CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE
Reviewing the literature in retrospect we find that various explanations have been put forward by biologists, sociologists, psychiatrists and the psychologists to understand the dynamics of crime. The biologists held that criminals are by and large biologically inferior (Lombroso, 1911; Ferri, 1917; Hootan, 1939). The psychiatrists stressed upon the emotional frustrations which predispose an individual into an open confrontation with societal norms (Healy and Bronner, 1936). The sociologists maintained that criminal behaviour is mostly a learnt behaviour (Sutherland and Cressey, 1939). The psychological theories have leaned heavily towards personality factors (Elliot, 1952). Though other factors are important in contributing to the final product of the criminal, it is the personality factors which play a major role (Jaspal, 1977).

Interesting, though these findings may be, it is unreasonable to suppose that criminals are a homogenous group. The personality differentiations to be made of criminals will have to be related to the type of crime committed (Eysenck, 1970). Eysenck (1977) found that prisoners who were administered the personality questionnaire, differed noticeably in their scores from one group to another, for example, violent offenders and sex offenders tended to have exceptionally high P scores, whereas conmen were high on E. It would seem to follow that by paying attention to the differences within the
criminal group with respect to personality i.e. by constructing a typology of criminals, much greater differences would be obtained than from a total group of criminals (Mohan and Jaspal, 1982; Mohan and Gill, J. 1984; Gill and Mohan, 1986; Mohan and Hazdaran, 1986).

The ensuing discourse would mainly revolve around the exposition of these determiners of crime i.e. type of crime and effect of various psychological variables on crime.

A. Type of Crime

Indeed crime does consist of heterogenous forms of activity, yet it is conceivable that these various forms of behaviour can be classified into more or less homogenous groupings or types. Thus by organizing these varied patterns of behaviour within different type categories, it would then be possible to identify the various kinds of factors that generate specific types of criminal activity.

A number of attempts have been made to classify crime and criminals. Different classifications have been suggested and invariably the criminal is categorized according to the kind of crime committed by him.

One of the primitive attempts to classify criminals was done by Bonger (1952) according to the motives of the offenders as economic crimes, sexual crimes, political crimes etc. Certainly the desire for excitement is common in all types of crime yet no crime can be reduced to one motive. Abrahamson (1960) differentiated between acute and chronic
offenders. Acute offenders are accidental criminals and chronic offenders are 'habitual' criminals. Crimes have also been classified as crimes against person, public order and public justice. This method seems unrealistic as in great majority of cases, an offender may easily fit into more than one category. Sutherland and Cressey's (1968) classification brands a criminal as a felon or a misdemeanor, where felonies are serious crimes punishable by death and misdemeanours are less serious crimes punishable by confinement in prison or fine. Britt and Tittle (1975) classified criminals according to the seriousness of the crime, as major and minor criminals. Mayer (1975) has put the different crime categories into four major groups as they emerged from the study of the definitions of crime categories as given in Indian Penal Code; They are: (1) Offences against public tranquility; (2) Offences against the person; (3) Offences against property; and (4) Total cognizable crime.

Schafer (1974) proposed a classification of criminals based on the idea of socialization. They are: (1) Occasional criminals; (2) professional criminals which are further categorized into (i) individual professional criminals; (i1) white collar criminals and (iii) sundry professional criminals; (3) Abnormal criminals (these included psychotics and psychopaths); (4) habitual criminals, they included,
alcoholics, drug addicts, vagrants, gamblers and prostitutes; and (5) finally there are convictional criminals. Mohan and Gill, J. (1984) and Gill, S.K. and Mohan (1986) have classified crime into three broad categories as given in Indian Penal Code. They are: body offences, property offences and excise offences. Narayan and Mani (1977) compared the hedonism scores (E x N) of murderers and thieves, with normals. Mohan and Jaspal (1982) have classified crime into two broad categories as major and minor offences. Nevertheless, none of these classifications offered so far are mutually exclusive. Moreover as Hartjen (1974) has stated "there has been little research to test the various schemes advanced, so that judgements as to the inclusiveness or validity of these taxonomies are at best speculative."

The present study classifies criminals into two broad categories viz. body and property offenders as mentioned in Indian Penal Code (1982). This type of classification using legal designation as a base has earlier been used by many researchers (e.g. Mohan and Jaspal, 1982; Mohan and Gill, J. 1984; Gill, S.K. and Mohan, 1986). In the present study, these two broad categories have further been divided into two subcategories in accordance with the gravity of offence as major and minor offences. Crimes against body are usually termed as 'crimes of passion'. According to Tappan (1960)
crimes against the person are for the most part "nonhabitual". They do not contribute a way of life. They are committed by 'criminal amateurs' very often as a consequence of circumstantial factors or unusual pressures. "Often amateur crimes are outbursts of passion, aggression or pathological distortions of the sexual impulse" (Tappan,1960). On the other hand crimes against property derive from social, economic and cultural circumstances and weaknesses of character rather than from extreme pathology (Tappan,1960).

Thus it would be worthwhile to study crime in relation to different type categories in order to investigate further into the dynamics of crime.

B. Factors Affecting Crime

Crime is always the resultant of the interaction of multiple personal and external factors and the nature of these factors varies with individual cases. Low intelligence, personality imbalance, unsatisfactory parent-child relationships, broken homes, low socio-economic status, cultural conflicts, social disorganization, low education level and a host of other factors that have been advanced at one time or another as causes of crime are all potential sources of crime and delinquency. "In specific instances they may so obstruct his adjustment to life problems as to create a situation favourable for the appearance of criminal behaviour." (Page 1947).
Though in psychological research personality factors are of prime relevance as important determiners of crime causation, yet there are some other individual factors also which affect crime. Some of the factors which affect crime have been either controlled or varied in the present study. These have been broadly grouped as:

I. Individual Factors
   (1) Rural-urban background
   (ii) Education
   (iii) Socio-economic status
   (iv) Age
   (v) Sex

II. Psychological Factors
   (1) Personality
   (ii) Adjustment
   (iii) Values

I. INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

Some researchers have reported a significant relationship between individual factors and crime. These factors do not affect crime directly but they operate in conjunction with other psychological factors. These are:

1. Rural-urban Difference and Crime

Many studies have been conducted to find the ecological differences in crime and criminal patterns, and in general crime and delinquency rates were found to be higher in urban
communities than in rural areas (Johnson, 1966). Studies in Iowa by Burrows (1930) and in Kansas by Smith (1937) indicated regular increase in delinquency rates from the most rural to the most urban countries. Useem and Waldner (1942) reported that urban crimes mostly comprised of offences against property (including theft, fraud, forgery and embezzlement) and they also include abortion, vice, political corruption and like, while rural crimes mostly involve property, but they tend to be discrete and naive.

Some of the Indian studies conducted by Gupta and Sethi (1974) and Gupta and Srivastava (1977) have reported that approximately 88% of the murderers confined in jails belonged to rural areas. Further studies by Sharma (1976); Singh, A. (1976); Mohan and Singh (1960) have shown that the rates of major crimes against persons are high in rural areas as compared to the urban areas.

Some authors have tried to explain this difference in the crime rates of rural and urban areas. Sutherland and Cressey (1966) have attributed this difference to social disorganization. They contend that social disorganization occurs more frequently and to a greater degree in urban areas than elsewhere. Heckscher (1971) seeks to explain this by saying that under conditions of relatively isolated living, where primary group relationships predominate, the spirit of independence burns fiercely and the reactions to interference
and friction are strong and violent. Grudges are nursed, revenge is strenuously demanded, passion and fanaticism are easily stirred and methods of regression are simple and direct."

