Table 01: Living Area of criminals

| Living Area | Frequency | Percentage (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 35 | 88 |
| Urban | 5 | 12 |
| Total | 40 | 100 |

Source: Field data
An analysis of the socio - demographic background data showed that the criminals range in age from 20 to 70 . Among the 40 criminals, the majority 14 (35\%) were aged range in 3140 and twelve $(30 \%)$ of the criminals were aged range of $20-30$. Eleven ( $28 \%$ ) were in the aged range of 41-50. Two (5\%) were in the age range of 51-60, while $2(5 \%)$ were in the aged range of 51-60.

Table 02: Age Distribution of Criminals

| Age Structure | Frequency | Percentage (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $20-30$ | 12 | 30 |
| $31-40$ | 14 | 35 |
| $41-50$ | 11 | 28 |
| $51-60$ | 2 | 5 |
| $61-70$ | 1 | 2 |
| Total | 40 | 100 |

Source: Field data
Among the 40 criminals, 31 ( $78 \%$ ) of the criminals were married. Seven ( $17 \%$ ) were unmarried and two (5\%) had been divorced.

Table 03: Marital Status of Criminals

| Marital Status | Frequency | Percentage (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Married | 31 | 78 |
| Unmarried | 7 | 17 |
| separated | 2 | 5 |
| Total | 40 | 100 |

Source: Field data
The majority of the criminals 20 (50\%) had achieved a secondary level education. 13 (33\%) of the criminals had a primary level education. Similarly, $5(12 \%)$ of the total criminals had studied up to O/L. Among the criminals $2(5 \%)$ hadn't gone to school.

