100.00%
Total		Count	41	54	20	77	25	217
		% within Frustration	18.90%	24.90%	9.20%	35.50%	11.50%	100.00%

The study findings indicated that 58.0% of those who were frustrated committed violent crimes as compared to 42.0% of those who committed violent crimes yet they were not frustrated. These findings imply that the majority of the violent crime offenders were frustrated and felt strained. Such people were more likely to use and abuse drugs especially alcohol to cope with the devastating impact of financial stress and therefore more likely to steal or rob a victim who may be better off. This could be a major contributor to crime since most residents struggle to earn a living just like other people. In every society, people with low incomes cannot meet their basic needs and therefore more likely to involve themselves in alternative ways of making the ends meet. They may opt to steal, use legitimate means to survive since they do not have other means of achieving their daily requirements. In minds of such people, the use of criminal solutions may be the easiest and the simplest way of earning income by robbery or forcing victims to surrender their property or using threats to take their money or property. Brookman, (2005) concur with the findings that income levels positively affects the probability of committing the crime. Overall, the results suggest that relative income affects criminal behavior.

Table 11: Relationship between Frustration and Type of Violent Crimes

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.671 ^a	4	0.004
Likelihood Ratio	7.662	4	0.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.626	1	0.429
N of Valid Cases	217		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.39.

The study found that there was a significant relationship between frustration and types of violent crimes ($p=0.004$). This implies that frustration influences the commitment of violent crimes. Frustrated persons are more likely to use and abuse drugs, above all alcohol to cope with the devastating impact of financial stress and strain and therefore more likely to steal or rob their victims who may be better off. Indeed, persons experiencing financial obscurity and squat incomes are more likely to use illegal means to make their living, including theft, robbery, or violence, chiefly if their financial circumstances are considered unjust. Low monthly incomes could also be a cause of violent crimes in society. This could be a result of the fact that lower incomes get depleted faster, especially in larger family sizes and hence people in such homes are more likely to steal to survive. These affect more those with manual occupations, the self-employed, those who have lost employment and working on part-time contracts, those in long-time unemployment and earning very low incomes and have large families and dependents to feed, clothe, educate and meet their other more demanding needs. During periods of economic hardship, the breadwinners are more likely to feel frustrated, angered, and hostile, which heightens their tendering to offend.

Discrimination boosts frustration and annoyance which adds to violent acts. The study results revealed that offenders who felt additionally cut off were extra likely to be violent offenders. Isolation is likely to create the emotion of extreme anxiety and larger irritation, which increases violent crimes. Thus, aggravated offenders opt for crime to retaliate felt discrimination and isolation. These findings, therefore, imply that the number of children, type of residence, discrimination and isolation could have an effect on the type of violent crimes committed by the respondents. Having no children could be a reason to engage in violent crime because one has the freedom to do whatever he or she wants and that no children would suffer out of his or her actions. A large number of children mean more mouths to feed, clothe and meet other basic requirements. This is likely to increase frustration among the lower-income earners. Increased levels of poverty and feelings of isolation accompanied by continued discrimination increase anger and hostility. This could lead the parents to seek other means to provide for their many children. When one is discriminated he/she could opt to crime since he/she would feel everyone is against him/her and committing the crime would be away of avenging them (Fischer, Greitmeyer & Frey, 2007)

Table 12: Cross Tabulation of Fear and Type of Violent Crime**Level of fear * Type of Crime Cross tabulation**

		Types of Violent Crimes					Total
		Murder	Robbery	Rape	Assault	Domestic violence	
Level of fear	Low	Count 22	23	2	35	12	94
		% within Level of fear 23.40%	24.50%	2.10%	37.20%	12.80%	100.00%
	Moderate	Count 12	16	1	12	5	46
		% within Level of fear 26.10%	34.80%	2.20%	26.10%	10.90%	100.00%
	High	Count 7	15	17	30	8	77
		% within Level of fear 9.10%	19.50%	22.10%	39.00%	10.40%	100.00%
Total		Count 41	54	20	77	25	217
		% within Level of fear 18.90%	24.90%	9.20%	35.50%	11.50%	100.00%

The study findings revealed that 43.0% of those who least feared the economic hardship committed violent crimes and that 35.0% of those who highly feared the economic hardship committed violent crimes. This indicates that economic hardship may trigger anxiety and fear hence one may want to mitigate the anxiety and therefore resort to crime to sustain or eliminate the anticipated level of economic downturn. These concur with the findings by Gould *et al.*, (2002) who point out that economic hardship may lead to the adoption of illegitimate means to provide for basic needs. Frustration-aggression theory hold that frustration, typically understood as an event instead of fear, increases the tendency to act or react aggressively (Breuer and Elson, 2017).

