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AIMS

Crime, today has become a prevalent fact of life and every one is haunted by its presence. "Leo Tolstoy believed that the seeds of every crime are in each of us. The poverty of his statement is that it does not describe how the criminal seeds are germinated" (Schafer 1976). Therefore vigorous research is necessary to identify the various factors related to the phenomenon of crime.

Current researches in the area of criminality seem to stress personality factors. Eysenck (1964, 1970) had put forward a theory of crime wherein he suggested that criminals would come from high E/I, i.e., P quadrants. A number of studies have been done in this area and supportive evidence has accrued over the years relating these personality factors to crime (Eysenck, 1964, 1970, 1977; Forrest and Hughushi, 1965; Schalling and Holmberg 1968; Singh, 1980; Mohan 1981; Mohan and Jaspal, 1982; Gill and Mohan 1986 and Mohan and Rezden 1986).

Besides personality, the causes of crime can best be sought in the adjustment of criminals to their environment. Researches have shown that maladjustment in some areas such as home, health, social and emotional due to defective socialization or other environmental factors may predispose an individual towards crime. Studies by Singh, A. (1979, 1980); Nirmal (1970); Mohan (1981) and Sahney (1985) have all revealed that criminals
show poorer home, health, social and emotional adjustment as compared to non-criminals.

Another variable related to personality and adjustment is the values of criminals. According to Eysenck (1964, 1970), "antisocial conduct is an evidence of lack of proper socialization and socialization is nothing but learning of behavioural modes approved by the society." A failure to adjust to these norms is likely to be conducive to maladjustment leading to a variety of behavioural problems ultimately resulting in antisocial behaviour and crime. Thus, one of the aims of the present study was to make a comparative analysis of personality, adjustment and values of criminals and non-criminals. This may prove helpful in further explaining the dynamics of crime at a more intensive level.

The evidence which was accumulated on the basis of research done in the area of crime and personality suggests that prisoners as a whole differ in their personality make-up from control groups (Tannenbaum 1977). In spite of the successful attempts relating different variables to crime, it is unreasonable to suppose that criminals are a homogenous group. It has further been suggested that even more significant differences could be obtained amongst criminals if typology of crime is taken into account (Eysenck, 1970; Mohan and Jaspal, 1982; Mohan and Gill, J. 1984; Gill, J.K. and Mohan, 1986; and Mohan and Razdan, 1986).
In the present study an attempt is being made to study the different types of criminals in relation to their personality, adjustment and values. The previous work done in this area takes into account only different types of criminal. The present work is an endeavour to study the above mentioned variables conjointly with different types and degrees of criminals.

One of the primitive attempts to classify criminals was done by Bonger (1952) according to the motives of the offenders as economic, social, political etc. Modern trends lean towards the classification of criminals that may lead to theoretical formulation (Schaefer, 1976). Although many attempts have been made to classify criminals generally in terms of the types of crime committed, yet the outcome has not been very successful (as discussed in Chapter IIIO). Certainly no classification can be perfect. Since human conduct and behaviour is complex and cannot be labelled and filled in individual categories.

Though various classifications have been made with regard to crime from time to time by different psychologists and criminologists, no satisfactory method has been arrived at. A synthesis is made between different classifications for evolving a suitable system for the present study. In the present study the classification of criminals was based on two broad categories viz., body and property offenders.
Crimes against body are generally termed as 'crimes of passion' and are committed by persons who are aggressive and impulsive. In such crimes, the offender usually has feelings of animosity towards the victim which result in sporadic outburst on the part of the offender leading to the act of violence terminating in the offence against body. Further taking a lead from recent interests in victimology crimes against body may to some extent be categorized under 'victim precipitated crimes' (Khun, 1983; Girohi, 1983; Lhomugam, 1985; and Chockalingam, 1985). Because in such crimes like murder, rape etc. victims sometimes precipitate the offenders in the commission of an offence. Crimes against property on other hand are generally termed as 'crimes of logic'. They are generally committed against strangers and thus are impersonal crimes. Such crimes usually do not represent any violent antagonism towards the victim, but are the result of scheming and ruthless and reckless interests at variance with the interests of the victims (Gill, S.K. 1982).