(ii) Education and Crime

Education accounts for the structuring of character to a great extent. It can arouse the socially acceptable ambitions, it can put him into contact with persons with whom he can identify himself and with whom he can strive to emulate. On the other hand, "it can leave scars in the psyche of the growing child which may well be related to the development of antisocial attitudes and on ultimate defiance of all authority" (Glueck and Glueck, 1957).

Wooton (1960) reported that there is a fairly good agreement on both sides of the Atlantic that those who are found guilty of offences tend to have poor school records. Glueck and Glueck (1957) reported that a large number of delinquents showed a dislike for school and indulged in truancy from school. Frum (1958) found that 23% of the total cases of adult recidivism started with juvenile truancy and incorrigibility. Palmer (1960) found that the murderers tended to be the persons with low education attainment. Mohan and Singh (1977) in a study on education and crime divided the offenders into three educational groups and found that 60% of the murderers belonged to the middle education group (middle to high school level),
22.5% to high and 17.5% to low education group. On the other hand, out of the offenders committing other crimes, 55% belonged to the low, 27.5% to middle and 17.5% to the high education group.

(iii) Socio-economic status

Traditional official statistics indicate that crime and delinquency exists among the lower than the upper and middle classes. Scholars like Garofalo (1914), Lewis (1961), Bonger (1964) have observed that large number of offenders are listed from the low income groups. This view has been contradicted by others like Healy and Bronner (1921); Burt (1925) and Riesman (1962). There is no doubt that poverty does play an important role in delinquency and the capitalistic system also does contribute to poverty in certain sections of the society. Cloward and Ohlin (1961) have observed that young people from lower socio-economic classes and minorities, impoverished and ill-educated who are denied the means of fulfilling their aspirations instilled in them, try to fulfill these by illegitimate means that they cannot hope to obtain legitimately.

(iv) Age and Crime

Crime rates vary among other factors according to the age of the offender. The overall picture of age distribution indicates that among juveniles the age group 13-14 and the age group 16-17 appeared with the highest arrest rate.
Among the adults the arrest rate shows a gradual decline towards age 24, and then, with a sudden increase reaching its peak at the age of 25-29. From then on, there is a steady decline till the age of 65 and above (Uniform crime reports, 1973). Schafer (1976) reported that younger offenders seemed to be more interested in criminal profit while older offenders seem more likely to commit violent crimes for emotional reasons. Further, declining physical strength and vigour in moving towards old age cannot be denied in explaining why most criminals came from the age group of 25-29 (Schafer 1976).

The association of age with criminal conduct varies with the kind of crime. In industrialised countries, burglary, automobile theft, and the ordinary 'larcenies' tended to be crimes of the teens and earlier years. The more intelligent crimes like, forgery, counterfeiting, fraud and embezzlement reach their peak during the prime of life, ages 25 to 34 (Nettler 1972).

Thus age factor has emerged as a significant factor in crime causation. More recently Mohan and Jaspal (1982) reported significant differences among criminals at different age levels.

(v) **Sex and Crime**

From the very beginning of criminal statistics sex was the first classification of offenders and a natural one.
Everywhere, throughout history men have committed more crimes than women, or one may say that male crimes are more visible than offences committed by females. Sutherland and Cressey (1966) stated, "the male sex has a great access to crime in all nations, all communities within a nation, all age groups, all periods in history for which organized statistics are available and all types of crime except for those which are somewhat intimately related to the female sex, such as abortion and infanticide".

The sex differences in crime rates are not well understood and there have been different and contradicting explanations. Otto Polak (1955) has contended that the tendency towards crime in males is not greater than that in females, but that the marked criminality of women hide their crimes from detection. Bertrand (1967) has taken a similar stand and speculated that in male-dominated societies women are subjected to a pattern of instrumentality that deprives them of perceiving themselves as agents and makes them victims and objects.

Despite recent changes in sex-role behaviour in many areas of human functioning, violence safely remains a male-dominated activity. Maccoby and Jacklin (1980) in their developmental study reported no instance of girls manifesting greater aggression than boys. Boys were significantly more aggressive in 75% of the studies. Maccoby and Jacklin (1980) further reported that boy's aggression is most often
displayed in the presence of male partners.

The evidence from cross-cultural studies (including study of the free-ranging chimpanzees) are also in the same direction (Wolfgang and Weiner, 1982). Although some of the Indian studies by Ahuja (1970, 1974); Somasundram (1973); Sharma (1976); Yadav (1976) have shown that rate of criminality among girls has increased these days.

II. PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS

(1) Personality

According to Eysenck (1964) Personality is made up of two aspects (1) cognitive (intelligence) and affective (consisting of Extraversion, Neuroticism and Psychoticism virtually independent of each other). Intelligence as a cognitive aspect of personality has often been linked with crime. In general, criminals are thought to be of lower and substandard intelligence to that of normal. This may of course be due to the fact that the more intelligent ones do not get apprehended by law (Gibbons, 1968).

The affective abilities as stated by Eysenck (1964) are of special significance to the present study and are discussed in somewhat details.

A Review of Eysenck's Personality Theory

In 1970, Eysenck had adumbrated a psychological theory which deduced that antisocial conduct, particularly crime would be found more frequently in people whose personality
placed them in the high Extraversion, high Neuroticism and high Psychoticism quadrants and a number of empirical studies were quoted to support this deduction. In the following discourse, each of these three factors as related to crime are discussed in details to throw some light on present evidence as it stands now.

(1) **Extraversion/Introversion**

According to Eysenck (1968), the typical extravert is sociable, likes parties, has many friends, needs to have people to talk to, craves for excitement, acts on the spur of the moment and is generally an impulsive individual. The typical introvert on the other hand is a quiet, retiring sort of a person, is reserved and distant except to intimate friends. He keeps his feelings under close control, seldom behaves in an aggressive manner and does not lose his temper easily.

On the causative side, Eysenck traces the origin of E/I from Pavlov (1927, 1941) excitation and inhibition balance in the Central Nervous System (CNS), and Hull's (1943) concept of reactive inhibition (Ir). In his review of personality, Eysenck (1963) gave evidence that differences in individuals on E/I were well grounded in the constitution of the individuals, especially on the ascending reticular formation of the CNS. Eysenck (1967) relates his conception of the physiological differences between Introverts and Extraverts to a distinction used by Russian researchers especially Sokolov (1963) and Teplov (1965) of organisms with "weak nervous system and
organisms with strong nervous system" (Gray 1965). Introverts are assumed to have a weak nervous system and Extraverts have a strong nervous system. Organisms with weak nervous systems are thought to respond at lower levels of stimulation and with greater intensity to stimuli than organisms with strong nervous system (Mohan 1976). The physiological basis of introversion are considered to be differences in the threshold of arousal of the reticular activating system. Introverts are presumed to have lower threshold of reticular arousal than Extraverts.

Criminal behaviour is obviously determined by an interaction of several factors and any randomly chosen group of criminals can be expected to be heterogeneous with regard to personality. Eysenck (1964) and Trasler (1962) have however argued that criminals may be more extraverted than non-criminal subjects.

 Extraversion/Introversion and Criminality: Eysenck and Eysenck (1964, 1970) while stating their theory of criminality have put forward the view that propensity to crime is universal, but is held in check in most of the cases by a person's "conscience". This "conscience" is essentially a generalized set of conditioned responses built up during the childhood and adolescence in the process of socialization according to the rules of Pavlovian conditioning. Since extraverted people tend to condition less well than introverted ones they are more likely to have an underdeveloped 'conscience'
and a much greater likelihood to behave in an antisocial fashion.