Table 13: Relationship between Fear and Type of Violent Crime**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.047 ^a	8	0.000
Likelihood Ratio	32.285	8	0.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.904	1	0.168
N of Valid Cases	217		

a. 1 cells (6.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.24.

The study results revealed that there was a significant relationship between the level of fear of economic hardship and types of violent crimes ($p=0.000$). Fear to face the challenges associated with the economic hardship pushes many members of the society to alternatives to making the ends meet. These alternatives at times include the commission of violent crimes. Fear of crime leads to those who are more prosperous to protect themselves and their property, possibly displacing crime to those less privileged (Riggs & Cook, 2015).

Table 14: Cross Tabulation of Anger and Types of Violent Crimes

Anger * Type of Crime Cross tabulation			Type of Crime					Total
			Murder	Robbery	Rape	Assault	Domestic violence	
Anger	Low	Count	10	5	7	16	3	41
		%	24.40%	12.20%	17.10%	39.00%	7.30%	100.00%
		within Anger						
	Moderate	Count	10	28	3	26	5	72
		%	13.90%	38.90%	4.20%	36.10%	6.90%	100.00%
		within Anger						
	High	Count	21	21	10	35	17	104
		%	20.20%	20.20%	9.60%	33.70%	16.30%	100.00%
		within Anger						
Total		Count	41	54	20	77	25	217
		%	18.90%	24.90%	9.20%	35.50%	11.50%	100.00%
		within Anger						

The study results showed that 48.0% of those who were highly angry committed violent crimes, 33.0% of those who were moderately angry committed violent crimes, while 19.0% of those who were lowly angry committed violent crimes. This shows that the higher the anger, the higher the likelihood of committing any type of violent crime. This was in agreement with findings by Coles, Greene, and Braithwaite (2002) who observed that when negative emotions take the form of anger, they are most likely to lead to acts of crime, particularly violence.

Table 15: Relationship between Anger and Type of Violent Crime

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.997 ^a	8	0.010
Likelihood Ratio	19.908	8	0.011
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.583	1	0.445
N of Valid Cases	217		

a. 2 cells (13.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.78.

The study findings revealed that there was a significant relationship between anger and the type of violent crimes ($p=0.010$). This implies that economic hardship can lead to violence by creating feelings of hopelessness and anger which may lead to diffuse aggression. Thus, actual as well as perceived economic deprivation can lead to violence. This is especially true if one's

economic hardship is believed to be unjust; for example, when one believes that one is economically deprived because of ascribed factors such as race, age, or religion. The implication is that policy initiatives need to reduce the actual levels of poverty and inequality that beset people as well as eliminate or reduce the perception that people are in poverty or are the victims of inequality. These can be achieved by providing skills, training, and employment for youths which may also affect perceptions of economic deprivation. Agnew and White (2002) observed that anger or rage is associated with a wide variety of violent acts, including homicide, aggravated assault, rape, domestic violence, child abuse, bullying, torture, and even terrorism.

4.0 Conclusion:

The study concluded that economic hardship leads to violence and crime. Economic hardship creates feelings of hopelessness and anger, which may increase aggression and hostility. Economic deprivation also reduces social trust and facilitates frustration-aggression, which in turn leads to violence and crime. The above indicates that economic deprivation may affect community and family processes in such a way that violence increases.

