The present research work was an endeavour to study the personality, adjustment and values of different types of criminals and non-criminals and a comparative evaluation was to be made between the criminal and non-criminal subjects. The criminals were further ramified into four subcategories according to the type (Body and Property offenders) and degree of the offence (Major and Minor criminals). The discussion that follows would therefore, highlight the observed differences between criminals and non-criminals on the variables of personality, adjustment and values as well as analyse the effects of type and degree of crime on these variables.

(A) PERSONALITY AND CRIME

While reviewing the literature on crime and personality it was suggested that there is a greater need to study the personality ingredients assumed to accompany some specific pattern of criminality. Feldman (1976) observed "Personality test scores do indeed help to predict aggressive behaviour; and the Eysenckian system of personality appears promising". Eysenck (1970) has opined that criminals are not a homogenous group, it is therefore likely that even more differentiating results could be obtained if typology of crime was taken into account. The present study was therefore undertaken to investigate the personality differences, if any, of different types of criminals and non-criminals. Personality was measured in terms of Eysenckian personality model of Extraversion,
Neuroticism and Psychoticism. In the ensuing discourse each dimension will be discussed separately in order to bring out a report of the final findings of the study.

**Personality Differences for Criminals and Non-criminals**

(1) **Extraversion and Crime**

According to Eysenck (1970), "propensity to crime is universal but is held in check by a person's conscience". This conscience develops through the process of socialization which occurs due to the formation of appropriate conditioned responses in childhood and youth. As these form less easily in extraverts so they are more likely to commit criminal and antisocial acts than introverts. However, a few studies have discredited Eysenck's (1964, 1970) hypothesis relating crime with E/I (e.g. Little, 1963; Hoghugi and Forrest, 1968; Singh, 1980; Mohan and Jasal, 1982; Gill, S.K. and Mohan, 1986). Later Eysenck himself (1971a) modified his theory and suggested that it is the Impulsivity aspect of E/I rather than Sociability which is related to crime.

On the basis of these studies it was hypothesized that criminals as a whole would not differ significantly from non-criminals on E/I as measured by PEN. The results of the present study are not in accordance with the hypothesis. A glance at the mean scores of criminals and non-criminals on PEN reveals that the criminals have scored a mean score of 12.27 and the
mean score for non-criminals is 13.26. A comparison of mean differences suggested that non-criminals are more extraverted than criminals. The differences have been found to be statistically significant (t-ratio = 3.25, p < .05).

The results of the present study have corroborated the findings of those studies which have discredited Eysenck's hypothesis relating E/I to crime, by showing that E/I factor is not higher in criminals. The present finding which suggests that non-criminals are higher on E/I than criminals have been confirmed by many earlier researches. Studies by Shammugam and Sundari (1966); Millman (1966); Berry (1968); Houghugh and Forrest (1967); Singh (1980); and Mohan and Jaspal (1962) have all revealed that criminals and delinquents were less extraverted than normals.

According to Eysenck (1964) internalization of norms is a conditioned reflex and since extraverts condition poorly due to their tendency to build up cortical fatigue quickly, they do not get properly socialized. Further time passes more slowly for extraverts, they become easily bored and seek stimulation (excitement) which may bring them in conflict with law. Therefore they would be predisposed towards criminal behaviour reflecting asocial viewpoints. Gough and Cleckly (1964) have aptly described criminals as "poorly socialized".

Megargee (1966) has given two exceptions to Eysenck's contention regarding E and criminality. (1) The introverts reared in criminal surroundings will readily adapt the norms of their
groups and therefore will frequently appear in criminal populations (Franks, 1956; Blackburn, 1968) and (2) under certain circumstances the oversocialized (introverted) behaviour may also lead to criminal activity. Blackburn (1968) tested Megargee's contentions and found that the extremely aggressive offenders were in fact more introverted, over controlled and more socialized.

Burgess (1972) while comparing the Canadian prisoners with normal Canadian controls contradicted Eysenck's theory. He found that mean scores on E/I for both the groups were virtually identical. Cochrane (1974) also failed to demonstrate a relationship of crime and E. The results of the present study have also failed to report a relationship of E/I to crime. Contrarily non-criminal subjects have obtained higher scores on E/I.

According to Jaspal (1977), "it would be reasonable to conclude that those studies which could not confirm Eysenck's theory regarding E/I had methodological errors in that the tools used for personality measurement were not clearly differentiated into relative proportions of sociability and impulsivity items." The results of the present study may also be explained in accordance with the above reasoning. The E scale of PEN inventory is heavily loaded with sociability items containing only 2-3 items relating to impulsivity (according to factor loadings on these items given by Eysenck, 1970a). This
strengthens our argument that since criminals are higher on Impulsivity, therefore they failed to score higher on E/I items of PEN inventory. Another reason could be that since criminals are not a homogenous group, more significant results could be obtained between E/I and crime, if typology of criminals is taken into account.

(1) **Extraversion and type of crime**

Harid (1978) is a comparative study of murderers and violent criminals (convicted for rape and dacoity) had come to the conclusion that all criminals do not exhibit the same personality traits; that violent criminals show tendencies of high E/I, N, P and that murderers scored more in their joint status on E/I and N. However, a contrary view was expressed by Sanocki (1967) who found that property offenders are more extraverted than murderers. Whereas a study by Singh (1980) failed to report that murderers are high on Extraversion. In the presence of such confounding results it was hypothesized that body and property offenders would not differ significantly on their joint scores on E/I. The overall results obtained are in the predicted direction.

The mean scores for body offenders on E/I items is 12.26 and for property offenders is 12.27. The obtained results are highly insignificant (F-ratio = .006; df = 1; p > .05)

A recent study by Gill and Mohan (1986) also reported insignificant results for body and property offenders on their
joint scores on E/I. However significant results were obtained when E/I items were further split into Impulsivity and Sociability items.

The findings of the present study further suggested that the type of crime is not affected by E/I factors alone and it would be worthwhile to study Extraversion in terms of Impulsivity and Sociability components in order to bring out differences between different types of criminals than pooled items on E/I.

(ii) Extraversion and degree of Crime

A study by Mohan and Jaspal (1982) revealed that Major offenders scored significantly higher than Minor offenders on E/I items. Earlier Mani (1978) had also reported violent offenders scoring higher on E. In the context of the above findings it was hypothesized for the present study that Major offenders would obtain higher scores on E/I as compared to Minor offenders. Thus the hypothesis has been upheld in the present case. The mean scores of major and minor offenders on E is 12.91 and 11.63 respectively. The mean differences have been found to be statistically significant (F-ratio = 9.79; df = 1; p < .01).

Interaction Effect For Extraversion

The positive effect of type x degree of crime is shown by a significant interaction scores on Extraversion (F-ratio=27.63; df = 1; p < .01). The mean scores of major offenders for body crimes is 11.82 and Minor offenders showed a mean score of 12.70.
On crimes against property Major and Minor offenders scored a mean score of 14.00 and 10.55 respectively. The Graph showing the two-way significant interaction is given in Fig. V. Fig. V reveals that on Extraversion the differences in the mean scores of Major and Minor criminals in crimes against property are very wide, whereas Major and Minor criminals in crimes against body could not show any significant differences.

Differences of Non-criminals and Different Types of Criminals on Extraversion

While comparing the scores of non-criminals to each type and degree group of crime it was found that on Extraversion two groups of criminals i.e. body major and property minor yielded significant results; the mean scores are respectively 11.82 and 10.55. The mean score for non-criminals is 13.26. The results were statistically significant (See Table V). Thus the obtained results do not hold true for Eysenckian model which suggests that criminals as a group are higher on E. On the contrary throughout the present study criminals obtained lower scores on E as compared to non-criminals even at different type and degree levels of crime.

(2) Impulsivity/Sociability and Crime

According to Eysenck and Eysenck (1963) Sociability and Impulsivity are the primary traits contributing to the higher order factor of E/I. It was also suggested that the two extraversion factors may differ with regard to the relative
importance of environmental vs genetic influences; impulsivity having deeper roots in heredity and sociability being more easily subjected to environmental influences (Eysenck 1963).