According to Mowrer (1950) socialization is mediated by learning in two stages: (1) fear responses are conditioned to cues associated with punishment or withdrawal of love (2) in the second stage, responses that are instrumental in removing the individual from the fear producing cues, e.g., inhibition of the forbidden behaviour are reinforced by fear reduction. A low capacity to conditioned fear responses and/or to acquire avoidance responses would be assumed to be conducive to crime and other non-conforming behaviour.

Eysenck (1960) in his review of the evidence on individual differences in conditioning stated that extraverts will show poor conditioning (Eysenck and GSR) than introverts under certain stated conditions (Eysenck, 1965). These conditions are: (1) partial reinforcement, (ii) discrimination learning; (iii) weak UCS and (iv) short CS-UCS intervals (Eysenck, 1967). Eysenck (1964, 1970), further explained the differences between Introverts and Extraverts in differential build up of reactive inhibition, though he mentioned the possibility that the differences might also be due to differences in excitatory potential (Passingham, 1967).

The assumption that criminals are more extraverted than non-criminals is based on a learning theory of interpretation of crime. Normally conditioned fear responses to
earlier punished or disapproved acts serve as deterrents. Crime may be regarded as a sign of failure to condition the fear responses essential for the socialization process. Highly extraverted subjects are considered to condition less efficiently, due to a more rapid growth of cortical inhibition (Eysenck, 1957, 1967). Under identical conditions therefore, the cortical arousal will be more marked in introverts and cortical inhibition in extraverts (Eysenck, 1967).

Passingham (1972) has summed up Eysenck’s theory of criminality with respect to conditioning in extraverts as follows: (1) Extraverts condition badly (Eysenck, 1964), (2) socialization is mediated by conditioning; (3) Extraverts will tend to be poorly socialized; (4) two predictions will follow from this: (a) criminals will tend to be extraverted, (b) criminals will tend to condition badly.

A number of studies have supported Eysenck’s (1964, 1970) theory regarding the relationship of E/I and criminality. Studies by Seigman (1962), Trasler (1962), Kierson and Kelley (1963), revealed that criminals are markedly extraverted as compared to non-criminals. Fine (1963) found traffic violators to be more extraverted than others. Syed (1970) on the basis of their studies on female prisoners found criminals to be significantly more extraverted. Eysenck and Eysenck (1973) found females prisoners scoring high on E/I, Wilson and Maclean (1974) found recidivists (which comprised of trainee
bus drivers) to be more extraverted than controls.

Some of the studies conducted in India by Singh and Akhtar (1971); Akhtar and Singh (1973); Shanmugam (1975); Singh, A. (1979b) have also obtained results supporting the contention that criminals score higher on extraversion as compared to non-criminals. Mani (1974) compared murderers, theft cases and non-criminals. He found that murderers were more extraverted than theft group and theft group was higher on E as compared to non-criminals. Geetha (1975) studied 100 women prisoners in comparison with 100 nonprisoner women, her findings were also similar.

However some studies have failed to report any significant differences on E/I dimension between normals and criminals. Studies by Bartholomew (1957, 1959, 1963); Field (1960); Fitch (1962); Little (1963); Hoghughi and Forrest (1965); McKerracher and Watson (1968); Schalling and Holmberg (1968); Mohan and Singh (1980) have all reported no significant differences between offenders and normals on the E/I dimension. Burgess (1972) compared a group of Canadian prisoners with normal Canadian controls. It was found that the mean scores on E/I were identical. Millman (1966); Forrest and Hoghughi (1968); and Mohan and Jaspal (1982) have obtained results which showed criminals to be lower on E than normal subjects.
Eysenck (1970, 1971) had himself suggested that in the field of criminality especially when dealing with incarcerated subjects, the sociability component is difficult to measure and that this consideration may account for failure of some researches.

Inconsistencies in the studies of E/I scores of criminals and non-criminals may be attributed to different reasons. One reason may be that the different testing devices used in different studies (Jaspal, 1977). The other reason advanced by Schalling and Holmberg (1970) is that the inconsistent results may be related to the fact that E/I is 'higher order factor' resulting from intercorrelations of primary factors of Sociability and Impulsivity. It is the Impulsivity component of this higher order factor of Extraversion which is higher for criminals and the sociability component is lower. The results based on the overall means of the two components may thus depict that criminals are low on extraversion as compared to non-criminals.

Eysenck (1970) after modifying his theory of criminality, as regards to E/I stated that, "It is the impulsivity component which may be considered to be associated with criminal behaviour."

**Dual nature of Extraversion**

In 1963, Eysenck and Eysenck put forward a theory about the dual nature of extraversion in which they asserted that Sociability and Impulsivity are primary traits contributing
to the higher order E/I factor. It was suggested that the two Extraversion factors may differ with regard to relative importance of environmental versus genetic influences — Sociability being more easily subjected to environmental influences and Impulsivity having deeper roots in heredity (Schalling and Holmberg, 1970).

(ii) Impulsivity/Sociability

Schalling (1970) held that impulsiveness includes a lack of planning and foresight a giving into 'whim' without visible signs of emotional turmoil, tension or conflict. Schalling (1970) contended that the concept of impulsiveness as used in certain psychiatric writings refer to a breakthrough in behaviour of unconscious, strong inner urges in context of tension and conflict. It also implies weak restraints (Cleckley, 1964) and inability to delay gratification (Buss, 1966). The main difference lies in the intrapsychic concomitants of the impulsive behaviour (Peterson, Quay and Cameron, 1959).

Eysenck (1976) stated that impulsiveness has the connotation of rapid-action without deliberation or hesitation, without having decided or planned the act. On the other hand, sociability envisages a liking for the company of others. Schalling and Holmberg (1970) contended that the relation between cortical arousal, conditionability and extraversion, as postulated by Eysenck are valid only for the impulsiveness
component of Extraversion. Hence it is expected that criminals would be higher on Impulsivity but lower on Sociability in comparison to non-criminals.

Impulsivity, Sociability and Crime: Ruch (1970) observed "There seems to be considerable evidence that delinquents are more impulsive than non-delinquents that is why they tend to act before thinking." A number of studies have used psychomotor task in a laboratory situation to test the relationship between impulsiveness and offending behaviour, presuming that impulsivity as a trait would be revealed in the form of errors made due to overhasty responding (Feldman, 1976). Experiments were conducted by Kelley and Veldman (1964) on seventh grade male students (approximately of 13 years of age) of four Texas towns during 1957, 1958 on symbolic language tests, four psychomotor tests and several self-report measures of surgency (684 pupils in all). In 1962, 424 of the original sample were recontacted; 32 pupils were officially labelled offenders, 52 had dropped out of school and the remainder were still in school. These three groups were compared for their scores on the original measures. There were no noticeable differences on the symbolic language tests but both the offenders and the dropout groups had obtained higher surgency scores and had made many more errors on the Psychomotor tasks than the other children. Thus the results revealed a greater element of impulsiveness in the offenders and dropouts. Erickson (1966) in a comparative study of conforming and non-conforming
prisoners of an institution on Porteus Maze Test found that the conforming prisoners made significantly fewer errors. Gibson (1964) Martin and Warde (1971) in similar studies have found delinquents to be more impulsive than non-delinquents. A number of studies have reported impulsive behaviour to be most important single characteristic of psychopathy, which has a significant bearing on criminality (Arieti, 1963; Buss, 1966).

Schalling and Holmberg (1970) in a study on "Extraversion in criminals and the dual nature of Extraversion" assumed that solidity in the Swedish Mark Nyman Temperament Inventory (MNT) is related to the Impulsivity aspect of E/I and stability to Sociability. The results supported the view that there is a relation between solidity and E-impulsiveness. The hypothesis that criminals are higher on Impulsivity was thus proved.

