CHAPTER III

AIMS AND HYPOTHESES
AIMS

Psychological interest in criminality is aimed at measuring objectively the degree to which criminals are psychologically different from non-criminals. Current theories of criminal behaviour lean heavily towards those which stress personality factors (Elliott, 1952). Eysenck (1970) related sociological, psychological and biological factors to an interactionist theory to explain criminal behaviour. A criminal, according to Eysenck (1964, 1970) would come from high P, high N and high E/I quadrant, apart from the sociological and biological influences. Research carried out in the area of crime and personality suggests that prisoners as a whole differ in their personality make-up from the non-criminals (Tennenbaum, 1977). But despite the acknowledged relationship between personality and crime, the criminals are not a homogeneous group.

There are different types of offenders. Eysenck and Eysenck (1970) observed "Little has in fact been done to sort out internal differences, i.e., differences in personality between different types of prisoners; this must be one of the most important research areas for the future." There are very few studies where empirical investigation into the specific personality correlates
of different types of offenders has been made. Aysenck (1977) found that different types of prisoners differed noticeably in their scores on personality variables e.g. violent and sex offenders were high on P while conmen. Earlier also attempts had been made to classify crimes. Bonger (1916) classified crimes by the motives of the offenders as economic crimes, sexual crimes, political crimes etc. But certainly no crime can be reduced to one motive, though desire for excitement is common in all types of crime. Crimes have also been classified as crimes against person, public order, and public justice. This method of classification is unrealistic in great majority of cases as an offender may easily fit into more than one category. Abrahamsen (1950) differentiated between acute and chronic offenders. Acute offenders are 'accidental' criminals and chronic offenders are 'habitual' criminals. Sutherland and Cressey (1968) classified crimes in respect of atrocity as felonies and misdemeanours. Felonies are serious crimes punishable by death and misdemeanours less serious crimes punishable by confinement in prison or by fines. This classification brands a criminal as a felon or a misdemeanant. There can be overlapping, too, in these two categories (Jaspal, 1977). Britt and Tittle (1973) made a typology of criminals, according to the gravity of the offence, into major and minor offences. Jaspal (1977), Mohan and Jaspal (1982)
studied the difference between major and minor criminals. Narayanan and K. Moni (1977) compared Hedonism scores \( \text{EkN} \) of murderers and thieves, with those of normals. Mohan and Singh (1978) made a two-way classification according to the gravity of crimes committed, i.e.,

- major crimes (murder, dacoity, etc.)
- minor crimes (petty stealing, bootlegging, etc.).

Other classifications are individual and group crimes and casual and hardened criminals analogous to Abrahamsen's 'accidental' and 'habitual' criminals. These classifications are not mutually exclusive. All these studies suggest that much greater differences would be obtained between different types of criminals and the controls by constructing a typology of criminals.

The Indian Penal Code classifies crime into offences against body and offences against property. Crimes against body are committed by persons who are aggressive and impulsive. 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 leading to the act of violence terminating in the offence against body. On the other hand, crimes against property are generally committed against strangers and are much more general and public as infraudulent stock and bond sales or fraudulent...
advertisements. They are impersonal crimes and generally represent no violent antagonism towards the victim but are result of scheming and ruthless and reckless pursuit of interests at variance with the interests of the victim. It may be, thus presumed that the person committing an offence against property would possess intense ability to scheme, manoeuvre and manipulate in order to deceive and cheat but would not be impulsive and aggressive like a body offender.

Motives have also a great bearing on behaviour. According to Murray's concept of needs and motives as elaborated by McClelland and his associates (1933), the three primary motives are need for Achievement (nAch), need for Affiliation (nAff) and need for Power (nPow). nAch may be defined as "concern over accomplishments, desire to do things well, the urge to improve, tendency to strive for success in competitive situations." The Affiliation motive or need (nAff) is defined as "concern over establishing friendly relationships with people." need for Power may be defined as "concern over controlling and influencing other people." McClelland and Winter (1971) elaborate, "The Motivation of a person with nPower is quite different. He wants to have impact on others, to control or persuade them. whereas a
businessman with high nAsh would do whatever is necessary to get his factory built, another man in the same position with high nPow might get so involved in controlling others that he might not care if the factory never got built. On the other hand a person with high nAff. wants to stay on friendly relationship with other people at all costs. Most of the work in the area of motives is concentrated in the field of education or business management. There is a relative paucity of work relating motives to crime.