It was hypothesized for the present study that criminals would obtain higher scores on Impulsivity and lower on Sociability as compared to non-criminals. In accordance with the hypothesis already framed the criminals in the present study have scored higher on Impulsivity and lower on Sociability as compared to non-criminals. The respective means for criminals and non-criminals on Impulsivity items are 7.82 and 5.12. The mean differences are statistically significant (t-ratio = 8.45; p <.01). On Sociability items the mean score for criminals is 7.24 and for non-criminals is 8.76. Again the differences have been found to be statistically significant (t-ratio = 5.45, p <.01).

The present findings have confirmed the earlier research work by Sanocki (1969); Schalling (1970); Eysenck and Eysenck (1971a), Singh (1980); Mohan and Jaspal (1982); and Gill, S.K. and Mohan (1986). Sanocki (1969) while studying the personality of criminals, item analysed the subjects responses on the E/I dimension of MPI and found that they scored significantly higher on Impulsivity rather than on Sociability. Eysenck and Eysenck (1971) also confirmed this finding that the Impulsivity component of E/I is higher in criminals.

According to Eysenck and Eysenck (1971) the correlation between eyeblink conditioning and Extraversion is mediated by
the Impulsivity items in the scale rather than the Sociability ones. This suggests that individuals who are higher on Impulsivity would condition poorly and also thereby are poorly socialized as compared to the individuals lower on Impulsivity. Deficiencies in the socialization process leading to socially deviant behavior have frequently been accounted for in terms of learning theory. They have been ascribed either to a special constellation of early learning experiences or to an inability on the part of the individual to learn the rules of the society. Thus it is the Impulsivity component of E/I rather than Sociability which may be considered to be associated with criminal behavior. The present findings have supported the earlier line of research by showing that the mean score of criminals is higher on Impulsivity as compared to the non-criminals. Also non-criminals have shown higher scores on sociability than criminals (see Table I).

The results showing that criminals score lower on Sociability have been linked with long imprisonment of criminals. Heskin et al. (1973) in a study on the long-term effects of imprisonment found that extraversion scores as measured by EPI declined with the increase of imprisonment period. According to Jespal (1977) "the conditions of prison life may influence the responses of prisoners, although instructions emphasize that the questions refer to habitual behavior."
As already stated crimes against body are primarily of an impulsive nature whereas crimes against property are usually the result of scheming and planning, lacking an element of aggressive impulsiveness. In this context it was therefore expected that body offenders would score higher on Impulsivity and lower on Sociability as compared to property offenders. The obtained results have confirmed the hypothesis. A comparison of mean scores of body and property offenders revealed that body offenders have scored higher on Impulsivity whereas property offenders have obtained higher scores on Sociability. The respective mean scores for body offenders on Impulsivity and Sociability are 10.15 and 5.47. The mean scores for property offenders are 5.50 and 9.00 respectively. The obtained $F$-ratios on Impulsivity and Sociability items are statistically significant beyond .001 level (See Table III).

The present results support the earlier findings of Sanocki (1969), Schalling (1970), Eysenck and Eysenck (1971), Singh, A (1930) by conforming that the I component of E/I is higher in criminals as compared to normals. Further more these findings highlights the fact the I factor is higher in body offenders than property offenders. Thus earlier when Sanocki (1967) found property offenders scoring higher on E/I than murderers, it was probably the Sociability component which was determining this difference. Similarly when
Maul (1978) found violent criminals and murderers scoring higher on the combined scores on E/I, it might then be the Impulsivity component which was dominating the scene. Crimes against body are usually called 'Crimes of passion' which are the result of emotional breakdown than scheming and planning, thus show higher scores on Impulsivity than Sociability items. The same trend is shown in the present results.

(ii) Impulsivity/Sociability and Degree of Crime

It may be asserted that major offences being more heinous and brutal than minor offences, are usually committed in the heat of emotional impulsiveness. Therefore, it was hypothesized that Major offenders would score higher on Impulsivity and lower on Sociability as compared to Minor offenders.

The obtained results are not in the predicted direction. Although Major offenders have scored significantly higher on Impulsivity and lower on Sociability but in comparison to the scores of minor offenders, minor offenders failed to score higher on Sociability as compared to Impulsivity. Conversely minor offenders have scored higher on Impulsivity. The mean score for Major offenders on Impulsivity items is 8.84 and Sociability is 8.08. Minor offenders have obtained the mean scores of 6.81 and 6.40 respectively on Impulsivity and Sociability. The respective F-ratios computed for Impulsivity
and Sociability are statistically significant (F-ratio = 60.97; df = 1; p < .001; F-ratio = 35.18; df = 1; p < .001).

Earlier Mohan and Jaspal (1982) reported that Major offenders score significantly higher on Impulsivity and lower on Sociability than minor offenders. The present finding lacks supportive evidence as not much work has accrued in terms of degree of crime as related to Impulsivity and Sociability. The results are not in the predicted direction. The results indicated that Minor offenders have scored higher on Impulsivity and lower on Sociability.

Differences of Non-criminals and Different Types of Criminals on Impulsivity and Sociability

Impulsivity

The present findings have shown a mean score of 5.12 for non-criminals. Body major group revealed a mean score of 11.27 and the differences were statistically significant (t-ratio = 22.20, p < .01). Similarly body minor group revealed a mean of 9.02 which is also higher than the mean score of non-criminals. The differences between the means of the two groups were again statistically significant (t-ratio = 15.92, p < .01). The above findings clearly support our contention that body offences are of an impulsive nature, therefore, body offenders in both major and minor groups scored higher than non-criminals. These findings also help us to draw a general conclusion that impulsivity yields significant results not
only with global group of criminals but also at type and degree levels.

**Sociability**

On Sociability the results of type and degree groups of crime in comparison to non-criminals have yielded results which are relevant to the study. The mean score for non-criminals on Impulsivity is 8.76. The two type x degree groups of crime which have yielded significant results i.e. body minor and property major have scored the mean scores of 4.85 and 10.22 respectively. The differences have been found to be statistically significant (t-ratio of 10.22, p<.01, and 3.90; p<.01).

The results reveal that minor body offenders have scored significantly lower on Sociability as compared to non-criminals. The results may best be explained due to the fact that body offenders are of an impulsive nature therefore, they failed to score higher on Sociability.

On the other hand Property offences are the result of scheming and planning, therefore property major group of criminals obtained higher scores on Sociability.

(3) **Neuroticism and Crime**

The second aspect of Eysenck's personality system which has been related to crime is that of Neuroticism. Although Eysenck (1970) did not place N at the top of the determinant of crime, Burgess (1972) rated the N dimension as a very important component of criminal personality. In most of the studies cited by Eysenck (1970) the prisoners were
found to score higher on N than the controls. Eysenck (1964) had postulated that psychopaths have high scores on N, hence high autonomic lability. Empirical studies have not however consistently confirmed this finding (Schalling 1970). In Eysenckian's view (1964) psychopaths suffer from learning deficit which is inferred from their marked disregard for future consequences of their acts. This implies the failure of cues associated with punishment to arouse sufficient anxiety to motivate avoidance behaviour. Eysenck (1970) consequently asserted that a highly labile autonomic system interferes with efficient learning of avoidance cues.

On these grounds it was hypothesized that criminals would obtain higher scores on N than non-criminals. The present results are in accordance with the hypothesis. A look at the mean scores of criminals and non-criminals reveals that they have scored 12.51 and 8.09 respectively on N. The t-ratio of 13.06 (p <.01) was found to be statistically significant (see table I).