Eysenck (1959) in a study found criminals scoring significantly higher on Impulsivity than Sociability. Eysenck and Eysenck (1971) have confirmed the results that it is Impulsivity rather than sociability which clearly differentiates between prisoners and controls.

Feldman (1976) asserted that these results must be viewed with precaution; the higher score for impulsiveness may indicate that either impulsiveness confers a higher likelihood of offending or being caught or both. Similarly "the lower sociability may simply reflect the reduced opportunity of
prisoners for mixing with their fellows" (Feldman, 1976). Eysenck and Eysenck (1971) have also asserted that long imprisonment may change the subject's response to sociability items. At the same time, it is of interest that despite of the higher scores on Impulsivity and lower on Sociability the combination yields approximately the same overall score on E/I.

Eysenck while explaining criminality has seemingly given a great deal of importance to the dimension of E/I in the causation of criminality. But Burgess (1972) in the field of criminality and Mohan and Kumar (1977) in learning research felt that the dimension of Neuroticism (N) is perhaps equally important and relevant to Eysenck's theoretical model.

(iii) Neuroticism

By Neuroticism (N) Eysenck (1953, 1957) refers to the "emotional lability or over-responsiveness of a person and likelihood of breakdown under stress". The general nature of N is assessed as instability, unadaptability, depressive moods, weak dependable attitude, narrow interests, symptoms of nervous breakdown (Mohan, 1976). The basis of N is taken to be neurophysiological and elaborated from the Hullian theory of Drive. Neuroticism is thus considered as a general factor in motivation or striving (Hall and Lindsey, 1962). Eysenck (1963) is of the view that "differences between people in emotionality or Neuroticism are mediated by inherited difference in the lability and excitability of the autonomic nervous system".
Some people are constitutionally predisposed to react strongly with their sympathetic nervous system towards incoming stimuli of various kinds, whereas other people are predisposed to react much less strongly."

Neuroticism and Crime: Eysenck (1964, 1970) has postulated that antisocial behaviour is a consequence of poor conditionability. Since behaviour is learned through socialization techniques during childhood, neurotics, because of higher autonomic drive levels tend to fare poorly as compared to stables with a more optimal drive level for learning performance.

According to Eysenck (1967) persons high on N have a highly labile ANS. When N is high it interferes with the efficient learning of responses particularly to unpleasant stimuli because of the irrelevant anxiety evoked (Feldman, 1976). The clear prediction is that socialization which is considered by Eysenck (1964, 1970) to be achieved by fear arousing stimuli will be interfered with by a high level of N and therefore antisocial conduct will be more evident among neurotics.

Reviewing Eysenck's theory regarding N, Passingham (1973) and Burgess (1972) have summarized (i) neurotics are high on anxiety or emotionality, (ii) Neuroticism acts as a drive reinforcing extraverted or introverted tendencies favouring or disfavouring antisocial conduct and (iii) neurotics with habitual antisocial response will tend to engage in those responses more strongly than non-neurotics.
Various investigations have attempted to relate N with crime and delinquency. Studies by Field (1960); Fitch (1962); Syed (1964); Berry (1966); Millman (1966); Price (1967); Bartholomew (1957, 1959) have revealed that N scores were consistently higher in prisoners as compared to non-prisoners. Eysenck and Eysenck (1970) compared 603 male prisoners with normals and found that prisoners were having higher N scores. Gibson (1967) and Moghunghi and Forrest (1970), on the basis of their study on younger male prisoners concluded that prisoners scored higher on N as compared to non-prisoners and N scores rose with the degree of misbehaviour within the institution. Chockalingam (1972), Feldman (1976) found recidivists scoring higher on N. Other studies by Gibson (1967), Allsopp (1968); Saxby et al. (1970); Feldman (1976) showed that self reported offending was positively related to N.

Bartholomew (1963); Eysenck and Eysenck (1973); Saxby et al. (1979) have all reported that in their studies of female offenders and controls, female prisoners tended to score much higher than controls on N.

Some of the studies conducted by Indian researchers have found that criminals scored high on N (Aggarwal 1961). Kast and Pati (1969) investigated the personality traits of juvenile delinquents, adult criminals and normal subjects. They found that juveniles, first offenders and recidivists were more neurotically prone than the other two groups.
Singh and Akhtar (1972) found that students suspected of cheating in examinations showed higher N scores on MMPI as compared to non-cheaters. Shanmugam (1973); Singh, U.P. (1973); and Mani (1974) reported criminals scoring high on N as compared to non-criminals. Singh (1978) reported a positive correlation between truancy from school and N in high school boys. Singh (1980) also reported criminals to be more neurotic than normals. Gill and Mohan (1986) compared prisoners in open and closed jails with normals and results supported the Eysenckian contention regarding N and criminality. They also reported probationers scoring higher on N as compared to normals. Geetha (1975); Yadav (1977); and Singh (1980); conducted studies on women prisoners and found that the N scores of women criminals were higher than normals.

On the basis of the evidence accumulated so far as regards the relationship between N and Crime, it may safely be predicted that criminals tend to score higher on Neuroticism than non-criminals.

(iv) Psychoticism

In Eysenck's general system of personality description, the factors of extraversion and Neuroticism are supplemented by another factor orthogonal to the other two and also of general applicability to normal samples; that of Psychoticism (Eysenck, 1970b). The notion of P factor originated from the observation of close relatives of schizophrenics and manic-
depressive patients among whom were found an unduly large number of psychotics. The concept is similar to the view that benign psychosis may arise from unspecific vulnerability (Weiner and Stromgren 1958). This was further elaborated by Eysenck (1970c). The hypothesis is based on the finding that quite generally psychotics of all types tend to behave in experimental situations and on laboratory tests of psychological nature, very much like one another and unlike neurotics.

The traits which characterize the factor of Psychoticism are (1) solitary; not caring for other people; (2) troublesome; not fitting in (3) cruel, inhuman (4) lack of feeling, insensitive; (5) sensation-seeking "arousal jag" (6) hostile to others; aggressive (7) liking for odd, unusual things; (8) disregard for danger; fool hardy; (9) making fool of others; upsetting them (Eysenck,1970).

Psychoticism and Crime: Eysenck and Eysenck (1970) gave two reasons for believing that P in addition to E/I and N is implicated in the causation of criminality. Firstly the traits enumerated above, resemble closely to those which are often exhibited by criminals. It is not suggested that all criminals are alike but merely that a certain proportion of what are often considered as the most difficult inveterate and incurable criminals seem to resemble this description in their personality make-up. The other more convincing reason
lies in the often repeated psychiatric observation that psychosis (particularly schizophrenia and criminality have a close connection).

Moreover Psychoticism (P) has also been expected to affect the response to learning experiences, as the other personality dimensions of Eysenck. Feldman (1976) reported that persons scoring high on P respond less well to avoidance training which is an essential part of socialization process. High P persons have been reported to respond more strongly to positive learning experiences concerning offending attitudes and behaviours than do low P persons. Some high P individuals are more exposed to learning from others and thus may learn attitudes and behaviour conducive to crime and anti-social activities (Feldman, 1976).

Many studies have reported a close relationship between psychoticism and criminality. Studies by Medor (1914) and Rudin (1916) revealed a number of criminals and alcoholics among the relatives of their schizophrenics. Odegard (1963) reported that out of first degree relatives of psychotic probands 10% could be classified as psychopaths, criminals or alcoholics. Many other earlier reports of such an association have been reviewed by Essen-Moller (1946) and Planansky (1966c). Heston's (1966) study on children born
to hospitalized schizophrenics but removed immediately after birth and brought up in foster homes showed that out of the 47, 9 such children were diagnosed as sociopathic personalities showing anti-social behaviour of an impulsive, illogical nature with long police records (only four of the children of these schizophrenic mothers developed schizophrenia as compared to the nine criminal ones). Thus these studies indicate that parental psychotic behaviour is being casually implicated in the psychopathic and criminal conduct of offspring.

