CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:
Past study reveals that crime is associated with human society since it came into existence. With the development of society, the number and the nature of crime have changed and increased. The earliest record of crime has been made by sociologist and priests. Psychologists are very late to enter the field. Priests, politicians and social workers have made constant efforts to minimize crime. These efforts have mostly been of primitive nature. Punishment was of physical nature — from tooth for tooth and eye for eye to the maximum denial of existence through capital punishment. Priests under the influence of religion advocated punishment in the form of internal sufferings in the present and the future life with all sorts of horrible tortures of hell. Society punished defaulters from a little financial penalty to a complete social boycott. This condition prevails even in most of the civilized countries even today. An analysis of these efforts of prevention and cure of crime reveals that there were minimum efforts to understand the socio-psychological factors involved in crime. Maximum emphasis was given to physical punishment only. In spite of all these efforts, the number of crimes and criminals is increasing day by day as reported by the Government from time to time.

During the later part of the nineteenth century the problem of crime has been viewed from a different angle. In the beginning, physical constitution and anthropological characteristics were considered to have been correlated with crime. But that was not a thorough scientific approach.
Of course, this did provide a direction wherefrom the problem of crime could be looked at. Later on, sociologists and other research scholars tried to understand this problem from economic and human habitat points of view.

Henderson (1893) wrote the first serious sociological treatise when he made an effort to establish relation between the cause and the cure of crime. He believed that the causes of crime are factors of personality and environment and the reaction of personality upon environment in the formation of habits and nature.

Sutherland (1960) is of the opinion that crime is always a personal situation complex. He maintains that in the causation of crime, both, the personality traits and the environment, play very important roles. Criminal behaviour is learnt in interaction with other people. Those who are already criminals would create such an environment that another individual who comes in contact with this environment would learn the ways of the criminals.

Elliot (1952) supports the above referred view of Sutherland and maintains that criminal activity is behaviour, which occurs because of the stimulus to the individual which his relationship to other people and group involves.

Gradually, the criminal with his socio-psychological composition became the focus point in contradiction to the nature of crime. This has resulted into an emergence of a new branch of psychology known as Criminology. The criminologists
(which included both sociologists and psychologists) have tried to understand the problem of crime scientifically. Their investigations have focused more on the juvenile delinquency rather than on adult criminals. The present investigation is, however, exclusively based on the study of adult criminals and therefore, only the findings related to adult criminals will be reviewed.

Lombroso (1911), the founder of the Italian school of Criminology, attempted to demark criminal and normal persons on the basis of physiognomy. He based his thesis on the anthropometric measurements and physiognomical features of criminals. He tried to prove that the typical criminal possessed certain definite physical characteristics of abnormality e.g. slanting forehead, flattened nose, long ear lobes, large jaws having to chin, heavy supraorbital ridges, excessive hair or no hair, extreme sensitivity or no sensitivity to pain etc. His theory was that men commit crime because they represent in their physical and mental make up a type of being that antilogically belongs to an earlier stage of evolution and they, therefore, commit acts that were natural to such a lower stage of social development. The thesis does not stand to the test of experimental findings.

The explanation of Goring (1913), an English physician, varies in as much as these bodily inferiorities are selective factors, determining to some extent conviction for crime, and thus maintained that crime was almost entirely a product
of heredity.

Ferri (1917), an associate of Lombroso, while adhering to Lombroso's anthropological theories of the genesis of crime, emphasised upon the social factors and gathered together and placed in logical form more clearly than any other member of the Italian School the various factors that go into the making of criminals.

Garofalo (1914), another member of the Italian School puts psychic or, as he prefers to call it, "Moral" anomaly at the very centre of his theory. As per his definition crime is an offence against sentiments or emotions of pity and probity.

Thus, the members of the Italian School of Criminology changed the emphasis from crime to various aspects of the criminal personality.

Kretschmer (1925), a German psychiatrist, and Sheldon (1940) have attempted to correlate behaviour to the body build and have applied the same thesis in the explanation of crime. Sheldon and his co-workers have found support in the work of Gluecks (1956) who have concluded that body build plays a greater role in precipitating delinquent behaviour than has, hithertofore, been acknowledged.

Gluecks (1930, 1934, 1937, 1952, 1956, 1960) very vividly described the difference between delinquent and nondelinquent
behaviour based on different characteristic factors, e.g. physical, temperamental, attitudinal, psychological and socio-cultural. They are of the opinion that the biological factors influencing personality make up are more important than the environmental factors, thus altering mental and emotional aspect of personality rather than the physical condition of personality. In individual cases the stresses contributed by any one of the multiple factors of dissocial behaviour tendency may adequately account for persistence in delinquency. In general, the high probability of delinquency is dependent upon the interplay of conditions and forces from all these factors.

Argyle (1964) has pointed out that delinquents differ physiologically. This difference depends upon the presence of 'theta' rhythm when electrical activity of their brain is measured. Yoshimi, Shinokoshi and Tani (1961) explain that the 'theta' pattern was related to emotional instability, asociality and immaturity. As per the study of Yoshi, Ishikawa and Tani (1964), the 'theta' wave pattern in young delinquents was directly correlated with violence having a habitual tendency.