These two broad categories were further subdivided into two categories as major and minor criminals according to the punishment involved in the crime. According to Singh (1980) major offences are offences against the state or persons which are triable by the court of session-judges and the punishment involved is more than three years. Minor offences on the other hand, are triable summarily and by any court of justice and the punishment involved is three years or less.
The present study envisaged to make a comparative analysis of personality, adjustment and values of different types of criminals and non-criminals. In an age wherein the theory of punishment is moving away from one of deterrence, it becomes essential to delve deeply into the 'psyche' of different types of criminals by studying their personality, value systems and maladjusted behaviour patterns. This may enable us in providing an explanatory framework for generating causal claims for different types of offenders. In the light of this kind of knowledge, proper direction could be given to their value patterns thus enabling them to acquire more satisfying ways of adjustment acceptable to society.

Moreover by relating different causal conditions to different offender types, it may be possible to type the population of offenders in prison and on probation. Furthermore, this may help us in obtaining clues as to optimal methods of treatment for different types of criminals (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1970). In this way typology would have prognostic as well as scientific value.

Whatsoever there is no dearth of studies stating the relationship of personality and adjustment factors to crime, yet little has been done to study the relationship of these variables conjointly in relation to type and degree of crime. In the present study an attempt has been made to study crime in relation to the type and degree offence and a comparative evaluation shall be made of criminal and
non-criminal sample.

Keeping in mind the aims of the present study, and in the light of the reviewed literature already discussed (in Chapter II) following hypotheses may be framed.

HYPOTHESES

(A) PERSONALITY AND CRIME

Eysenck's theory of criminality (1970) stated that criminals would come from high E/I, h, P quadrants as compared to matched normal controls. There is bulk of literature supporting this evidence which has already been discussed in Chapter II. The three factors viz. E/I, N, P would be discussed separately in order to deduce hypotheses linking each with the type and degree of crime as well as with non-criminals.

(I) Extraversion and Crime

Eysenck (1970) stated that "it is conscience which is in the main instrumental in making us behave in a morally and socially acceptable manner; that this conscience is the combination and culmination of a long process of conditioning; and that failure on the part of a person to become conditioned is likely to be a prominent cause in his running a foul of the law and of the social mores generally." Furthermore it has been stated by Eysenck (1970) that introverts are characterised by a strong excitatory and weak inhibitory potential, whereas, extraverts are characterized by a weak excitatory and strong
inhibitory potential resulting thereby, that introverts should form conditioned responses better than extraverts."
It was therefore predicted that extraverts are more susceptible to commit antisocial and criminal acts (Eysenck 1970). Many studies have discredited Eysenck's hypothesis (1964, 1970) relating crime with E/I (e.g. Little, 1963; Hoghughi and Forrest, 1968; Singh, 1980; Mohan and Jaspal and Gill, B.K. and Mohan, 1986). Later Eysenck modified his theory and suggested that it is the Impulsivity aspect of E/I rather than the Sociability which is related to crime (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1971a).

On the basis of these studies, it may be hypothesised that:

"Criminals and non-criminals as a whole would not differ significantly on their scores on Extraversion."

(1) Extraversion and Type of Crime

Mani (1978) in a comparative study of murderers and violent criminals (convicted for rape and dacoity) had come to the conclusion that all criminals do not necessarily exhibit the same personality traits; that violent criminals show tendencies of high E/I/S/P and that murderers scored more in their joint status on E/I and N. However, a contrary view was expressed by Smocki (1967) who found that property offenders are more extraverted than murderers. In the context of such confounding results it may be hypothesized that:

"Body and property offenders would not differ much on their scores on Extraversion."
(ii) **Extraversion and Degree of Crime**

Mohi and Jasmp (1982) in their study reported major offenders scoring higher on E/I as compared to minor offenders. Mani (1978) also reported violent offenders scoring higher on their joint status on E/I. Since major crimes are more violent in nature than minor crimes it may be hypothesized that:

"Major offenders would score higher on Extraversion as compared to minor offenders."