The present finding on criminals supports most of the earlier evidence that had accumulated in favour of criminals having higher N scores. Studies by Bartholomew (1959, 1963); Field (1960); Pitch (1962); Berry (1966); Millman (1966); Price (1968); Eysenck and Eysenck (1971a); Burgess (1972); Singh (1960); Mohan (1981) have all supported the Eysenckian contention regarding N and criminality. However Jaspal (1977) found non-criminals scoring higher on N than criminals.
(1) Neuroticism and type of crime

Eysenck, Rust and Eysenck (1977) selected a group of adult prisoners representing four areas of criminal activity (violence, theft, fraud inadequacy) and one of multiple criminal activity (Residual). These groups were tested with the help of questionnaire (Epy). The results reported that the conmen have very low N scores, violence and property offenders have low N scores and the inadequates and residuals have high N scores. For N significant differentiation involved conmen as compared with property offenders, inadequates and residuals (Eysenck, Rust and Eysenck, 1977).

On this basis it was hypothesized in the present study that body offenders could score higher on N as compared to property offenders. The results obtained are in the predicted direction. The mean score for body offenders on N dimension is 14.13. Property offenders scored a mean of 10.89. The differences have been found to be statistically significant (F-ratio = 87.97; df = 1; p < .01). The body offenders in the present case proved to be more neurotic than property offenders.

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. Sethi et al. (1976); Yakey (1976); Nirmal (1977); Lingham, A. (1979a and 1979b) reported murderers scoring higher on N than other criminals.
Generally offences against body are of an aggressive nature. Mohan and Gill, J. (1984) and Mohan and Randan (1986) also found body offenders scoring higher on manifest aggression than property offenders. Therefore body offenders were expected to score higher on N than property offenders. However, Gill, L.K. and Mohan (1986) failed to report any significant differences on N scores of body and property offenders.

Although there are very few studies directly relating N to type of crime, yet the present results have magnified the assumption that aggressive crimes such as crimes against body are affected by high N scores.

(11) 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 as compared to criminals who had committed minor offences. Therefore, it was hypothesized that major offenders would score higher on N than minor offenders.

The results of the present study have confirmed the hypothesis. The mean score for major offenders on N is 14.86. Minor offenders on the other hand, scored a mean score of 10.15. The results are statistically significant (F-ratio = 190.62; df = 1; p < .001). The results may be explained on the grounds that since major crimes are more violent in nature than minor crimes, they are expected to carry implications of high N. Mani (1978) also found violent offenders scoring higher on N.
The above obtained overall findings on a dimension revealed that criminals have scored consistently higher on N than non-criminals and furthermore the differences are significant at type and degree level also.

**Differences of Non-criminals and Different Types of Criminals on Neuroticism**

While comparing the scores of the various groups of crime and the non-criminals population it has been found that except the property minor groups all the three groups have scored higher on N than non-criminals (see Table V). The differences have been found to be statistically significant. Thus the overall results on N have been found to be significant at type and degree level in comparison with non-criminal subjects.

(4) **Psychoticism and Crime**

The earlier description of personality given by Eysenck was a simple two dimensional model of E/I and N. In 1970, Eysenck added a third dimension called Psychoticism, to their model of Personality. It was then suggested that in addition to E/I and N, P too would be implicated in the causation of crime. On these grounds it was hypothesized for the present study that the criminals would obtain higher scores on P as compared to non-criminals.

The results of the present study on Psychoticism are in line with the prediction of Eysenck and Eysenck (1970) which stated that criminals are higher on P as compared to non-criminals.
normals. The mean scores of criminals and non-criminals (Table I) have revealed these differences on P. The mean score of criminals is 11.59. The non-criminals have shown a mean score of 4.89. The differences are statistically significant (t-ratio = 15.97; p < .01).

The present finding supports most of the earlier evidence that had accumulated in favour of criminals scoring higher on P. Medor (1914); Ruxin (1916); Essen-Moller (1946); Odegard (1963); and Flannensky (1966) all obtained evidence to give support to one of Eysenck and Eysenck's (1970) contention for implicating P in the causation of crime, i.e., that psychosis and criminality have a particularly close connection. Other studies by Segrawes (1969); Wilson and Maclean (1974); Singh, A. (1976); Nirmal (1977); Eysenck et al. (1977); Singh, A. (1979a, 1979b); Singh (1980); Mohan and Jaspal (1982) have all obtained evidence to show that criminals tend to be more psychotic than normals. "Most of the items on P are saturated with processes closely interlinked with socialisation of an individual. A criminal is lacking the necessary socialization and formation of conscience (Eysenck, 1970).... hence it is quite natural that he should be scoring high on P," (Mohan and Singh, 1980). The findings of the present study have shown a similar trend.
(1) **Psychoticism and Type of Crime**

It has been already stated that crimes against body are usually the result of feelings of hostility towards the victim whereas, property offences are impersonal crimes. Since hostility constitutes an important aspect of Psychoticism (Eysenck, 1970) it was therefore hypothesized that body offenders would score higher on P than property offenders.

The present results are in accordance with the hypothesis already framed. A comparison of mean scores of body and property offenders on P revealed that body offenders are more psychotic than property offenders. The mean scores for body and property offenders are respectively 13.85 and 7.34. The mean differences are statistically significant (F-ratio = 62.25; df = 1; p < .001). However, studies by Eysenck (1977) and Gill and Mohan (1986) have failed to report any significant differences on P scores of body and property offenders.

(11) **Psychoticism and Degree of Crime**

A few recent studies have reported a close relation between Psychoticism and violent offences. Eysenck and Eysenck (1977) 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. Since major acts of crime are more violent in nature than minor crimes, it was therefore hypothesized that major offenders would score higher on P items than minor offenders.
The hypothesis has been upheld in the present case.
A comparison of mean scores of major and minor offenders revealed that major offenders have scored significantly higher on P than minor offenders. The mean scores for major and minor offenders are respectively 14.41 and 6.78. The results are statistically significant (F-ratio = 253.23; df = 1; p < .001).

Earlier studies by Eysenck (1971), Jaspal (1977); and Singh, A. (1979a and 1979b) also found major offenders scoring higher on P items than minor offenders. The results of the present study fit into the framework of earlier observations.

**Interaction Effect For Psychoticism**

The present results have shown a positive interaction effect on P scores. The effect of type x degree of crime is shown by the significant interaction (F-ratio = 49.30; df = 1; p < .001). The mean scores for major and minor body offenders on P are respectively 15.42 and 12.27. The mean scores for major and minor property offenders are 13.40 and 5.27. Graphic representation in Fig. V clearly reveals a significant variation indicating that on P, differences between major and minor criminals were more evident in crimes against property than in crimes against body.

**Differences of Non-criminals and Different Types of Criminals on Psychoticism**

On Psychoticism the mean score for non-criminal subjects is 4.89. The four type x degree crime groups i.e. body major, body minor, property major and property minor revealed the mean
**Fig. V** Interactions by Analysis of Variance Performed on E and P
scores of 15.42, 12.27, 13.40 and 5.27 respectively. The differences between the means between the type x degree groups of crime with non-criminals have been found to be statistically significant except for property minor group (see Table V).

The above mentioned results have corroborated the fact that high P score not only differentiate between criminals and non-criminals, but significant differences could be obtained between non-criminals and different types of criminals on the dimension of Psychoticism.

(5) Lie-Scale and Crime

In the present study the mean lie-score for criminals is 6.44 and for non-criminals is 6.79. The difference in the mean scores have been found to be statistically insignificant. However, earlier studies by Eysenck (1960), Singh (1980), Mohan & Jaspal (1962); Sarney (1985) have reported that criminals score higher than non-criminals on lie-scale due to social desirability.

According to Gill (1983) the tendency to lie on the part of the prisoners may be due to two reasons: firstly their desire to give socially favourable responses and secondly due to a compulsive tendency to tell lies even if prevarication is not called for. "In the first case they may be extra cautious to take food in order to present a better picture to a society which has condemned them behind bars." In the
second case it is a manifestation of their inherent Psychotic tendencies (Gill, 1983). The results of the present study have failed to produce any significant differences in the mean scores of criminals and non-criminals.

(1) **Lie-scale and Type of Crime**

The results obtained reveal that there are significant differences in the lie-scores of body and property offenders. The mean score for body offenders is 5.94 and for property offenders is 6.94. The obtained mean differences are statistically significant ($F$-ratio = 11.05; df = 1; $p < .05$).