The present research envisaged to study the personality and motives of different types of criminals. Eysenck (1970) has suggested that different types of crime would correlate with different personality type. So by paying attention to the differences within the criminal population with respect to P, E and N, we may be able to increase our knowledge and understanding of dynamics of crime in relation to personality. This may help us in obtaining clues as to the optimal methods of treatment of different types of criminals (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1970).

One of the other factors found to be affecting the personality of the criminals is the residential background. Debrata (1964) found unemployed urban
youth to be less neurotic and less introverted. Agarwal’s study (1977) revealed marked differences in personality and values of the urban and rural students. Neumann (1977) found urban subjects lower on anxiety as compared to rural subjects. Singh (1977) and Srivastava and Seth (1978) reported differences among tribal and rural subjects. Singh, A. (1976) Mohan and Singh (1982) found rural criminals scoring high on P scale of MN. Verma (1975) found rural delinquents higher on N. Singh, A. (1980) did not find any significant difference on N among rural and urban criminals. Since residential background i.e. rural/urban has been found to affect the personality and motives of criminals the differences among property and body offenders on the variables of personality and motives were planned to be studied in the present research by comparing the criminals belonging to rural/urban areas.

Another factor that may effect changes in personality and motives of criminals is the length of imprisonment. Comparatively little is known of the effects of length of imprisonment on the psychological make up of the criminal. The need to answer this question has become more urgent as crime and consequently
conviction rate is shooting up. Those studies which have studied personality traits of prisoners, have not taken into account the influence of length of imprisonment and consequently, it is difficult to judge to what extent the personality characteristics reported reflect the "criminal personality" or the experience of imprisonment. Banister et al. (1973) observed, "The research conducted with prisoners to date suggests that changes may occur during imprisonment, but it does not permit any firm conclusions to be made about their nature." It was therefore aimed in the present study to find whether there are corresponding changes in personality and motives correlated with the length of imprisonment and whether a causal link between imprisonment and psychological variables can be established.

Prisoners in our state have now been redesignated as 'Sudhar Ghar' i.e. "Homes for Reformation." Prison rules affirm that the training and treatment of convicted prisoners shall be to encourage and assist them to lead a good and useful life. The punitive, the deterrent, the retributive concepts of imprisonment have now been replaced by the reformative and restitutive concept. Prisoners are being provided with conditions in the jails, as near those in the
outside society, in which they are to move later on, as possible in order to enable their proper socialisation. Open air prisons are coming into existence where prisoners are not locked up by night. They live in open barracks and work freely in the fields, as they would in their own home places, with unrestricted freedom to meet and communicate with relatives and friends. No study has so far been carried out, in this region, to determine the changes, if any, in the personality and motives of criminals through confinement in open-air and closed jails. The present investigation also aimed to study the effect of type of prisons on the personality and motives of criminals.

**Hypotheses**

In the light of the reviewed literature, and keeping in mind the aims of the present research, as already discussed the following hypotheses are framed.

A. **PERSONALITY AND CRIME**

The theory of criminality advanced by Á parentId (1970) predicts that criminals would show higher scores on extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism as compared with matched normal controls. There are several studies which support this prediction. The
bulk of the literature relating crime to personality has been reviewed earlier in chapter II. The three factors of E, N and P would be discussed separately in order to deduce hypotheses linking each with the typology of crime and other classification of criminals made in the present study.

1. Extraversion and Crime

Eysenck (1964, 1970) propounded his theory of crime, "that it is conscience, which is, in the main instrumental in making us behave in a moral 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 the 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." It has been experimentally shown that the extraverts are more difficult to condition than the introverts. Thus it may be presumed that extraverts would have a low inhibition against aggression. Because of their poor socialisation any provocation or frustration would lead them to aggressive behaviour.