In empirical terms, Eysenck and Eysenck (1970) found that the scores of a questionnaire measures of Psychoticism were higher in the sample of criminals as compared to non-criminals. Segraves (1969) compared a group of drug taking students with non-drug takers. He found that drug-takers had significantly higher scores on P. Similar results were reported by Eysenck and Eysenck (1971) in a comparative study of prisoners and matched control. Wilson and Maclean (1974) supported Eysenck's three factor theory and said that criminals tended to be more psychotic than controls.

Hostility constitutes an important aspect of P 'The Bristol Social Adjustment Guide'. Stott (1960) has been found to distinguish well between criminal and non-criminal adolescents on P items (hostility to adults, hostility to
other children and withdrawal). However, no detailed result analysis of the items from this point of view are available. On the other hand Caine, Poults and Hope (1967) found psychotics as well as criminals showing elevated scores on their Hostility scales. Eysenck and Eysenck (1973) related $P$ with masculinity and reported that men on the average scored higher on $P$ than women; but in their study female prisoners were found to be scoring high on $P$.

Most of the Indian studies have also reported criminals score higher on $P$ than non-criminals. Shanmugam (1956, 1957) in a study of delinquent boys found that delinquent boys reacted unfavourably to stress from the environment by manifesting aggressive behaviour whereas, the normal boys manifested anxiety. The delinquent boys generally manifested hatred, rebellion, violence, suicidal tendencies, insecurity, and sense of failure, whereas normal boys generally manifested traits of hope, courage, confidence and faith. Pati (1966, 1966b) found delinquents to be more aggressive and in pathological condition, possessing psychotic symptoms. Mani (1974) conducted a study on adult murderers, thieves and non-criminals. He found murderers to be more psychotic than thieves and theft group to be more psychotic than normals. Shanmugam (1978) found delinquents scoring higher on $P$ as compared to non-delinquents. Singh (1976, 1979, 1980) reported criminals showing high $P$ scores than non-criminals. Mirza (1977) also revealed the same results on delinquents. Mohan and Jaspal (1982)
found criminals committing major crimes higher on P than those committing minor crimes. Studies by Singh, A (1979a, 1979b) showed rural criminals scoring significantly higher on P as compared to urban criminals.

Shanmugam (1975) in a study of personality pattern among delinquents found both delinquent boys and girls higher on P as compared to non-delinquents. Before that Shanmugam (1956, 1957, 1958) while comparing female delinquents with normals and found female delinquents to be higher on P. Geetha (1975) studied 100 women prisoners and non-prisoners and revealed similar results. More recently Sahney (1985) have reported that delinquents scored high on P than non-delinquents.

From the above discussion it may be presumed that in a strict psychotic sense not all criminals are certainly psychotic. But in general Psychoticism and criminality do share certain important features leading us to believe that Psychoticism and criminality are quite significantly related.

(i1) Adjustment

A related aspect of personality is the adjustment of individuals. Adjustment is a process whereby an organism, organ or an individual entity enters into a relationship of harmony or equilibrium with its environment. Human beings make constant efforts to adjust themselves in relation to others so that they may lead a life acceptable to society.
Society makes it obligatory on the part of its members to conform to certain modes of conduct. The state, the tribe, village family and other nucleus groups impose various controls on an individual in order to keep him within accepted norms. The adjustment of an individual lies in self-direction through the development of a favourable self-image, learning of socially approved goals, a realistic aspiration level and frustration tolerance (Singh, 1980).

According to Crow (1974) the important components of adjusted behaviour are the possession of (1) a wholesome outlook towards life, (2) a realistic perception of life, (3) emotional and social maturity, (4) a good balance between inner and outer forces that activate human behaviour. A failure to achieve these is likely to be conducive to maladjustment which may lead to a variety of behaviour pathologies like emotional disorders, antisocial activities and crime.

Adjustment and Crime: "Crime is an individual affair, and there are as many causes of crime as there are sources of individual discontent and frustration" (Page 1971). The causes of crime can be best sought in the adjustment of the individual to his environment. Criminal behaviour is an indirect and irrational attempt to satisfy human wants and adjust to discomforting or frustrating situations. When an individual finds it difficult or impossible to satisfy his wants and desires in a direct and socially acceptable
manner, he is faced with the alternative of renouncing his motives or attempting to find substitute satisfactions. Due to non-availability of desireable solutions some persons react by developing personality disorders while others engage in antisocial behaviour of a criminal nature (Page 1981).

According to Eysenck (1964, 1970), "antisocial conduct is evidence of a lack of proper socialization" and the socialization is nothing but learning of behavioural patterns approved by the society. In this process one tries to make various adjustments toward different areas of one's life space. Reckless (1971) distinguished between two such areas and termed them as inner containment and outer containment. "The inner containment refers to the controls imposed on the individual by his conscience which helps the individual in 'self direction through the development of:

1. A favourable self image, self concept, self perception.
2. The capacity to withstand adverse pressure from others, failures and disappointments;
3. Goal orientation towards socially approved goals and a realistic aspiration level;
and finally
4. Retention of, adherence to, commitment to, acceptance of, identification with, legitimization of values, norms, laws, codes, institutions and customs'. "The outer containments refer to the controls imposed on an individual by 'society', state, the tribe, the village, the family and other nucleus groups", which are able to hold him within the bonds of accepted norms and expectations" (Reckless 1971).
Thomas (1923) has defended the interpretation of crime as a form of lack of adjustment to inner and outer motivating forces. He reduced human motives to four basic wishes, namely desire for new experiences, security, recognition, and response from others under certain circumstances, especially when normal channels of expression are blocked, individuals may resort to criminal behaviour in order to satisfy these wishes.

Adjustment is multidimensional and hence it involves, home adjustment, marital, social, emotional, occupational and health adjustment. Though it is difficult to measure adjustment with any criteria of objectivity, Bell (1937) has listed five major areas i.e., home, social, emotional, health and occupational adjustments. The criminals who have drifted away from societal norms and expectations should have poorer adjustment in these areas as compared to non-criminals who are very much in close contact with the norms of society. Thus in the acts of crime there is breach of adjustment (Mohan 1981).

The ensuing portion of this chapter is devoted to study the various dimensions of adjustment as related to crime.

(1) **Home Adjustment and Crime**

The home has been described as the cradle of personality. The family has almost exclusive contact with child during the period of greatest dependency and plasticity
and continued intimate contact over a subsequent period of several years. Thus the child's early experiences within the family group exert a profound and lasting influence on his later behaviour.

Criminologists in general, are in agreement that certain functions and characteristics of the family are among the most important factors of juvenile delinquency and that adult crime stems from the delinquent conduct shown by the juvenile (Schafer 1976). Thus unhealthy intrafamilial relationships play an important role in explaining criminal behaviour. According to Sutherland and Cressey (1966) "no child is so constituted at birth that it must inevitably become a delinquent or that it must inevitably be law-abiding. and the family is the first agency to affect the directions which a particular child will take". Barnes and Teeters (1966) stated, "A disorganised family is one of the causal factor behind most child neglect and delinquency. A disorganized family life sets in motion processes harmful to children, who may react to them by becoming delinquent or by developing traits that lead to breakdown later on, and from disorganized families come other serious social breakdowns such as mental disease, mental deficiency, child-abuse, delinquency, divorce and crime and violence". Schafer (1976) maintained that deficiency in the familial socialization process encouraged delinquent conduct, and then having failed to develop an adequate socio-ethical personality the adult engages in criminality.
Burt (1944) concluded from his study that vice and crime were present five times as frequently in the homes from which delinquent came as in the homes of non-delinquents. Glueck and Glueck (1950) reported that 84.8% of the offenders released had been reared in the homes in which there were other criminal family members.