(II) **Impulsivity/Sociability and Crime**

Eysenck and Eysenck (1963) put forward a theory about the dual nature of Extraversion, wherein they said that Sociability and Impulsivity are primary traits contributing to the higher order Extraversion-Introversion factor. The failure of many studies to find any relationship between E/I and crime (Bartholomew, 1959; Hitch, 1962; Little, 1963; Burgess, 1972; Singh, 1980; Mohi and Jasmp, 1982; and Gill, S.K. and Mohi 1986) was attributed to the fact that it is the impulsivity items that clearly differentiate between criminals and controls than the sociability ones (Schalling, 1970).

According to Schalling (1970), the relations postulated by Eysenck (1957) to exist between cortical arousal, conditionability and Extraversion are valid only for the impulsiveness component of E/I. In accordance with this reasoning, Eysenck hypothesized that criminals are higher on impulsiveness and lower on sociability as compared to
non-criminals. Eysenck and Eysenck (1971) later confirmed this finding that it is the Impulsivity items rather than the Sociability ones which differentiate the criminals from non-criminals. Indian studies by Singh (1980), Mohan and Jaspal (1982) and Gill, S.K. and Mohan (1986) have also reported criminals scoring higher on Impulsivity and lower on Sociability items as compared to non-criminals.

In the light of above review it may be hypothesized that:

"Criminals would obtain higher scores on Impulsivity and lower on Sociability as compared to non-criminals."

1) **Impulsivity/Sociability and Type of Crime**

According to Eysenck (1976) Impulsiveness has the connotation of rapid action without deliberation or hesitation and without any prior planning of the act. Sociability on the other hand envisages a liking for the company of others. As stated earlier, crimes against body are primarily of an impulsive nature. On the other hand crimes against property are usually the result of scheming and planning lacking an element of aggressive impulsiveness. Therefore, body offenders are expected to score higher on impulsivity and lower on sociability items. A recent study by Gill, S.K. and Mohan (1986) has also revealed that body offenders scored higher on Impulsivity and lower on Sociability items as compared to property offenders.
Keeping in line with the above reasoning it may be hypothesized that:

"Bodily offenders would obtain higher scores on impulsivity and lower on sociability items as compared to property offenders."

(ii) Impulsivity/Sociability and Degree of Crime

Furthermore it may be asserted that major offences being more heinous and brutal are committed in the heat of emotional impulsiveness. Therefore it may be predicted that major criminals would score higher on impulsivity than minor criminals. Singh (1979) reported that major offenders scored higher on Impulsivity items and lower on Sociability items as compared to minor offenders.

Hence in the light of above review it may be deduced that:

"Major offenders would obtain higher scores on impulsivity and lower on sociability as compared to minor offenders."

(III) Neuroticism and Crime

Eysenck and Eysenck (1971) while stating his theory of crime held that "high degrees of anxiety or neuroticism tended to act as a drive strongly reinforcing the extraverted or introverted tendencies favouring or disfavouring the anti-social conduct." Thus it was deduced that criminals would obtain higher scores on N than controls. A majority of studies
have put forth the evidence supporting the relationship between Neuroticism and crime (Bartholomew, 1957, 1959; Field, 1960; Syed, 1964; Millman, 1966; Schalling and Holmberg, 1968; Eysenck and Eysenck, 1970, 1971, 1973; Singh, 1980; Mohan, 1981; Mohan and Jaspal, 1982). On the other hand, a few of the studies have found no differences between the Neuroticism scores of criminals and non-criminals (Bartholomew, 1963; Little, 1963; Hoghuchi and Forrest, 1965).

Burgess (1972) elevated the dimension of Neuroticism to the top position of the determinants of crime. Burgess (1972) argued that "neurotics with habitual antisocial response tend to engage in those responses more strongly than non-criminals."

Thus if this be the case, it may be hypothesized that:

"Criminals would obtain higher scores on Neuroticism than non-criminals."