These results suggest that property offenders are more prone to telling lies than body offenders. The results may be explained due to the fact that crimes against property are the result of scheming and planning. Thus property offenders are more inclined to tell lies in order to justify the reasoning behind their plan for committing crime.

(ii) **Lie-scale and Degree of Crime**

The present results have not revealed any significant differences in the mean scores of major and minor criminals on lie-scale. The mean score for major criminals on lie-scale is 6.17. Minor criminals have scored a mean of 6.71. The $F$-ratio is statistically insignificant.
The second area of study for the present research work was adjustment. Adjustment was studied in terms of home, health, social and emotional adjustment (Bell, 1937). The following discussion deals with the differences in adjustment between criminals and non-criminal subjects and differences amongst criminals in relation to their type and degree of crime.

Adjustment Differences for Criminals and Non-criminals

I. Home Adjustment and Crime

Barnes and Teeters (1966) stated that "a disorganised family is one of the causal factors behind most child neglect. A disorganised 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 disorganised families come other serious breakdowns such as mental disease, mental deficiency, child abuse, divorce, violence, crime and delinquency". In other words, if the atmosphere in the family is unhealthy and there are shallow relationships between family members, the child is unable to find a healthy role model, with whom he can identify. Thus conditions like broken homes, parental rejection, domination, punishment or overprotection may lead to poor socialization of child. Also thwarting of the need to be belonged, to be loved may predispose an individual to adopt some form of maladaptive behaviour patterns.
The earlier review of literature in Chapter II also showed that there is a close relation between home-maladjustment and crime. Therefore it was hypothesized that the criminals would show poorer home adjustment as compared to non-criminals. The present results are in accordance with the hypothesis already framed. Looking at Table I we find that the mean home-adjustment scores of criminals and non-criminals are 21.06 and 10.78 respectively. The results clearly indicated that criminals have shown poorer home-adjustment as compared to non-criminals. The differences have been found to be statistically significant (t-ratio = 26.70; p < .01).

Earlier, studies by Ahuja (1970); Gupta and Sethi (1974); Singh, A. (1976, 1979, 1980); Hirmal (1977); Mohan (1981); and Sahney (1985) had also reported that criminals show poorer home-adjustment as compared to non-criminals. This relation becomes clearly evident when we study victim-offender relationship. Most of the studies have shown that a large number of victims are either family members or close relatives (Ahuja, 1970; Gupta and Sethi, 1974; Sharma, S. 1976; and Singh, A. 1979b).

The present findings may also be supported in context of the 'Self Concept Theory' (as discussed in Chapter II). According to this theory the formation of poor self-concept is the result of faulty socialization which predisposes an individual towards criminal behaviour. Since socialization process begins at home conditions like broken-homes, parental
rejection, parental domination and punishment may lead to the breakdown of socialization thereby predispose an individual towards antisocial and criminal activities. The present findings have clearly supported the earlier contention that poor home-adjustment is responsible for criminal or delinquent activities (Nirmal, 1977; Singh, 1960; Mohan, 1961; Banney, 1985). The present results are in line with the hypothesis already framed.

(1) Home-Adjustment and Type of Crime

In the absence of research evidence supporting the relationship between the type of crime and home maladjustment a null hypothesis stating that there will be no differences in the adjustment scores of body and property offenders was framed for the present study.

The present findings have indicated that body offenders have poorer home-adjustment as compared to property offenders. The mean score of body offenders for home-adjustment is 21.79. Property offenders scored a mean score of 20.33. The results were statistically significant (F-ratio = 14.40; df = 1; p < .01). The results may best be explained on the grounds that crimes against body are generally the result of feelings of animosity towards the victim. Such feelings may said to be the outcome of poor home adjustment due to faulty socialization. Furthermore in the face of poor home conditions like broken homes, parental rejection or punishment an individual may react aggressively to give vent to his suppressed feelings...
thereby terminating in an offence against body. Property offences on the other hand are impersonal crimes. In accordance with the above mentioned reasoning the present results have clearly shown that property offenders have better home adjustment as compared to body offenders.

(ii) Home Adjustment and Degree of Crime

It was hypothesized in the present study that major offenders would score higher on home adjustment as compared to minor offenders. The present results have confirmed the hypothesis. The mean score for major offenders on home adjustment is 23.88. Minor offenders have shown a mean of 18.24. The differences have been found to be statistically significant ($F$-ratio = 214.01; df = 1; $p < .001$). The results revealed that major offenders had poorer home-adjustment as compared to minor offenders.

A few of the earlier studies have reported a close relationship between degree of crime and home-maladjustment. Mannhan (1957) reported that delinquents coming from broken homes were more likely to be recidivists than delinquents coming from unbroken homes. Jang, S. (1979) reported that major criminals showed poorer home-adjustment as compared to minor criminals. Furthermore, since home maladjustment is directly related to criminal behaviour, it may be asserted that major offences which are more heinous and brutal are the outcome of intense breakdown of home-adjustment on the part of
offenders. Therefore major offenders shall show poorer home adjustment than minor offenders. The present findings have confirmed this viewpoint.

(iii) Differences of Non-criminals and Different Types of Criminals on Home Adjustment

A look at Table V reveals that all the four type and degree groups of criminals i.e. body major, body minor, property major and property minor have scored significantly higher from non-criminal subjects on home-adjustment. The mean differences have been found to be statistically significant at .01 level (see Table V).

These findings imply that on home adjustment not only criminals have shown poorer home-adjustment as compared to non-criminals rather the differences have been found to be significant at type and degree level in comparison to non-criminal subjects.

(2) Emotional Adjustment and Crime

The second area of adjustment studied was emotional adjustment. On the basis of review of literature (in Chapter II) it was hypothesized that criminals would show poorer emotional adjustment as compared to non-criminals. The hypothesis has been upheld in the present case. A comparison of mean scores for criminals and non-criminals revealed the criminals have scored higher on emotional adjustment as compared to non-criminals. The respective mean scores for the criminals and
non-criminals on emotional adjustment are 20.86 and 10.48. The mean differences are statistically significant (t-ratio = 25.19; p < .01). These findings clearly imply that criminals are poorly emotionally adjusted than non-criminals.

Trojanowicz (1978) contended that "parents who have their own emotional sickness frequently 'act out' the sickness or transmit it to their children. 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 greater the chance of emotional problems or deviant behaviour". Rajgurum (1957) revealed that sex delinquents were more maladjusted in the area of emotions. Pati (1966) found delinquents to be more aggressive in pathological conditions.

Eysenck (1968) opines that emotional lability and over reactivity are related to neuroticism. Individuals under stress or emotional experience develop neurotic disorders. They also report many worries and other disagreeable emotional feelings. But they tend to return to normal state after the emotional experience. The differences between people in emotionality or neuroticism are mediated by inherited differences in the lability and excitability of the autonomic nervous system (Eysenck, 1963). The results of the present study have also shown that criminals had poorer emotional
The relationship between crime and emotional disturbances has been upheld by many earlier studies (Burt, 1938; Healy and Bronner, 1936; Glueck and Glueck, 1956; Rajagun, 1957; Sharmugam and Sundari, 1960; Majumdar and Roy, 1962; Pati, 1966; Singh, 1976; Singh, 1960; Mohan, 1981 and Sahney, 1985). The present findings have further confirmed this earlier viewpoint which asserted that emotional maladjustments may predispose an individual towards criminal or delinquent tendencies.

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

As already stated 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 offenders, thereby terminating in an offence against body. Crimes against property, on the other hand are crimes of logic, which are impersonal in nature and generally do not represent violent antagonism towards the victim. In this context it was hypothesized that body offenders would show poorer emotional adjustment as compared to property offenders.

The obtained results are in accordance with the hypothesis already framed. The mean score for body offenders is 22.95. Property offenders have scored a mean of 18.75.
A comparison of means clearly implies that body offenders have shown poor emotional adjustment. The F-ratio computed for type of crime has been found to be statistically significant. (F-ratio = 64.38; df = 1; p < .01).