In 1963, Eysenck and Eysenck put forward a theory about the dual nature of extraversion stating
that it has two components: sociability and impulsivity. It was held by them that it is the impulsivity which differentiates between criminals and controls rather than the sociability. Schalling and Holmberg (1970) reported that the impulsiveness component of extraversion is higher in criminals as compared to non-criminals.

In view of the above discussion, it may be hypothesized that:

**Criminals, as a whole, would score higher on the impulsivity component but lower on the sociability component of E/I as compared to the normals on the EPI scale.**

1) **E/I and Type of Crime**

As the offences relating to body are primarily of impulsive type, it may be hypothesized that:

**Criminals committing body offences would score higher on impulsivity as compared to property offenders.**

Since property offences are the result of scheming and planning, these may be presumed to lack an element of aggressive impulsiveness. It may be hypothesized:

**Criminals committing property crimes would score lower on impulsivity and higher on sociability as compared to criminals committing crimes against body.**
ii) E/A and Habitat

A number of studies demonstrate that crime and delinquency rates are higher in urban communities than in rural communities (Johnson, 1966). Useem and Waldner (1942) differentiated between the nature of urban and rural crimes; the latter tended to be naive and discreet. On the other hand, Sutherland and Cressey (1966) state that, "The rural rates are higher than the urban rates for homicide and about one half as high as assaults, one fourth as high for burglary, larceny and auto theft." Sharma S. (1976) has shown that the rates of major crimes against person are very high in rural areas as compared to the urban areas. The rural population of this region is comparatively backward being less mobile than their urban counterparts. Their contact with advanced technology and refined media of learning is less, resulting in poorer opportunities of socialisation. Thus it may be predicted that:

THE RURAL CRIMINALS WOULD SCORE LOWER ON EXTRAVERSION AND SOCIABILITY BUT HIGHER ON IMPULSIVITY AS COMPARED TO THE URBAN CRIMINALS.

iii) E/A and Term of Imprisonment

Hoskin et al. (1973) in a study on the long term
effects of imprisonment found some increase in measures of self-directed hostility and $N$ among the prisoners with length of imprisonment. These changes are likely to give a boost to impulsiveness hence it may be hypothesized that:

**CRIMINALS WHO HAVE ALREADY UNDERGONE A LONG TERM OF IMPRISONMENT, i.e. 24+, WOULD SCORE HIGHER ON IMPULSIVITY BUT LOWER ON SOCIABILITY AS COMPARED TO PRISONERS WHO HAVE BEEN IN PRISON FOR A SHORT TERM OF IMPRISONMENT, i.e. 6.**

iv) $n/i$ and Type of Jail

The prisoners who are considered to be having 'good-conduct' during their stay in the closed jails are allowed to be kept in the open jails for the remaining period of their term. Good conduct reflects better socialisation which is possible in prisoners low on $n/i$. Thus it may be predicted that:

**PRISONERS IN THE OPEN JAILS WOULD SCORE LESS ON extraversion THAN THOSE IN THE CLOSED JAILS.**

2. NEUROTICISM AND CRIME

Burgess (1972) elevated the dimension of $N$ to the top position of the determinants of crime. In most of the studies cited by Eysenck (1970) prisoners were found to score higher on $N$ than the controls. Thus it may be hypothesized that:
CRIMINALS WOULD SCORE HIGHER ON N THAN THE NON-CRIMINALS.

1) N and Type of Crime

Blackburn (1968) held that the frequency and intensity of aggressive responses are both indications of habit strength. Thus there should be a very close link between N, aggression and aggressive crimes. Singh A. (1979a) found male criminals who had committed major offences scoring higher on N than petty offenders. In a subsequent study Singh A. (1979b) reported murderers to be scoring higher on N than other criminals. Generally offences against body are of an aggressive nature. In view of the above it may be hypothesised that:

BODY OFFENDERS WOULD SCORE HIGHER ON N THAN PROPERTY OFFENDERS.

ii) N and Habitat;

A number of reported studies (Verma, 1975; Verma, 1976; Singh, A., 1980) showed rural subjects scoring higher on neuroticism than the urban. In the light of these findings it may be hypothesised that:

THE RURAL CRIMINALS WOULD SCORE HIGHER ON NEUROTICISM AS COMPARED TO THE URBAN.
iii) **N and the Term of Imprisonment**