(1) Neuroticism and Type of Crime

For the N dimension, Blackburn (1968) held that the frequency and intensity of aggressive responses indicated habit strength; thus there should be a very close relation between N, aggression and aggressive crimes. Singh (1980) reported murderers scored higher on N than other criminals. Generally offences against body are more of an aggressive nature as compared to crimes against property. Studies by
Mohan and Gill (1964) and Mohan and Randan (1986) also reported that body offenders score higher on manifest aggression than property offenders.

Keeping in view with the above reasoning it may be deduced that:

"Body offenders would score higher on Neuroticism as compared to property offenders."

(ii) Neuroticism and Degree of Crime

Studies by Singh (1980) and Mohan and Jaspal (1982) have reported that male criminals who had committed major offences scored higher on N than minor offenders. Mani (1978) found violent criminals scoring higher on N. Thus it may be safely predicted that major offences which are more violent in nature than minor offences may show higher scores on Neuroticism.

In the light of above discussion it may be deduced that:

"Major offenders would score higher on Neuroticism as compared to minor offenders."

(IV) Psychoticism and Crime

Apart from E/I and N being related to criminality Eysenck (1970) has maintained that the third affective dimension of personality i.e. Psychoticism (P) is perhaps more consistently linked with crime. He had suggested that
there may be two reasons for believing this: (1) The traits describing a psychotic resemble those exhibited by criminals (2) and that psychoses and criminality have a particular close connection (Odegard, 1963; Hesten, 1966; and Eysenck, 1972).

Furthermore, criminals as a whole have been observed to have very high scores on Psychoticism in comparison to non-criminals (Eysenck, 1970; Caine, Poulds and Hope, 1970; Shamugam, 1975; Mohan, 1981; Mohan and Jaspal, 1982; and Gill & Mohan, 1986). Unlike E/I and N, no negative or insignificant results have been obtained so far.

Hence, in the light of findings of the above-mentioned studies, it may be hypothesized that:

"Criminals would obtain higher scores on Psychoticism as compared to non-criminals".

(1) Psychoticism and Type of Crime

Hostility is an important aspect of P (Eysenck, 1970) and it is interesting to note that Caine, Poulds and Hope (1967) found that both psychotics and criminals had elevated scores on hostility scales. The Bristol Social Adjustment Guide (Scott, 1960) has been found to distinguish well between criminal and non-criminal adolescents on P items (This includes hostility to adults, hostility to other children and withdrawal). Keeping this line of
research in mind it may further be predicted that body offenders would show higher scores on Psychoticism than property offenders. Since crimes against body are usually the outcome of intense feelings of hostility towards the victim. Whereas property offences are impersonal crimes. However studies by Eysenck (1977) and Gill, B.K. and Mohan (1986) failed to obtain any differences between body and property offenders on the P dimension.

In the light of above discussion it may be deduced that:

"Body offenders would score higher on Psychoticism as compared to property offenders."

(ii) Psychoticism and Degree of Crime

A few recent studies have reported a close relationship between Psychoticism and violent offences. Eysenck and Eysenck (1971) asserted that aggressive crimes and crimes involving unnecessary cruelty seemed to carry implications of high P. Marriage (1975) found that violent offences are high P offences. Furthermore, Eysenck et al. (1977) found that violent offenders scored very high on P. Therefore, it may be asserted that major offences which are more aggressive and violent in nature than minor offences are also high P offences. Singh (1979) found major offenders scored high on P than minor offenders.

In the light of this positive evidence it may be
deduced that:

"Major offenders would score higher on Psychoticism than minor offenders".

(B) ADJUSTMENT AND CRIME

The second area of the present study aimed at studying the adjustment differences of different types of criminals and non-criminals. According to Eysenck (1964, 1970) "antisocial conduct is evidence of a lack of proper socialization and socialization is nothing but learning of behavioural patterns approved by the society." Deviations or moving away i.e. a failure to adjust to these norms and expectations may lead one towards crime (Moh'an 1981). A number of studies have confirmed this relationship between maladjustment and crime/delinquency. (Singh, A 1976; Nirmal, 1977; Singh, A., 1977a; 1979b; Singh, 1980; Mohan, 1981; and Sahney, 1985).

Adjustment is multidimensional and hence it involves home, social, emotional, occupational and health adjustment (Bell, 1937). The ensuing portion of this chapter is devoted to framing of hypotheses relating different types of adjustment to crime.