Vold (1958) holds the views that the acquiring of attitudes favourable to crime and the learning of criminal behaviour pattern is just as normal a psychological process as that of learning the way of life, approved of by law abiding society. Thus, there is no present evidence at
all of physical type as such having any consistent relation to legal and sociologically defined crime.

In India, sociologists are the pioneers in the study of crime. Criminals have been studied in relation to their community, caste, urban rural habitat, economic condition, and education. Substantial work does not seem to have been done in this field of personality and more so in the direction of finding a relationship between the traits, temperament and personality on one side and criminal behaviour on the other. Dependable studies for references are not available for the present study. However, a thorough examination of various studies reference to which are made hereinbelow, was carefully done by the present investigator to find out any fruitful indication which may throw some light on the present study.

Singh (1967) focused on criminals and their attitudes towards their families, parents and authority. In a matched group study of 100 criminals and 100 noncriminals investigated through 5 point Likert Attitude Scale, he found that the mean scores of the noncriminals were greater than those of the criminals. The differences were significant indicating that the criminals as a group had more unfavourable attitudes towards family, parents and authority. He further observed that there were no statistically significant difference existing between the two groups, although criminals had slightly a higher score over noncriminals as far as extroversion was concerned and had high scores on neuroticism dimension.
as measured by Maudslay Personality Inventory. It was also found that criminals had a lower IQ than noncriminals.

Murthy (1966) attempted to find out the relationship between crime and temperament. Through a questionnaire administered on a totally heterogeneous group of 26 male criminals, with an age range of 22 to 58, Cyclothymic and Schizothymic scores were obtained and interpreted. The results showed that ambiverts constituted the bulk of the population examined, next in order were schizothymes and last the Pyknes, while only one cyclothymic was found in the population. Considering the relation of type of crime and the temperamental type, ambiverts dominated the different categories of crime. The cyclothymes were prone to offences affecting property prompted by a tendency to acquisition. On comparison between cyclothymes and schizothymes, the schizothymes appeared in every category of crime.

Sharma (1965) observes that any serious study of the personality organisation of criminals should address itself to the question of what criminality means to the offenders and what aims it serves in the dynamics of his inner life. A detailed inquiry should go beyond intellectual and emotional inadequacies and abnormalities and explore motivation and self image.

Durganand Sinha (1968) studied a sample of matched group of 100 criminals and 100 noncriminals with the help of a self rating inventory consisting of five favourable, five
social and five unfavourable traits. It was found that the criminals had a strong tendency to perceive themselves as possessing more of undesirable traits, and it was concluded that the criminals had more "social conflict" than the noncriminals.

Mukherjee (1966) in his "Personality of Criminals - a Rorschach Study" found that out of 8 variables, only two variables pertaining to productivity and emotional maturity failed to differentiate the groups adequately. The study consisted of experimental and control matched groups of criminals and normals, 10 each tested on Rorschach test.

Amuja (1969) in his study has found that crime is predominantly a male behaviour. Women are less criminal because they are inherently more moral. Women have great ability to suffer in silence and they are physically less active and mentally subdued.

Cadets of the Jail Officers Training School, Hisar (1962) in a pilot study observed that prestige was the main cause of offence in 18 cases in the first group of 25 violent offenders but none in the second group of 25 property offenders.

De (1970) is of the opinion that in recent researches there is hardly any relationship between intelligence and criminality. In case of fraud, forgery, smuggling, etc,
there may not be any relationship between intelligence and criminality but in the case of murderers, larcenists and sex offenders, lesser intelligence also may do. Sex offenders have below normal intelligence. Or it may be that mostly the mentally deficient offenders get caught.

The data analysis of 380 criminal mental patients made by Kishor Varma and Shah (1970) reveals that the incidence of crime was significantly higher in male patients and in the age group of 18-40 years.

Luthra (1957) and Shanmugam (1962) have observed the presence of more neuroticism in delinquents and criminals.

Shanmugam (1969) observes that every one of us is a potential murderer as we all contain the idea of murder in one way or the other. Freud explains it as sadistic masochistic tendencies which sometimes result in killing of near relatives. Pavlovian explanation takes into account the balancing mechanism of excitatory and inhibitory potentials of the brain which when disturbed results in aggression. Epilepsy is also the cause of some murders.

According to Mahendale (1959) the factors of criminal causation were motives for anti-social acts, loss of or fear of loss of reputation and self esteem, blame being put on the family of wrong doer.

Gupta's (1959) findings centre around the ego structure of the delinquent not being properly organised, control of
agression as one of the problem and anxiety ridden in their personality patterns.

Haikarwal (1934) puts emphasis on the sociological side of crime. Shanmugam (1948) found poverty to be an important factor in crime, whereas Shanker (1955) arrives at the conclusion that maltreatment of parents and step parents is a causal factor in juvenile delinquency.

The studies referred to above pertain to the crime and the criminal behaviour of persons of States other than Gujarat. No systematic inquiry seems to have been conducted with respect to the criminal behaviour and the causative factors. The present study is perhaps the first of its kind in Gujarat. Further the present study differs from the previous studies in two respects. Firstly, it deals exclusively with the Gujarat State and secondly, it tries to find out whether criminals differ significantly from noncriminals in respect of their traits and level of conflicts.