Goffman (1961) had reported an increase in apathy and a reduction of drive over the years in imprisonment. An increase in anxiety during short periods of confinement was reported by Schultz (1965). In view of these findings it may be hypothesised in the present study that:-

**THE PRISONERS WHO HAVE UNDERGONE A SHORT TERM OF IMPRISONMENT WOULD HAVE HIGH N SCORES WHICH WOULD GO DOWN AS THE TERM OF IMPRISONMENT INCREASES.**

iv) **N and the Type of Jail**

Open jails are minimum security prisons. Only such prisoners are taken out for work and lodging in the open jails who have displayed a consistently good conduct during their stay in the closed jails. Good conduct is synonymous with better socialisation which envisages good conditioning a pre-requisite of which is a high drive. It may therefore be hypothesised in the present study that:-

**THE OPEN JAIL PRISONERS WOULD BE HIGHER ON N THAN THE PRISONERS LODGED IN THE CLOSED JAILS.**

3. **PSYCHOTICISM AND CRIME**

i) **P and the Type of Crime**

All the studies conducted so far have found
criminals scoring higher on psychoticism as compared to non-criminals. Eysenck and Eysenck (1971) had suggested that aggressive crimes involving unnecessary cruelty would carry implications of high P. Marriage (1975), Singh A (1976, 1979a, 1979b), Jaspal (1977) corroborated the contention that violent criminals are high on P. Eysenck et al. (1977) in a special study designed to classify prisoners found Violence and Property offenders scoring high on P though the differences failed to reach statistical significance. Jaspal (1977) in her study on major minor criminals had found no differences in the two types of psychoticism. In view of the above evidence it may be hypothesised in the present study that:

**THE SCORES ON PSYCHOTICISM OF BOTH THE PROPERTY AND BODY OFFENDERS WOULD BE HIGH COMPARED TO THOSE OF NON-CRIMINALS BUT THEY WOULD NOT DIFFER SIGNIFICANTLY FROM ONE ANOTHER.**

**ii) P and Habitat**

Singh A. (1976) found rural criminals scoring very high on the P scale on PdN. Mirmal (1977) reported similar findings with juvenile delinquents. It may therefore be hypothesised that:

**THE RURAL CRIMINALS WOULD HAVE HIGHER P SCORES THAN THE URBAN CRIMINALS.**
iii) **P and Term of Imprisonment**

Heskin et al. (1973) in their study on the psychological correlates of long-term imprisonment did not give a finding on P as the personality inventory used was the EPI which did not have a P scale. No other study on the above topic has been available. It has already been hypothesised that there would be a decisive increase in the sociability and decrease in the impulsivity of the prisoners as the term of imprisonment lengthens. With the introduction of reformative trend in the jails the behaviour of prisoners is also expected to improve with length of imprisonment. In P aN most of the items on P are saturated with processes closely inter-linked with socialisation. Hence it may be hypothesized that:

\[
\text{THE PRISONERS HAVING UNDERGONE A LONG TERM OF IMPRISONMENT i.e. 24} \quad \text{WILL BE LESS PSYCHOTIC THAN THE PRISONERS HAVING UNDERGONE A SHORT TERM OF IMPRISONMENT i.e. 6.}
\]

iv) **P and Type of Jail**

The atmosphere in the open jails is conducive to the development of loving feelings through unrestricted interviews of inmates with relatives and
friends. The staff working in the open jails is better attuned to the reformative trends in jail administration. These conditions are conducive to generation of love and reduction of negative feelings towards the family members. In view of the above facts it may be hypothesised that:

**THE PRISONERS LODGED IN THE OPEN JAILS WOULD BE LOW ON PSYCHOTICISM AS COMPARED TO THE PRISONERS LODGED IN CLOSED JAILS.**

8. **MOTIVES AND CRIME**

As already discussed, hardly any studies are available showing the relationship of crime to motives. In view of this, an effort is being made to deduce the relationship from theoretical background.