(I) Home-Adjustment and Crime

The importance of home in an individual's life is fairly obvious. There have been many studies which have related home-maladjustment to propensity of crime. Barker
and Adams (1962) found that one third of the institutionalized delinquents came from broken homes. Ganguly and Maitra (1966) have related parental role and family dynamics to the inadequate socialization of delinquents. Singh (1980) and Mohan (1981) have also reported home maladjustment to be significantly related with criminal behaviour. More recently Sahney (1985) has reported delinquents showing poorer home adjustment than non-delinquents.

In light of the above mentioned studies it may be hypothesized that:

"Criminals would show poorer home-adjustment than non-criminals".

(1) **Home Adjustment and Type of Crime**

In the absence of research evidence supporting the relationship between the type of crime and home adjustment, it would be difficult to formulate any precise hypothesis. Hence a null hypothesis may be framed. A null hypothesis according to Garret (1977) "constitutes a challenge and the function of an experiment is to give the facts a chance to refute (or fail to refute) this challenge." Therefore, in the present case it would be better to formulate a null hypothesis where body and property offenders are being tested on home adjustment. The obtained results will give further direction to the study. Therefore it may be stated that:
There will be no significant differences between body and property offenders on their scores on Home-adjustment.

(ii) Home Adjustment and Degree of Crime

Manhan (1957) reported that delinquents coming from broken homes were more likely to be recidivists than delinquents from unbroken homes. Singh, A. (1979a) and Singh (1980) found that male criminals committing major crimes showed poorer home-adjustment as compared to the criminals committing minor crimes. Since home-adjustment is directly related with criminal behaviour, it may further be stated that major acts of crimes being more heinous and brutal than minor offences, are the result of intense breakdown of home adjustment.

If this be the case it may be hypothesised that:

"Major offenders would show poorer home adjustment as compared to minor offenders."

(II) Emotional Adjustment and Crime

Various investigators have reported criminals showing poorer emotional adjustment than non-criminals. Realy and Bronner (1936) found that 91% of the delinquents gave evidence of emotional impairment. Shanmugam (1953) reported that delinquent boys reacted aggressively to stress situations as compared to normal boys. McCord and McCord (1959) believed that there is a strong emotional factor in criminality. Singh (1960) and Mohan (1961) have also found criminals showing
poorer emotional adjustment than controls. More recently Bahney (1985) has also reported that delinquents had poorer emotional adjustment than non-delinquents.

Therefore it may be hypothesized that:

"Criminals would show poorer emotional adjustment than non-criminals."

(1) Emotional Adjustment and Type of Crime

Crimes against body are usually termed as crimes of passion and are committed in the heat of emotional impulsiveness. Generally the victim is a person against whom the offender has feelings of animosity which result in the sporadic outburst on the part of the offender. Crimes against property on the other hand are crimes of logic which are usually impersonal in nature and generally do not represent violent antagonism towards the victim.

Further taking a lead from recent interests in victimology it may be stated that in crimes against body victims presence is somehow directly involved in the commission of an offence (Siven, 1983; Shanmugam, 1985; Chockalingam, 1985). Therefore any provocation on the part of the victim may lead to an intense breakdown of emotional adjustment on the part of body offenders.

In the light of this evidence it may be deduced that:

"Body offenders would show poorer emotional adjustment than property offender"
Mohan and Mazumdar (1986) in their study reported that major criminal acts being more heinous and brutal involved intense breakdown of emotional adjustment and stability than minor criminal acts. Earlier Mohan and Jaswal (1982) had found that major offenders scored higher on anxiety than minor offenders. Singh, A. (1972) reported that the criminals committing major crimes like murder show poorer emotional adjustment than the criminals committing minor acts like theft, pickpocketing.

Keeping this line of research in mind it may be hypothesized that:

"Major offenders would score higher on emotional-adjustment than minor offenders."