The results may also be explained on the grounds of recent interests in victimology (Schafer, 1976; Shanmugam, 1985; and Chockalingam, 1985). As already stated in Chapters III and IV that in crimes against body, victims presence is necessary and in such crimes like sexual assault etc. victims sometimes precipitate the offender in the commission of an offence. Thus any provocation on the part of the offender may lead to an intense breakdown of emotional adjustment on part of the offender and a crime is committed in the heat of emotional disturbance. Therefore body offenders are expected to show poor emotional adjustment as compared to property offenders.

Although the results of the present study have confirmed the hypothesis yet the study lacks supportive evidence as not much work has accrued in terms of type of crime as related to emotional adjustment.

(11) Emotional Adjustment and Degree of Crime

It was hypothesized for the present study that major offenders would show poorer emotional adjustment as compared to minor offenders. The hypothesis has been upheld in the present case. A comparison of mean scores of major and minor offenders
on emotional adjustment have shown that major offenders have scored higher; thus showed poorer emotional adjustment than minor offenders. The mean scores for major and minor offenders on emotional adjustment are respectively 22.53 and 19.20. The differences between the means have been found to be statistically significant. (F-ratio = 40.83; df = 1; p < .01).

A recent study by Mohan and Kasdan (1986) have also reported that major criminal acts being more heinous and brutal are the result of intense breakdown of emotional adjustment and stability. The present findings have further confirmed this earlier contention. Furthermore emotional maladjustment would come very near to high levels of anxiety. Mohan and Jaspel (1962) found major offenders scoring higher on anxiety as compared to minor offenders.

The overall picture revealed that major offenders have poor emotional adjustment than minor offenders.

(iii) Differences of Non-criminal and Different Types of Criminals on Emotional Adjustment.

While comparing the differences of non-criminal subjects with the four type and degree groups of crime i.e. body minor, body major, property minor, and property major, it was found that criminals in all the four groups have scored significantly higher than non-criminal subjects on emotional adjustment. The results thereby imply that criminal subjects in all the four groups have shown poor emotional adjustment as compared to
non-criminal group of subjects. The results have been found to be statistically significant at .01 level (See Table V).

These findings help us to draw a general conclusion that poor emotional adjustment not only differentiates between criminals and non-criminals but significant differences could be obtained between non-criminals and various type and degree of group of criminals on emotional adjustment.

(3) Social Adjustment and Crime

Sutherland (1950) observed that poor family conditions together with lack of understanding on the part of parents leads to increased possibility of children becoming delinquents. In other words poor socialization prevents an individual in learning to adjust with other members of the society or to the group with whom they are identified in particular. It was therefore hypothesized in the present study that criminals would show poorer social adjustment as compared to non-criminals. The present findings are in accordance with the hypothesis already framed. The mean score for criminals on social adjustment is 20.21. Non-criminals scored a mean of 10.21. A comparison of means clearly implies that criminals depicted poorer social adjustment as compared to non-criminals. The differences have been found to be statistically significant (t-ratio = 27.60; p < .01).

The assumption relating social maladjustment to crime has earlier been upheld by a few studies (Singh, A., 1976;
According to Trojanowicz (1978), "society, which makes possible the human existence also sets limits on human conduct designed to perpetuate and protect that society; delinquency for a variety of reasons often violate these limits, be they customs and traditions, social norms and roles, tribal taboos or the formalized criminal law. The reasons may be faulty intellectual ability, ignorance or just plain naiveté."

The present results have also shown that criminals have poor social adjustment as compared to non-criminals. According to Mohan (1981) the earlier experiences of poor socialization are likely to have their carry over affect in later life and also in one's social adjustment. So in the case of criminals one may expect poor social adjustment (Mohan 1981). Later Mohan (1981) confirmed this finding.

(1) Social Adjustment and Type of Crime

On the basis of research data available it had been hypothesized (in Chapter III) that body offenders would show poorer social adjustment than property offenders. The hypothesis has been upheld in the present case. The mean score for body offenders is 21.51. Property offenders have scored a mean of 16.91. A comparison of means clearly implies that property offenders have better social adjustment. The results are statistically significant (F-ratio = 31.40; df = 1; p < .01).
Earlier studies by Mohan and Gill, J. (1984) and Mohan and Ragdan (1986) had reported that property offenders had better social adjustment than body offenders. These results may be explained in consonance with the fact that property offences are the result of scheming and planning. Consequently property offenders get along well with their gang mates in order to carry out their plans successfully. The present results showing that property offenders have better social adjustment than body offenders further confirm this viewpoint.

Furthermore the present results come very near to the results obtained for sociability items on E scale of EPI. There also property offenders scored higher on sociability. The present findings help us to draw a general conclusion that property offenders have better social adjustment as compared to body offenders.

(ii) Social Adjustment and Degree of Crime

A recent study by Mohan and Ragdan (1986) reported major offenders showed poorer social adjustment than minor offenders. This observation may best be explained on the grounds that major offenders once being condemned by the society desire to shun society. Therefore major offenders show poor social adjustment as compared to minor offenders.

In this context it was hypothesized that major offenders would show poor social adjustment as compared to minor offenders. The results of the present study have
confirmed the hypothesis. A comparison of mean scores of major and minor offenders on social adjustment revealed that major offenders have scored higher on social adjustment. The mean scores of major and minor offenders on social adjustment are respectively 22.75 and 17.68. The mean differences have been found to be statistically significant (F-ratio = 119.65; df = 1; p < .001). The results may be explained on the grounds that since criminals are unable to accept the norms imposed on them to maintain healthy relations in society and they show poor social adjustment. In the presence of such unhealthy social relations major offenders react aggressively resorting to more heinous and brutal crimes like dacoity or murders whereas minor offenders restrict their aggression by indulging in petty crimes such as pick-pocketing, etc.

In the absence of research data relating social adjustment to degree of crime it is difficult to support the present findings yet the present results have substantiated the earlier work by Mohan and Razdan (1986).

**Interaction Effect for Social Adjustment**

The interaction effect of type x degree of crime on social adjustment is evident from the F-ratio = 7.26; df = 1; p < .01) which is statistically significant. Graphic representation in Fig. VI reveals that on social adjustment in crimes against body major and minor criminals have shown wider differences as compared to major and minor criminals in crimes against property.
differences of Non-criminals and Different Types of Criminals on Social Adjustment

A glance at Table V again depicts that all the four type and degree groups of criminals have scored significantly higher than non-criminals subjects on social adjustment. The results have been found to be statistically significant (see Table V).

(4) Health Adjustment and Crime

A glance at Table 1 reveals that mean score on health adjustment for criminals is 15.16 and for non-criminals is 13.54. The mean differences are statistically significant (t-ratio = 4.68; p < .01).

The results of the present study are in accordance with the hypothesis already framed which states that criminals would show poorer health adjustment than non-criminals. Thus the hypothesis has been upheld. Earlier studies by Singh, A. (1976, 1979); Mirmal (1977); Mohan (1981); and Sahney (1985) have reported criminals showing poorer health adjustment than non-criminals. According to Sahney (1985) any health problem or physical defect is likely to be a source of self-consciousness to the individual which may cause emotional insecurity. Furthermore when parents and peers do not help him to overcome this insecurity antisocial tendencies take their form. The results of the present study have further confirmed this viewpoint.
(1) **Health Adjustment and Type of Crime**

Due to lack of any supportive evidence a null hypothesis was framed relating health adjustment to type of crime. The present findings have revealed that property offenders have shown poorer health adjustment as compared to body offenders. The mean scores for body and property offenders on health adjustment are 14.21 and 16.11 respectively. The results are statistically significant ($F$-ratio = 15.68; $df = 1$; $p < .01$).

This observation may be explained on the grounds that poor health of property offenders might have served as a deterrent to earn their living; thus they resorted to crimes against property to earn their livelihood though by illegitimate means.

(II) **Health Adjustment and Degree of Crime**

A null hypothesis was again formulated for health adjustment as related to degree of crime. The present results have shown that minor offenders have poorer health adjustment as compared to major offenders. The mean score for major offenders is 14.24. Minor offenders have shown a mean of 16.09. The obtained mean differences are statistically significant ($F$-ratio = 15.06; $df = 1$; $p < .01$).