There are some disorganized and pathogenic family patterns resulting in maladjustment to home. A few of them are discussed below:

(a) **Broken Homes**: The broken home has been tabbed by many sociologists as a prime determinant in the causation of criminal behaviour. A home may be physically broken (due to death, desertion or divorce) or psychologically broken (due to strained intrafamilial relationships (Sheldon and Glueck, 1968).

Ernest Shideler (1918) was one of the first to investigate this problem and he found that about 40 to 50% of delinquent children came from broken homes. Later on, several studies emphasized the role of broken homes in the genesis of delinquent and criminal behaviour (Breckinridge and Abbott, 1922; Study by California Youth Authority, 1948; Glueck and Glueck, 1950; Burt, 1955; Browning, 1960; Barker and Adams, 1963; Slocum and Stone, 1963).

The data of 1950 census for Philadelphia indicated that the breaking up of the home is differentially related to
delinquency affecting girls and negroes most damagingly. Toby (1957) on the other hand reported that broken homes have a causal impact on the preadolescent boys and girls. Though some of the studies by Shaw and McKay (1948); Ashley and Weeks (1940); Smith (1955); Singh A, and Sharma (1978) failed to find any consistent relationship between broken homes and rates of crime delinquency. Yet on the basis of present evidence Coleman (1970) concluded that early prolonged parental deprivation seems to play a key-role in producing affectionless characters, and schizoid personalities who are poorly socialized personalities and susceptible to involvement in delinquent activities."

(b) Inadequate Families: Despite of the evidence stating relationship between delinquency and broken homes it may well be asserted that the association between the two can be accounted for largely and entirely on the basis of defective family relationships and baneful influences in the neighbourhood preceding the breach. Mamhan (1940) has strongly supported this view. Glueck and Glueck (1950) reported that parents of delinquents were found most frequently to be mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, alcoholic, criminalistic, dependent, irresponsible and ailing in health. Other studies by Surt (1955); Shulman (1949); Healy (1915); Barker (1958) arriving at similar conclusions have shown that delinquency is associated with parental crime,
vice, alcoholism, mental disability, incompatibility and with the attitudes and behaviour of the parents towards the child. Nye (1958) found less delinquent behaviour in broken than in unhappy broken homes. Hence these factors appeared to be undoubtedly important in producing both delinquency/crime and broken homes.

(c) Parental Discipline and Crime: Burt (1925) contended that the most important difference between the situations of delinquent and non-delinquent children was in their home discipline. Further, studies by Burt (1944); Merril (1947); and Glueck and Glueck (1950) reported that delinquents came from homes where discipline had been very lax or very severe or highly erratic. A comparatively recent study by West (1969) has reported that, "lax parental rules, unstable maternal personality and disharmonious and inconsistent parents (are) three factors most highly predictive of future delinquency."

(d) Parental Punishment: McCord and McCord (1959) reported that delinquent parents depended largely on physical punishment as their method of controlling the children. They further reported that 56% of the delinquent mothers and 68% of their fathers utilized physical punishment as a primary technique, compared to 35% of the non-delinquent mothers and 35% of their fathers. Merril (1950) reported that the use of physical punishment had a positive relationship to crime. Silver et al. (1969) in a study covering three generations of
families of abused children concluded that a child who experiences violence as a child, has the potential of becoming a violent member of society in the future. From a review of literature Ilfeld (1970) concluded that "physical punishment by parents encourages violence, punishment both frustrates the child and give him a model to imitate from."

(e) **Parental Rejection**: Martin (1961) has laid emphasis on the feeling of 'anomie' a feeling of unrelated to, and helplessly detached from family and society. Communication is cut of, which results in failure on the part of the individual to learn appropriate social values and to a tendency to act out inner tensions in hostile or destructive behaviour (Coleman, 1970). Jenkins (1957) found that parental rejection had a direct affect on the child's ultimate development and growth of conscience which combined with feelings of hostility for being rejected leads to general unsocialized aggression.

Nye (1958) on the other hand reported that mutual acceptance or rejection of parent and child is more closely related to delinquent behaviour than either taken separately.

(f) **Father's Rejection**: Glueck and Glueck (1950) concluded from their study that delinquents had been emotionally deprived and stunted in personality through poor father-son relations. McCord and McCord (1959) reported that warm fathers had few criminals among their sons while neglecting fathers produced
the highest numbers of delinquents. They also concluded that the son's drive towards crime is increased even more if the father himself is criminal. Andry (1962) found that a large number of delinquent boys felt rejected by their fathers but loved by their mothers, while non-delinquents felt equally loved by both parents. Cortes and Gitti (1972) placed a heavy emphasis on father-son relationship in the genesis of delinquent behavior because the socialization of children consists in learning to accept restraints to their behavior and it is the father who is most likely to impose these restrictions.

(g) Maternal Deprivation or Over-protection: Glueck and Glueck (1950) from their long term studies of delinquents concluded quite positively that maternal role is a strong antinode to crime and that parental love unless coupled with maternal neglect also tends to prevent it. Gibbens (1961) has pointed out in his report to W.H.O. that during adolescence a boy who has identified with his mother and relied heavily on her as a role model has difficulty in shaping a masculine self-concept. As a consequence he tends to be rebellious and engages in "proving offenses".

McCord and McCord (1959) and Zola (1959) while relating type of crime to maternal protection reported that crimes against the person are for the most part a reaction against either maternal domination or parental rejection. "Retaliation against the cruelty or neglect of their fathers and the overprotectiveness of their mothers seemed to be the primary
motivations of these criminals". (McCord and McCord and Zola, 1959).

Further according to them the processes generating violent crimes might be described in this way: "Severe rejection or maternal domination causes feelings of frustration and rage, which are not inhibited by internalized controls. Because these children have aggressive models, they may in later life identify with the aggression and express this aggression towards others." (McCord and McCord and Zola, 1959).

It is evident from the above discussion that thwarting of the basic needs such as feelings of belongingness, to be loved and feelings of security have consistently been revealed in these studies that lead to some form of maladjusted behaviour, ranging all the way from mild aggression to delinquency and crime.

(II) Emotional Adjustment

According to Crow (1974) there is a continual flow of emotional experience that accompanies most of our behaviour. These affective mental qualities arise from the facilitation, inhibition, and obstruction of the impulses resulting from external and internal stimuli. The resulting emotional states give richness to life and prevent monotony. But these emotions may also present many problems in expression and control. In some extreme and dramatic experiences, emotions can pervade our whole being and warp our ways of thinking and perceiving - thus resulting in psychological imbalance. As Trojanowicz (1978) writes, "early emotional deprivation is directly associated
with and related to later psychological disturbances and emotional behaviour. "The greater the deprivation, the greater the emotional insecurity and therefore the greater the chance of emotional problems and deviant behaviour."

Coleman (1970) asserted "that our emotions are important resources in our adjustive arsenal". "These emotions may also present many problems in expression and control. Emotions like anxiety, fear, anger, depression, guilt and grief are all difficult emotions to handle effectively (Coleman, 1970). Realistic anxiety and worry help us to deal with threats and dangers but we often over react to minor anxieties and thus they become maladaptive. "Anger and hostility are often constructive forces in helping us to overcome obstacles through aggressive action, but unbridled anger and sustained hostility complicate interpersonal relations and tend to isolate the individual from others" (Coleman, 1970). In some instances chronic hostility may even lead to criminal and antisocial behaviour (Buss, 1966). Thus, failure on the part of the individual to adjust properly to these situations may give rise to variety of pathological behaviour, like emotional disturbances, alcoholism, drug addiction and other antisocial and criminal activities.