(III) **Crime and Social Adjustment.**

Social adjustment is another aspect which may be of salience in the study of crime. 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. Much of the research work in the recent years have been centered upon the processes of learning of aggressive behaviour, especially upon the role models and conditions which lead to the learning of aggressive responses (Bandura and Walters 1959, 1963, Trasler, 1962 and Eysenck, 1964, 1970).
The earlier experiences of poor socialization are likely to have their carry over effect in later life and also in one's social adjustments. So in case of criminals one may expect poorer social adjustment (Mohan, 1981). Later Mohan (1981) confirmed this finding that criminals showed poorer social adjustment than non-criminals. Sahney (1985) also reported that delinquents showed poorer social adjustment than non-delinquents.

In the light of the above evidence it may be hypothesized that:

"Criminals would show poorer social adjustment than non-criminals."

(1) Social Adjustment and Type of Crime

Mohan and Gill, J. (1985) and Mohan and Hazdan (1986) found that property offenders showed better social adjustment than body offenders. The results were explained in consonance with the fact that property offences are the result of scheming and planning and are usually committed in a group, thereby result in better social adjustment than body offenders. Thus one may expect better social adjustment among property offenders though for a wrong goal.

Hence it may be hypothesized that:

"Body offenders would show poorer social adjustment than property offenders."
(ii) **Social Adjustment and Degree of Crime**

A study by Mohan and Razdan (1986) revealed that major offenders had poorer social adjustment than minor offenders. This could be due to the fact that major offenders once being condemned by their society desire to shun society thereby show poorer social adjustment than minor offenders.

This observation may lead to the following hypothesis:

"Major offenders would show poorer social adjustment than minor offenders."

(IV) **Health Adjustment and Crime**

None of the theories offered so far as reviewed by Reckless (1967) Barness and Teeters (1966) reported poor health as a factor responsible for crime. Although Mohan (1981) reported criminals having poorer health adjustment compared to non-criminals. Any health problem or physical defect is likely to be a source of self consciousness to the individual which may not have a direct affect on an individual's personality, but on the individuals own reaction to his peculiarity (Tappan, 1949; Station, 1963). This could lead to poor adjustment in the area of health.

In the light of the above evidence available the following hypothesis may be framed that:

"Criminals would show poorer health adjustment than non-criminals."
Due to lack of supportive evidence, it is very difficult to formulate any precise hypothesis relating health adjustment to type and degree of crime. Therefore, it would be better if a null hypothesis of no differences may be framed in the present case where different types and different degrees of criminals are being tested on health adjustment. The results shall give further direction to the study.

Therefore it may be hypothesized that:

(a) "There will be no significant differences between body and property offenders on their scores on health adjustment."

(b) "There will be no significant differences between the scores of major and minor offenders on health adjustment."

Another area for the present research work was to study the value systems of criminals and non-criminals. Bokeach (1973) has indicated that "differences among individuals may not be so much in the presence or absence of particular values, as in their arrangement of values on hierarchy." The present study intended among other things to study the differences in the value systems of criminals and non-criminals in respect to Instrumental and Terminal values with the help of a Bokeach Value Scale (Bokeach, 1967).
According to Eysenck (1964, 1970), "antisocial conduct is an evidence of lack of proper socialization and socialization is nothing but learning of behavioural modes approved by the society". In accordance with Sutherland's theory of differential association (1960) 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. Since the behaviour of criminals is in conflict with the social norms, it follows that their value systems will be quite different from the non-criminals who show reasonable respect to the norms of their social and cultural make-up. Studies by Bortland and Berger (1970); Homant and Rokeach (1970) and Cochrane (1972) revealed that delinquents differed in their value preferences from non-delinquents. This is explained by Shanker (1978) who believes that "the system of social and moral values or 'super ego' or 'conscience' of delinquents is ill developed which makes him 'patient of behaviour disorder' and hence different from non-delinquents."

Values in the present study have been studied in the context of instrumental and terminal values. Terminal values according to Rokeach (1973) are ultimate goals of existence that are worth striving for and instrumental values refer to beliefs or conceptions about desirable modes of behaviour that are instrumental to the attainment of
desirable end states. Furthermore, Rokeach (1973) has asserted that individuals differ not in the presence or absence of such values but in their arrangement or hierarchy. In accordance with Eysenck's reasoning which stated that criminals are poorly socialized, it may further be asserted that ultimate goals and the means for achieving these goals of criminals and non-criminals will be quite different. Thus significant differences may be observed in the value systems of criminals and non-criminals in respect to instrumental and terminal values.