The present findings help us to draw a general conclusion that poor health may prove responsible for minor
criminal activities but in major crimes, like murder, robbery, poor health does not have much role to play in explaining the dynamics of crime.

**Interaction Effect for Health Adjustment**

The interaction effect for type and degree of crime on health adjustment is statistically significant ($F$-ratio = 21.78; $df = 1; p < .01$). Graphic representation in Fig. VI reveals that on health adjustment major and minor offenders in crimes against property have shown more significant differences in their mean scores. Whereas in crimes against body major and minor offenders could not obtain significant differences in their mean scores.

**Differences of non-criminals and Different Types of Criminals on Health Adjustment**

The results as presented in Table V revealed that although the four different types of criminals scored higher than non-criminals on health adjustment, yet all the results are not statistically significant except for property minor group of criminals. The present findings imply that poor health has not emerged as a significant variable for explaining the dynamics of different types of crime.

(5) **Crime and Total Adjustment**

A glance at Table I reveals that the mean scores of criminals and non-criminals on total adjustment were 77.32 and 44.92 respectively. The differences have been found to be
The present findings imply that the overall adjustment of criminals is poorer as compared to the non-criminals. Bahney (1985) also reported delinquents showing poorer total adjustment than non-delinquents. The areas of adjustment are interdependent and there is a significant relationship among them. For the individual who shows poor adjustment in the areas of home, emotional, health and social the overall adjustment would also be poor. As Mohan (1981) stated that the poor overall adjustment of criminals speaks volumes of their poor socialization and lack of 'Inner' and 'Outer' containment. 

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

The present results have shown a mean score of 80.53 for body offenders. Property offenders have scored a mean score of 74.13. A comparison of means revealed that on the whole body offenders have shown poorer adjustment than property offenders. The differences have been found to be statistically significant ($t$-ratio = 54.24; df = 1; $p < .01$).

The results may best be explained on the grounds that crimes against body are usually an outcome of pathological disturbances whereas crimes against property are the result of circumstantial factors. Therefore body offenders have shown poorer overall adjustment than property offenders.

**Total Adjustment and Degree of Crime**

The total adjustment scores of major and minor offenders
revealed that overall adjustment of major offenders is poorer as compared to minor offenders. The mean score for minor offenders is 71.14. Major offenders have shown a mean score of 63.51. The mean differences have been found to be statistically significant (F-ratio = 202.14; df = 1; p < .01).

The present findings imply that poor adjustment may serve as an important determinant for explaining the dynamics for major crimes than for minor crimes.

**Interaction Effect for Total Adjustment**

The effect of type x degree of crime on total adjustment is evident from the significant F-ratio of 28.33 (p < .01) which is statistically significant. The Graphic presentation in Fig.VI reveals that for total adjustment differences in the mean scores of major and minor criminals on crimes against body are more wide than in crimes against property.

**Differences of Non-criminals and Different Types of Criminals on Total Adjustment**

The results as presented in Table V revealed that on total adjustment all the four groups of criminals have scored significantly higher than non-criminals. The differences have been found to be statistically significant.

The present findings on the variable of adjustment have suggested that a study of maladjustments in the areas of home, health, social and emotional adjustment may prove
helpful in explaining the dynamics of crime at a more intensive level.

The overall results on the variable of adjustment showed that significant differences have emerged not only between criminal and non-criminal subjects but significant differences have also emerged between types (body and property) and different degrees (major and minor) of criminals.
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Values were the third major variable on which a comparative analysis was made between criminals/non-criminals, body/property offenders and major and minor criminals. Research regarding values of criminals is conspicuous by its absence. Criminal tendencies are learnt processes. Acquisition of right type of values is also a learnt behaviour and is related to the mores of the society. Criminals who go against the mores of society may show certain differences in their values. The present research work made on effort in this direction. Values in the present study were studied in terms of instrumental and terminal values (Rokeach, 1967).

Rokeach (1979) contended that "humans differ not so much in the presence or absence of particular values as in the arrangement of values, their hierarchies or priorities". According to Rokeach (1979), "Value hierarchies or priorities are organizations of values, enabling us to choose between alternative goals and actions, and enabling us to resolve conflict. At the individual level, for instance, value priorities guide decisions about occupational goals and interests, as how to spend our money, or for whom to vote. At the superindividual level, value priorities guide decisions about such things as the setting of organizational goals, the allocation of resources and the formulation of new policies". The following discussion would therefore highlight the observed differences for the various instrumental and terminal values in terms of their priorities assigned to them, indicating the difference in importance attached to these values by criminals and non-criminals.
(I) Instrumental Values and Crime

According to Rokeach (1979), "Instrumental values are concerned with modes of conduct such as courage and honesty". As stated by Eysenck (1970), "antisocial conduct is evidence of lack of socialization" and socialisation is nothing but learning of behavioural patterns approved by the society. Thus one may presumably hold that due to poor socialization the 'modes of conduct' of criminals will be different from those of non-criminals.

Direct evidence on criminals and their value system was not so far available to the author. The previous work by Sahney (1985) was related to the delinquents who were criminals in the making. The study reported that the delinquents attached significantly more importance to the instrumental values namely, "Capable", "Clean", "Courageous" and "Forgiving" than non-delinquents. Non-delinquents on the other hand placed significantly higher the values of "Broadminded", "Honest", "Obedient", "Responsible" and "Self-controlled" in the hierarchy. The present findings have indicated a somewhat similar trend. Due to paucity of research work accrued in terms and values and crime, null hypotheses were assumed for the remaining instrumental values.
Differences of Criminals and Non-criminals on Instrumental Values

The results of the present study regarding instrumental values as presented in Table VI indicated that the value rankings of criminals and non-criminals differed significantly in respect of as many as on 16 instrumental values. These are: Ambitious, Broadminded, Capable, Cheerful, Clean, Courageous, Forgiving, Helpful, Honest, Imaginative, Independent, Intellectual, Obedient, Polite, Responsible and Self-Controlled. The present findings have been summarized in Table VIII.

The clear result that emerges from the comparative figures given in the Table VII is that the average value priorities of the criminals for a set of sixteen instrumental values of Rokeach Value Scale were remarkably different from those of the non-criminals.

Mukherjee and Moitrayee (1980) had earlier suggested that values have positive effect on frequency of delinquent behaviour and its causation. This supposition has been confirmed through the present results.
(1) **Values rated higher by Criminals**

The results as presented in Table VI revealed that criminals have attached significantly more importance to the instrumental value of "Ambitious", "Broadminded", "Capable", "Cheerful", "Clean", "Courageous", "Imaginative", "Independent" and "Intellectual" as compared to non-criminals.

According to Rokeach (1979), "computation of median ranks and composite ranks allow us to ascertain not only which are the most important values but also which ones are not important, or are minimally important." The results as presented in the above mentioned table indicate that "Courageous" is the most important instrumental value for criminals followed by "Independent", "Imaginative" and "Intellectual". The four least important instrumental values for criminals are "Responsible" followed by "Polite", "Obedient" and "Helpful".

The median ranks show that criminals have attached more importance to the values - "Ambitious", "Courageous" and "Capable". Rokeach (1967) has given a list of phrases accompanying these values (as mentioned in Appendix 'B'). An inference may be drawn from these accompanying phrases that the criminals were hard-working (Ambitious) stood by their beliefs (Courageous) and competent (Capable). These results may indirectly be explained for their tendency of being higher on need for achievement (nAch).

reported that crime is usually a result of economic and social frustration therefore criminals strive to achieve something in life. The present results in a way support this finding though indirectly. Tutt (1973) also found that high $\alpha$Ach delinquent boys tended to be aggressive towards society.