1. **Need for Achievement and Crime**

Cattell (1957) found McDougall's conception of "self-assertive" drive to be borne out in his "self-assertion" erg. In view of this it may be predicted that:

**CRIMINALS WOULD SCORE HIGHER ON MACH AS COMPARED TO NON-CRIMINALS.**

1) **Mach and Type of Crime**

McClelland (1961) had linked mach with economic
activity through entrepreneurs. Moderate risk-taking was considered as one of the important characteristics of an entrepreneur. Property offences involve comparatively moderate risk taking as compared to body offences. In view of this it may be predicted that:

PROPERTY OFFENDERS WOULD SCORE HIGHER ON NACH AS COMPARED TO BODY OFFENDERS.

ii) NACH AND HABITAT

McCleland (1961) found that persons residing in areas of higher economic growth had higher nach. Thus it may be predicted that:

URBAN CRIMINALS WOULD SCORE HIGHER ON NACH AS COMPARED TO THE RURAL.

iii) NACH AND TERM OF IMPRISONMENT

Adorno et al. (1950) and Asch (1952) showed through a series of experiments that subjects high on nach displayed a greater independence under social pressure to conform (McCleland et al., 1976). Hence it may be hypothesized that:

PRISONERS HAVING UNDERGONE LONG TERM OF IMPRISONMENT WOULD BE HIGHER ON NACH THAN THOSE UNDERGONE SHORT TERM OF IMPRISONMENT.
iv) **rach and Type of Jail**

Prisoners in the open jails are exposed to self-discipline as compared to those in the closed jails. Sidiqui and Akhtar (1969) found disciplined students high on nAch. In view of this, it may be hypothesised that:

**PRISONERS IN OPEN JAILS WOULD BE HIGHER ON nAch THAN THOSE IN CLOSED JAILS.**

2. **Need for Affiliation and Crime**

McClelland (1951) states that there may be two types of motives - one characterised by approach behaviour and the other by avoidance behaviour. According to this theory the "two aspects of nAff would be (a) seeking affiliation because of the pleasant stimulus reward value of the affiliative relationship (approach behaviour), (b) seeking affiliation because of the painful stimulus value of rejection" (Atkinson, 1966, p. 103). Criminals, broadly speaking, have suffered rejection in some form or the other at the hands of society. It may, therefore, be deduced from (b) above that criminals would be high on nAff as compared to non-criminals.

There is a relative paucity of work on nAff and crime. At best we may formulate a null hypothesis that:
3. Need for Power and Crime

Skelnick (1966) found significant relationship between npow and ratings on drives manifestly expressing aggression. Terhune (1968a and 1968b) found men high on npow having exploitative and unco-operative tendencies. In view of these studies it may be deduced that:

CRIMINALS WOULD SCORE HIGHER ON nPow AS COMPARED TO NON-CRIMINALS.

There are hardly any studies on npow and crime. At best we may formulate a null hypothesis that:

THERE WOULD BE NO DIFFERENCE ON nPow BETWEEN PROPERTY AND BODY OFFENDERS, IN RURAL AND URBAN CRIMINALS, IN SHORT AND LONG TERM PRISONERS AND IN THOSE KEPT IN OPEN OR CLOSED JAILS.

4. Need for Aggression and Crime

Studies by Frederikson (1942), Sherman and Gest (1942), Seashore and Bevelac (1942) showed that aggression was not an invariant response to frustration (Hall, 1961). Criminals are mostly frustrated individuals. Hence it may be presumed that:

CRIMINALS WOULD SCORE HIGHER ON nAgg AS COMPARED TO NON-CRIMINALS.
There are hardly any direct studies on nhgg and crime. At best we may formulate null hypothesis that:

There would be no difference on nhgg between property/body offenders, rural/urban criminals, short/long term prisoners, in open/closed jail prisoners.

5. Need for Security and Crime

Lack of security is generally associated with social behaviour. It may hence be predicted that:

Criminals would score higher on nsec as compared to non-criminals.

There are hardly any studies on nsec and crime. At best we may formulate a null hypothesis that:

There would be no difference on nsec, between property/body offenders, rural/urban criminals, in short/long term prisoners and in open/closed jail prisoners.

The results of the present study, for different needs, if found significant for any of these groups will give a direction to future work.