(I) Instrumental Values and Crime

A recent study by Sahney (1985) revealed that criminals and non-criminals differed significantly in their preference towards nine of the instrumental values. The study reported that delinquents attached relatively more importance to the instrumental values of Capable, Clean, Courageous and Forgiving than non-delinquents. Non-delinquents on the other hand preferred more for the values of Broadminded, Honest, Obedient, Responsible and Self-controlled.

Though these results were obtained on delinquent and non-delinquent subjects, it is expected that the same differences may be obtained on the adult sample. Thus it may be hypothesized that:
"Criminals would rate significantly higher for the instrumental values of Capable, Clean, Courageous and Forgiving but significantly lower on Broadminded, Honest, Obedient, Responsible and Self-controlled than non-criminals."

In the absence of research evidence stating the relationship of the remaining instrumental values of Rokeach Value Scale to crime, null hypothesis has been assumed.

(II) Terminal Values and Crime

A study by Sainey (1985) derived a few differences in the preferences of delinquents and non-delinquents in respect to terminal values. It was reported that delinquents rated higher for terminal values of Family-security, True-friendship, and Wisdom as compared to the non-delinquents. For the remaining terminal values the preferences of delinquents were similar to that of non-delinquents. Hence it may be hypothesized that:

"Criminals would rate higher for the terminal values of Family-security, True friendship and Wisdom than non-criminals."

Null hypothesis may be assumed for the remaining terminal values. The obtained results shall give further direction to the study.
Values and Type/Decree of Crime

The aforementioned studies were making comparisons between the value preferences of criminal and non-criminal subjects. So far not much work has accrued in terms of typology of crime and values. A recent study by Mohan and Razdan (1986) has reported that body and property offenders differed significantly in their value preferences on some of the instrumental and terminal values.

(1) Instrumental Values and Type of Crime

On instrumental values Mohan and Razdan (1986) found that property offenders attached more importance to the instrumental values of Ambitious, Clean, Helpful and Honest. Body offenders on the other hand rated higher for the instrumental value of Honesty than Property offenders. The results were explained in consonance with the fact that, "Crimes against property are usually the result of the dishonest nature on the part of the offenders, whereas body offences are mostly impulsive" (Mohan and Razdan, 1986). Therefore body offenders were expected to attach more importance to the value "Honesty" than
property offenders.

Keeping in view the above mentioned results it may be hypothesized that:

"Property offenders would rate significantly higher on instrumental values of Ambitious, Clean, Helpful and Logical but significantly lower on Honesty than body offenders."

Null hypothesis may also be assumed on the remaining instrumental values, as results will give further direction to the study.

(ii) Terminal Values and Type of Crime

Mohan and Hazdan (1986) found that property offenders attached relatively more importance to the terminal values of "An exciting life" and "True friendship" than body offenders. The results were explained on the grounds that since crimes against property are usually committed in a group, therefore property offenders craved for more excitement in life and rated higher for the value 'True friendship' than body offenders. Body offenders on the other hand valued self respect higher on hierarchy than property offenders. The results were explained on the grounds that, "to body offenders self respect is of great value, hence a slight provocation on the part of the victim may lead them to commit an offence against body" (Mohan and Hazdan, 1986).
In the light of the research evidence available, it may be hypothesized that:

"Property offenders would rate significantly higher for terminal values of 'An Exciting life' and 'True friendship' but lower on 'Self respect' as compared to body offenders."

Null hypothesis may be assumed for the remaining terminal values. The results shall give further direction to the study.

Due to lack of any research evidence supporting the relationship between degree of crime and values it is difficult to formulate any precise hypothesis. Therefore, it would be better to formulate a null hypothesis when major and minor criminals are tested in respect to instrumental and terminal values.

Thus it may be stated that:

"There will be no significant differences in the value systems of major and minor offenders in respect to instrumental and terminal values."