The results also depicted that criminals have attached more importance to the instrumental values of "Broadminded, Cheerful and Clean". The major theme suggested by the defining phrases accompanying these values is that criminals are open-minded, light-hearted and tidy (Rokeach, 1967). These results may be attributed to the effects of social-desirability. The possible answer for these findings is that these values may not be the actual modes of conduct desired by the criminals. Rather by attaching more importance to these values the criminals have attempted to overcome the guilt feelings associated with their criminal conduct. The results may plausibly be explained on the grounds that criminals have tried to be broadminded about their activities which are otherwise antisocial and punishable by law. However, Sahney (1985) reported that delinquents were less broadminded in their outlook than non-delinquents.

Furthermore the results depicted the criminals have presented a more cheerful outlook towards life than non-criminals.
In an attempt to explain these results it may be stated that such differences can be accounted for the most part—a reflection of guilt feelings over the wrong doings of criminals. However, this finding indirectly supports the earlier assertion by Eysenck (1964) which stated that criminals were of extraverted/cheerful temperament. Moreover, the criminals have placed more importance to the value "Clean" may be attributed to the effects of social desirability.

The median ranks for criminals and non-criminals on the value "Independent", revealed that this value has been identified as one of the most important instrumental value of criminals. The results may be explained on the grounds that these individuals or groups whose values and interests are in conflict with the norms of society shall understandably attach more importance to the value "Independent" than these groups which heartily accept these norms. It goes without saying that criminals are against the norms of society.

Finally the findings indicated that criminals have attached more importance to the value "Imaginative" and "Intellectual" as compared to non-criminals. The results showed that the criminals rated themselves to be more intellectual which could be called wish-fulfillment. Thus the results may be attributed to the effects of social desirability. The studies in relation to crime and intelligence have shown that criminals by and large have been found to be low on intelligence, (Goddard 1912, 1924, Gibbens (1968), Jaspal (1977). But to have high intelligence is a socially desirable phenomenon across all cultures.

(ii) Instrumental values rated higher by Non-criminals
The results as presented in Table VIII bring out that non-criminals have attached significantly more importance to the instrumental values of "Forgiving", "Honest", "Helpful", "Obedient", "Polite", "Responsible" and "Self-controlled" as compared to criminals.

The median ranks and composite ranks as presented in the value hierarchy of criminals in Table VI indicated that the four most important instrumental values for non-criminals were "Honest", followed by "Forgiving", "Self-controlled" and "Helpful". The values of least importance to non-criminals were "Intellectual", "Imaginative", "Courageous" and "Ambitious".

The major theme suggested by the value hierarchy of non-criminals for instrumental values is that non-criminals are willing to pardon others, sincere, work for the welfare of others, dutiful, courteous and self-disciplined (interpreted in accordance with Rokeach's 1967 terms).

An interesting finding of the present results is that the value Forgiving has been ranked as among the most important instrumental values of non-criminals. The criminals have ranked this value much lower in the hierarchy. These results may be explained in terms of victim-offender relationships. Studies by Khan (1983), Sirehi (1983), and Checkalingham (1985) have all suggested that due to peer
emotional control the criminals are unable to forgive even a slight provocation on the part of the victims. They react to these provocations with aggression and a crime is committed. The present results for the value Forgiving support this theme.

Studies by Shortland and Berger (1970) on female employees showed that those who returned their pencils after completing the questionnaires showed differences from the non-returners on the values of Honest and Helpful. Cochrane (1977) compared male and female prisoners with normals and found that the male inmates cared more for Happiness, Pleasure and being Capable and Self-controlled than the normals. The female inmates ranked Independent, Broadminded, Intellectual and Logical significantly higher than the normal women. The study failed to show any differences on the remaining instrumental values.

The present study also failed to report any significant differences on two of the instrumental values namely Loving and Logical (p > .05). The results imply that the value preferences of criminals and non-criminals towards these two instrumental values were the same.

§2) Terminal Values and Crime

According to Hokeach (1979) terminal values are composed of beliefs concerning desirable end states of existence such as world at peace and human equality." It
may again be stated that there is very likelihood that due to faulty socialization, the criminals shall have different end states of existence as compared to non-criminals who show proper respect to the rules and regulations of society. The previous work by Sahney (1985) on delinquence and non-delinquents reported significant differences on three terminal values of Rokeach Value Scale (1961). These were "Family security", "True friendship" and "Wisdom". It was reported that non-delinquent group of subjects attached more importance to these values than delinquents. In the present study and attempt is being made to bring out the differences on terminal values of criminal and non-criminals.

(I) Differences of Criminals and Non-Criminals on Terminal Values

The overall results on terminal values may be summarized as follows:

1. **Terminal Values rated higher by Criminals**

   The results obtained on the terminal values for criminals and non-criminals as presented in Table IX depicted that criminals have attached significantly more importance to the terminal values of an exciting life, a comfortable life, a sense of accomplishment, a world at peace, a world of beauty, Freedom, Nature love, Pleasure and Wisdom than non-criminals.

   The median ranks and composite ranks as mentioned before in the value hierarchy of criminals revealed that the most important terminal values for criminals were "Freedom" followed by "An exciting life," "Pleasure" and "A comfortable life." The least important terminal values for criminals were "Social recognition" followed by "Self-respect, Inner-harmony and Family security."

   The results imply that criminals prefer for a more comfortable life, desire for making some lasting contributions, think of world free of war, appreciate beauty of nature and arts and are of independent nature (interpreted in accordance with Rokeach 1967 terms).

   This cluster of values for criminals suggests that the value system of criminals is hedonistically oriented. The law of hedonism as stated by Eysenck (1977) is that "people tend to refrain from doing what is unpleasant."
Thus, according to Eysenck (1977) criminals indulge in various illegal activities because punishment is long delayed and uncertain and the acquisition of the desired object is immediate. Eysenck (1977) based this finding on Mayer's Law of Integrative Learning (1957).

The previous research has shown that the value 'A comfortable life' has been termed as an index of a desire for better social status (Rokeach, 1973). The present findings depicted that criminals exhibited significantly more importance to this value as compared to non-criminals. The results may be explained with the help of previous research work as stated in Chapter II which states that criminals usually come from lower social class wherein poor economic conditions deprive them from enjoying the comforts of life (Bagot, 1941; Reid, 1979). Thus ranking of the value 'A comfortable life' much higher on hierarchy by criminals may be explained for their strong urge for a comfortable living because of their previous poor living conditions.

Finally, the results have shown that criminals exhibited more importance to the value 'Freedom' than non-criminals. This implies criminals are more freedom loving. This research finding in a way may be supported with the help of an allied study by Rokeach (1973) which stated those individuals who were against the black civil rights movement rated higher for value freedom than those who supported this movement. Thus criminals in the present study are more freedom loving because
they are against the restrictions placed upon its members by the society.

The median ranks for the value "A sense of accomplishment" indicated that this value has been rated higher by criminals as compared to non-criminals. These results may again be supported with the help of an allied study by Gill, S.K. (1982) which stated that criminals are higher on need for achievement. Since crime is sometimes a result of economic, social and other frustrations therefore criminals are expected to attach more importance to the value "A Sense of Accomplishment."

Furthermore the present results depicted that criminals have manifested more importance towards the value "A world at peace" than non-criminals. The present finding enabled us to draw a general conclusion that though criminals are against the norms of society and indulge in various antisocial and illegal acts yet they desired for a peaceful world at large.

The results indicating that criminals have attached significantly more importance to the terminal values viz. "A world of beauty, Mature love, and Wisdom" than non-criminals are difficult to interpret.

(ii) Terminal Values rated higher by Non-Criminals

The results are presented in Table IX revealed that
non-criminals have attached significantly more importance to the terminal values mainly "Family security", "Equality", "Salvation", "Self-respect", "Social recognition" and "True friendship" than criminals.

A look at the value hierarchy for non-criminals revealed that the most important terminal values for non-criminals were "Equality" followed by "Family security", "Salvation" and "Social recognition". The terminal values of least importance to non-criminals were "Mature love", followed by "A world at peace", "A comfortable life" and "An exciting life".