**Emotional Adjustment and Crime**

Beginning around '1900' many authors have written about emotional disturbances and criminality/delinquency.
Healy (1924-) in his study found emotional instability as the cause of misconduct. Later Healy and Brenner (1936) comparing 105 delinquents and 105 non-delinquents came to the conclusion that 91% of the delinquents as compared to 13% of non-delinquents had a clear evidence of being unhappy and discontented with their life circumstances or extremely disturbed because of emotion provoking situation or experiences. While only 13% of the non-delinquents presented the same figure. Burt (1927) calls emotional instability a single central factor which in his opinion pervades a number of symptoms. In his study, Burt (1938) alleged that 85% of the delinquents studied by him were emotionally impaired, and Shanmugam (1953) found them to react strongly to stress situations as compared to normals. Glueck and Glueck (1950) found delinquents to be more impulsive, vivacious socially assertive, defiant and ambivalent to authority, far more hostile, suspicious and destructive as compared to normals. Rajanam (1957) studied various problems of sex delinquents and prostitutes and reported that in addition to low intelligence, maladjustment in the areas of home and emotion may lead to criminal conduct. Shanmugam and Sundari (1960) found that delinquent boys lacked in disinhibition, Chowhan and Dixit (1965) reported that those delinquents who had been truants also shared characteristics of emotional insecurity. Pati (1966) revealed delinquents to be aggressive and in pathological emotional conditions.
Johnson (1966) termed crimes like murder as 'Crimes of emotionality'. Singh, A. (1976) reported major criminals having poor emotional adjustment than minor criminals. Later, Singh (1979 & 1980) also found criminals showing poorer emotional adjustment as compared to normals. Cormier (1962) stated that "murder occurs at a point of intense emotion and a feeling that to continue the relationship is inconceivable and to give up impossible." Mohan (1961) reported criminals showing poor emotional adjustment to non-criminals. Sahney (1985) reported the same on delinquents.

Recently many workers in the delinquency field consider that emotional as distinct from intellectual retardation is clearly discernible amongst delinquents as a group (Prins 1973). Roper (1952) a prison psychiatrist feels that criminality is essentially the persistence of immature attitudes and that this persistence is due to faulty home training. Edelston (1952) has provided us with a very useful and more specific concept of 'emotional infantilism' which he suggests could account for young delinquents who had remained completely arrested in their emotional life.

Thus it is evident from the above discussion that emotional maladjustment brings about emotional deprivation which plays an important role in producing criminal behaviour.
From early childhood onwards an individual is concerned with the development of self realization and self-esteem. Satisfying achievement of these personality attributes is not developed in a vacuum but depends on the amount and kind of interaction, and individual experiences in relation with other individuals in the home, school, areas of occupational activity, neighbourhood and larger societal group. Thus any attempt to explain human adjustment must take into account an individual’s interpersonal relationships (Crow, 1974). Crow (1974) stated that social relationships have emotional concomitants. Though individuals desires and drive are extremely personal, but their overt expression becomes social in its effect. “Each individual has a desire to do what he wants to do in the way he prefers and at the same time he wants to do it. However, he also learns that he is compelled by social pressures to accept the wishes of the group relative to what he does. “The gang life of children and adolescents is filled with numerous instances in which the individuals undergo humiliation and bear hardships or even pain in order that they may become members of a particular gang or clique” (Crow, 1974).

The influence of healthy interpersonal relationships for effective living are tremendous. The individual’s personality is moulded according to his experiences with the members of the various groups and the individual becomes an accepted member
of a society. Conversely, due to unhealthy social interactions certain behaviour abnormalities may occur. Therefore proper guidance is very important at this point. If these abnormal activities are allowed to continue, the seeds of self-centred activity may be sown and the individual may develop antisocial behaviour.

The sociological view of crime assumes that the offenders' criminal personality develops through his relations with his social environment. These thinkers comprehend that the criminal as a member of his social group is not an isolated individual but a product of his society. According to Schäfer (1970) the criminal is socially different from those others who prove to be 'normal' by obeying law. The lawbreaker's criminal behaviour originates in the abnormalities of his social existence or in society's attitude towards him. As opposed to the conformist conduct, he displays a form of antisociality. Thus any solution to the problem of criminals, crime can be found only in the analysis and evaluation of his relationship to his social environment" (Schäfer 1976).

Although the sociological explanations of crime have been widely criticized, even the extreme adherents of the biopsychological approaches are unable to ignore the significance of social factors in the etiology of crime. Reckless (1967) stated that though Sutherland's theory of differential association is not accepted in toto, it does
throw light on a very important aspect of crime that it is primarily learnt in association with others. The earlier experiences of poor social maladjustment are likely to have their carry over effect in later life and also in one's social adjustments (Mohan 1981).

Although it is difficult to measure social maladjustment objectively, some of the recent studies have shown that there is a significant relationship between social maladjustment and crime studies by Singh, A. (1976); Suvodha (1970); Nirmal (1977); Singh, A. (1979, 1979b); Mohan (1981); have all shown that criminals have poor social adjustment than non-criminals. More recently Sahney (1985) has shown the same results on delinquents and non-delinquents.

Thus all these studies revealed that criminals are socially maladjusted due to one reason or another.

(iv) Health Adjustment and Crime

According to Crow (1974) the individuals who suffer from any physical defect such as deafness, blindness, lameness, or are victim of chronic ill-health want to receive sympathetic understanding of their difficulty from others. At the same time, he wants to develop an attitude of self-dependence and self-realization and resents over-solicitous attempts on the part of others to do things he can do himself. Contrariwise, he becomes emotionally disturbed as if he can not adjust to his physical or health handicap. Thus he becomes a
Thus individuals with ill-health may try to compensate their feelings of inferiority in any of the numerous forms of problem behaviour. The favourable attitude of the parents and peers helps them to overcome insecurity caused by physical handicaps or ill-health, whereas an indifferent and unfavourable attitude may cause embarrassment and emotional insecurity resulting in aggressive and antisocial or deviant behaviour.

Thurston (1942) and Reckless and Dinitz (1969) found that poor health was the major factor in the behaviour of delinquent children, whereas, Glueck (1950) concluded from a study of 500 delinquents and 500 non-delinquents that weak health was not a very big factor in the behaviour of a person.

Studies by Singh (1976, 1980), Mohan (1981), Sahney (1985) revealed that criminals showed poorer health adjustment as compared to non-criminals. A comparison of results of studies by Mohan and Singh (1982) and Suvarcha (1970) revealed that normal adolescents were better adjusted on the area of health as compared to the criminals (Mohan 1981). Nirmal (1977) found delinquents showing poorer health-adjustment as compared to non-delinquents.

Thus all these studies clearly reveal that poor health may precipitate an individual to indulge in various antisocial or criminal acts.
(v) **Total Adjustment and Crime**

A review of the studies conducted on adjustment by various researchers (as discussed earlier) revealed that delinquents and criminals are poorly adjusted towards all the areas of adjustment as compared to the controls. Since all the dimensions of adjustment are interdependent it can be safely concluded that total adjustment of criminals would be poor as compared to the non-criminals. This is confirmed by the results of the various studies (Singh, 1976; Nirmal, 1977, Singh, 1930; and Mohan, 1981).