Economic hardship and the associated socio-economic inequalities may lead some individuals both employed and unemployed to experience strain or frustration which may bring them to greater involvement in violent crimes. Because employment is perceived as conventional behavior and serves to reinforce social bonds and activate social control, it also acts to reduce involvement in criminal behavior. Unemployment leads to economic hardship which leads to the breakdown of positive social bonds. This, in turn, may increase the probability of people resorting to criminal activity due to difficulties in making the ends meet.

5.0 References

1. Agnew R, and White H. R, (2002). *An Empirical Test of General Strain Theory*” Criminology
2. Agnew, P. (2009). The Conditional Effects of Stress on Delinquency and Drug Use: A Strain Theory Assessment of Sex Differences." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 34(1):46-79 (2009).
3. Akers R L. and Sellers C S. (2004). *Criminological Theories: Introduction, Evaluation and Applications*. Fourth ed. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.
4. Aronson. S. L, (2010), Crime and Development in Kenya: Emerging Trends and the Transnational Implications of Political, Economic and Social Instability, Pulse Submissions vol.2. No.09. pg 2
5. Brookman, F. (2005). *Understanding Homicide*. London: Sage
6. Butts, W. (2008) *General Strain, Street Youth and Crime: A test of Agnew's revised theory.* " *Criminology* 42:457-483 (2008)
7. Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (3rd edition) California: Sage
8. Creswell, W. J. (2013). *Research Designs: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* London: SAGE Publishers
9. Cullen, F. T., & Agnew, R. (Eds.). (1999). *Criminological Theory, past to present: Essential Readings*. Los Angeles: Roxbury.

10. Cullen, F. T., Wright, J. P., & Belvins, K.R. (Eds.) (2006). *Taking Stock: The status of Criminological Theory*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
11. Donald, H.M., & Theresa, L.W., (2013). *Research Methods*. New York: Wadsworth publishers.
12. Fisher, A., Shah, A., Gupta, S., Punjabi, A & Ranka, A. (2011). *Research Methodology; Methods and Techniques*. 2nd Edition. New Delhi; New Age International Publishers
13. Gould, E., Mustard, D. and Weinberg, B. (2002). "Crime Rates and Local Labour Market Opportunities in the United States, 1979-97", *Review of Economics and Statistics* 84 45-61.
14. Hale, C., et al., (2005). *Criminology*, Oxford University Press
15. Herzog, S. (2005). *The Relationship between Economic Hardship and Crime*; The case of Israel and the Palestinians and Crime.
16. Jenkins, P. (2008). Serial murder in England, 1940-2005, " *Journal of Criminal Justice* 16, 1-15
17. Julius O. J and Charles O. O, (2011) *Qualitative Research: An Introduction to Principles and Techniques*, Moi University Press.
18. Kenya Police, (2011). *Crime Statistics; 2010*, Nairobi, Government Printer
i. , (2012), *Crime Statistics; 2011*, Nairobi, Government Printer
19. Kombo, K. D. & Tromp D. L. (2009). *Thesis Writing: An Introduction*, Paulines Publications Africa.
20. Kothari, C.R. (2013). *Research Methodology; Methods and Techniques*. 2nd Edition. New Delhi; New Age International Publishers
21. Lafree, G. (2009). *Rape and Criminal Justice: The Social Construction of Sexual Assault*, Wadsworth, Calif Belmont
22. Lederman, (2006). "Adapting to strain: An examination of delinquent coping responses." *Criminology* 34:39-60 (2006)
23. Lonnie, A. (2002). *The creation of Dangerous Violent Criminals*, University of Illinois Press.
24. Mugenda, G. A. (2008) *Social Science Research Theory and Principals*, Nairobi: Applied Research and Training Services (ARTS) Press
25. Neal, Q. R, (2012), *Crime and Social Inequality, From the Lower Class to Prison* Pearson Learning Solutions.
26. Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods* (2nded.) Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
27. Reid, S. T. (2007). *Crime and Criminology*, (7th Ed.), Brown & Benchmark Publishers.
28. Siegel, L. (2007). *Criminology*, 7th Edition, Instructors Edition, Thomson Wadsworth. Washington, D.C. US. Government printing office
29. Vold, B. G., Bernard, J. T. and Snipes, B. J.(2002). *Theoretical Criminology*, Oxford University Press, Inc.