The accompanying phrases as mentioned by Rokeach (1967) bring out that non-criminals are more family oriented, crave for salvation, self respecting, desire for a respectable place in a society and are true friends an explanation for an attempt to explain the presence of these values in criminals is that such values are likely to be the desired 'end states of existence' of these individuals who act as responsible members of the society and show proper regard for its rules and regulations.

Studies by Shortland and Bigger (1970) revealed that these subjects who returned their pencils were different from non-returners on the terminal values of "A world at peace", and "Salvation". Cochrane (1971) in his study found that male inmates cared less for equality and more for happiness,
pleasure and being capable and self-controlled than their female counterparts. Women in prison placed a higher value on autonomy, tolerance and self-fulfilment. They ranked 'A sense of accomplishment, Freedom, and being Independent, Brought up, Intellectual and Logical' significantly higher than non-prisoner women. These studies did not reveal any significant differences on the remaining terminal values.

The present study also failed to report any significant differences between criminals and non-criminals on the terminal values of Happiness, Inner harmony and National security.

In sum while stating the relationship of values to crime two conclusions may be drawn from the present study. These are (1) criminal behaviour is positively affected by their value systems (2) although significant differences have been emerged on various instrumental and terminal values for criminals and non-criminals yet these values cannot be termed as predictors of their conduct because of the effect of social desirability. However these results have enabled us to believe that there exists a difference in the Value system of criminals and non-criminals, which is responsible for their conduct.
(3) **Instrumental Values and Type of Crime**

Mohan and Razaun (1986) in their study found that property offenders who were involved in major crimes attached significantly more importance to the instrumental values namely Ambitious, Clean, Helpful and Logical and lesser importance to the value Honesty as compared to bodily offenders. Whatever there is clear dearth of studies stating the relationship of values to type of crime. Keeping in view the above findings it was hypothesized that property offenders would rate significantly higher for the Instrumental Values—Ambitious, Clean, Helpful and Logical but significantly lower on "Honesty" than bodily offenders. The present findings have partly supported the hypothesis. The results are as follows:

(1) **Differences of Bodily and Property Offenders on Instrumental Values**

The value hierarchies of bodily and property offenders for instrumental values as presented in Table 1 revealed that significant differences have emerged on six values namely Ambitious, Brooding, Honest, Imaginative, Independent and Responsible between two types of criminals.

The median ranks as obtained by property offenders bring out that they have attached more importance to the values—Ambitious and Independent. The median ranks scored by property offenders for these values are 5.35 and 4.25 respectively. The respective median ranks of bodily offenders for these values are
8.32 and 7.03. The rank differences have been found to be statistically significant at .01 and .05 level respectively (See Table X).

The possible reasoning behind this finding that property offenders have rated higher for the value 'Ambitious' may be the fact that usually crimes against property result from economic frustrations. Thus property offenders set higher goals in life and hence are more ambitious than body offenders. Body offences on the other hand are generally the result of circumstantial factors. Mohan and Razdan (1986) also reported that property offenders placed significantly higher in the hierarchy the value 'Ambitious' as compared to body offenders.

The results show that body offenders have placed significantly higher the values - "Breadminded", "Honest", "Independent" and "Responsible" in the hierarchy. The respective median ranks for these values as obtained by body offenders are 7.06, 8.50, 3.52 and 12.5. For these values property offenders have scored the median ranks of 9.14, 13.86, 5.65, and 15.66
The rank differences have been found to be statistically significant (see Table X).

The results suggest that the value Honesty is more of importance to body offenders than to property offenders. The findings are indicative of the fact that since crimes against property are the outcome of dishonest nature on the part of criminals, therefore the value 'Honesty' is of lesser importance to them.

(4) Terminal Values and Type of Crime

A study by Mohan and Razdan (1966) reported that property offenders placed significantly higher the values - 'An exciting life' and 'True friendship' as compared to body offenders. Body offenders on the other hand ranked higher for the value 'Self respect'. Keeping in view these findings in mind it was hypothesized that property offenders would rate significantly higher for the values 'An exciting life' and 'True friendship'.

The present results indicate that significant differences have emerged in the preferences of body and property offenders towards six Terminal values. These are: "A sense of accomplishment, Equality, Freedom, Mature love, Self respect and True friendship."

The findings indicated that body offenders have attached significantly more importance to 'A sense of
accomplishment, Freedom, Mature love and Self respect as compared to property offenders. The median ranks scored by body offenders for these values are respectively 12.7, 1.5, 10.1 and 13.5. The respective median ranks for property offenders are 12.15, 5.5, 12.5 and 15.03. The rank differences have been found to be statistically significant (See Table XI).

Property offenders on the other hand have significantly higher the values - Equality and True friendship. The median ranks scored by property offenders for these values are respectively 9.83 and 4.84. The respective median ranks of body offenders for these values are 13.38 and 11.16. The results are statistically significant (see Table XI).

Mohan and Razdan (1986) reported that since crime against property are usually committed in a group therefore property offenders are expected to attach significantly more importance to the value "True friendship" as compared to body offenders. The present finding have supported this earlier theme.

(5) Instrumental Values—and Degree of Crime

As already stated in the absence of supported evidence stating the relationship of different types of values to degree of crime, it is difficult to formulate a precise hypothesis. Thus null hypothesis was assumed for the present piece of work.
The results as presented in the Table X indicated that major offenders have placed significantly higher the values - "Broadminded, Cheerful, Imaginative and Intellectual." The respective median ranks scored by major offenders for these values are 7.83, 7.42, 3.83 and 5.61. The median ranks scored by minor offenders for these values are respectively 8.57, 9.5, 7.3 and 9.16. The rank differences have been found to be statistically significant (see Table X).

The results as presented in Table X depicted that minor offenders on the other hand have rated higher for the values - "Forgiving, Independent and Self-controlled." Table X indicates that the respective median ranks of minor offenders for these values are 7.30, 4.12 and 5.3. The median ranks of major offenders for these values are respectively 13.50, 6.76 and 14.83. The rank differences have been found to be statistically significant (see Table X).

In the absence of studies supporting the relationships of instrumental values to the degree of crime it is difficult to interpret these findings. However these findings have highlighted the fact that there exists a difference in the value system of major and minor offenders in terms of terminal values.
(6) Terminal Values and Degree of Crime

Terminal values significant differences in the rankings of major and minor offenders have emerged for eight terminal values namely, "A sense of accomplishment, A world at peace, A world of beauty, Inner harmony, National security, Pleasure, True friendship and Wisdom."

Table XI indicates that major offenders have placed significantly higher for the values - "A sense of accomplishment, A world of beauty, Inner harmony, National security, and Wisdom." The respective median ranks scored by major offenders for these values are 10.31, 9.32, 10.87, 7.07 and 5.59. The median ranks scored by minor offenders for these values are respectively 13.04, 12.5, 14.59, 8.07 and 11.83.

Minor offenders on the other hand have attached significantly more importance to the values - "A world at peace, Pleasure and True friendship." Table XI depicts that for these values minor offenders have scored the median ranks of 10.05, 3.76 and 5.37 respectively. The respective median ranks of major offenders for these values are 12.23, 5.5 and 5.5. The results have been found to be statistically significant.
(7) **Differences of Different Types of Criminals and the Non-criminals on Instrumental Values**

A glance at table XII reveals that significant differences have emerged between major property offenders and the non-criminal group of subject on all the instrumental values except for 'Independent'.

The differences between the value ranking of minor property offenders and non-criminals were insignificant for the values - "Ambitious, Forgiving, Logical and Self-controlled".

Table XII revealed that for the criminal groups viz. major body offender and minor body offenders significant differences have emerged in the values rankings for all the instrumental values except in "logical".

(8) **Differences of Different Types of Criminals and the Non-criminals on Terminal Values**.

Table XIII reveals that on terminal differences between major property offenders and non-criminal subjects were significant for all the values except for "Happiness and National security".

The differences in the value rankings of minor property offenders and non-criminal subjects were insignificant on the values - "A sense of accomplishment, A world of beauty, Inner harmony, True friendship and Wisdom".
The value ranking for body offenders in both the groups i.e. major and minor were significant for all the terminal values except on Inner harmony and National security.