Furthermore study by Bell (1937) revealed that there is a positive significant relationship among four areas of adjustment i.e. home, emotional, health and social. Stott (1967) worked out several correlations and concluded that those adolescents who have difficulty in making adequate adjustment particularly in their social contacts tend strongly to be the same individuals whose personal relations with their parents and family are not happy. It is therefore likely that criminals will have poorer total-adjustment as compared to non-criminals.

(iii) **Values**

Another psychological factor related to personality and adjustment is the values of criminals. According to Eysenck (1970), "antisocial conduct is evidence of a lack of proper socialization and socialization is nothing but learning of behavioural patterns approved by the society".
In accordance with Sutherland's theory of differential association (1966) a person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favourable to violation of law over definitions unfavourable to violation of law; which would be intimately connected with one's value system. Thus a proper understanding of value system of criminals could be of great help in explaining the dynamics of crime causation.

A value system according to Rokeach (1979) "is an organized set of preferential standards that are used in making selections of objects and actions resolving conflicts, invoking social sanctions and coping with needs or claims for social and psychological defences of choices made or proposed."

Rokeach (1979) has stated three major assumptions concerning values: (1) different values have differing degrees of importance to any given individual; (2) resistance to change is strongest for beliefs and values; (3) if a particular value or belief is changed, the more central it is the more numerous will be changes in other beliefs and values.

**Types of Values**

Rokeach (1973) has indicated that differences among individuals are not so much in the presence or absence of particular values as in the arrangement of values, their hierarchies or priorities. "Certainly differences in values across total social systems and major distinctive cultures or civilizations typically do not consist of the total absence
of some values as over against their presence in another. In every full fledged society, everyone of Rokeach's 36 values will appear, yet as total systems, societies differ radically in their patterns of values" (Rokeach 1979). Thus value hierarchies or priorities are organizations of values which enable us to choose alternative goals and actions and to resolve conflict. In addition to hierarchical ordering, societies do differ in the extensiveness of adherence to any particular values (Williams 1970). "And finally a related but no identical mode of patterning is in their degree of universality of application" (Rokeach 1979).

A number of models to explain value system have been put forth from time to time. The model proposed by Rokeach (1967) takes a sufficiently wide view of values in terms of instrumental and terminal values.

1. **Instrumental Values**

According to Rokeach (1978) instrumental values refer to beliefs or conceptions about desirable modes of behaviour that are instrumental to the attainment of desirable end-states such as behaving honestly or responsibly. These are two types - moral or competence values. Competence or self actualization values have a personal rather than interpersonal focus and are not specially concerned with morality. A person may experience conflict between two moral values
between two competence values (e.g. to act politely and to offer intellectual criticism) (Rokeach, 1973).

2. **Terminal Values**

According to Rokeach (1973) terminal values refer to beliefs or conceptions about ultimate goals or desirable end-states of existence that are worth striving for such as, happiness or wisdom. Further terminal values may be self centered or society centered, interpersonal or interpersonal in focus; end-states such as salvation and peace of mind, for instance are interpersonal while world of peace and brotherhood are interpersonal.

**Values and Crime**

Values are 'ought' in character. 'Ought' according to Heider (1958), is impersonal, relatively invariant and interpersonally valid. "Deriving from what Kohler (1938) has called 'objective requiredness' oughtness is more an attribute of instrumental than terminal values." A person phenomenologically experiences 'oughtness' to be objectively required by society in somewhat the same way that he perceives an incomplete circle as objectively requiring closure. The oughtness of certain values is seen to originate within society which demands that all of us behave in certain ways that benefit and do not harm others. It is an objective demand that we perceive to place upon others no less than upon
ourselves in order to ensure that all people live out their lives in a social milieu within which people can trust and depend upon others. (Heldr, 1968). Thus, socialization of an individual is largely taken to be of great importance in transmitting values so that he conforms to the norms of society. Since the behaviour of criminals is in conflict with the norms of society, it is presumed that criminals and non-criminals may differ in their value systems. In other words certain values which are of least importance to non-criminals may carry a great meaning for criminals. Thus an understanding the values system of criminals and non-criminals could further prove helpful in explicating the dynamics of crime.

American criminologists held that value conflict leads to the emergence of delinquent sub-culture. This viewpoint asserted that societies often contain value system which vary in their relative dominance so that conformity with a subordinate value system evokes sanctions from the agents of dominant value system. Cohen (1955) and Miller (1958) opined that American values are dichotomized between middle and working (lower) class. Wirth (1937) says that when two conflicting value systems are simultaneously internalised, it produces a feeling of anxiety and insecurity which may result in delinquent behaviour.

In the opinion of Tannenbaum (1938) the divergence of the child from the straight road during play, adventure
and excitement along with unfavourable adult reactions results in alienation of the child which ultimately leads to acts that conflict with adult interests and values. Shaw and McKay (1957) asserted that access to criminal roles and advancement in the criminal hierarchy depends upon stable associations with older criminals from whom the necessary values and skills may be learnt. In the words of Mukherjee and Moitrayee (1980), "delinquent values have positive effect on frequency of delinquent behaviour and its causation".

Kobrin (1951) classified that the slums differ in the degree to which deviant or conventional value-systems were integrated with each other. The integrated area apparently constitutes a "training ground" for the acquisition of criminal values and skills. Cloward and Ohlin (1960) supported this view and their studies concluded that illegal opportunity structures tend to emerge only when there are stable patterns of accommodation between adult carriers of conventional and deviant values.

Shortland and Berger (1970) conducted a value survey of 131 female employees of a company. It was observed that after completing the survey only 39 per cent of the subjects returned the scoring pencils that had been distributed to them and 61 per cent did not. These females were further distinguished from one another in their value patterns.
The researchers found them differing significantly on four values:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental Values</th>
<th>Returning</th>
<th>Non-returning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminal Values</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A world at peace</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>8.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Homant and Hokesch (1970) provided twelfth graders an opportunity to cheat under conditions of high and low motivation. They also had to rank 12 instrumental values in order of their importance viz., Clean, Hardworking, Loyal, Friendly, Honest, Polite, Brave, Smart, Careful, Obedient, Sincere. Significant correlation was found between value for honest and amount of cheating under the low motivation conditions. Significant correlations of .30 and .23 were found between cheating and pretest rankings of parents.

Cochrane (1971) compared the values of inmates in states prisons in Michigan with National samples. Both the groups were matched for sex, age and race. Significant differences were reported on five values, namely - Honest, Wisdom, A World at Peace, Salvation and National security among male and female inmates. Female inmates placed a higher value on autonomy, tolerance self-fulfilment. Further values
such as Sense of accomplishment, Freedom, Independent, Broadminded, Intellectual and logical were ranked significantly higher than non-prisoner women. On the other hand, male inmates cared less for equality and more for happiness, pleasure and being capable and self-controlled than their non-prisoner male counterparts.

Stephen (1978) studied value-orientation and delinquency involvement with a sample of 412 male high school students in a mid-western standard metropolitan statistical area and concluded that (1) subscription to conventional value orientation inhibits involvement in delinquent activities, (2) adherence to subterranean value orientation serves to induce involvement in delinquent behaviour patterns. These relationships remained significant where the effect of socio-economic status and level of perceived legitimate opportunities are held constant.

More recently Snively (1985) compared the value-preferences of delinquents and non-delinquents and reported significant differences in regard to some of the instrumental and terminal values. In the case of instrumental values, the delinquents were found more inclined towards the values like Cheerful, Helpful, Honest, Intellectual, Loving and Responsible and self-controlled. Whereas on terminal values significant differences were obtained on the values of True-friendship, Wisdom, and Family security.
Whatsoever, there is a clear dearth of significant studies concerning values and crime in general yet little has been done to uncover the specific models of values as determinants for particular types of crime.