CHAPTER - I
INTRODUCTION

Aberrant human conduct which is made culpable under the law is called crime. In this sense of the term every year a large number of people commit crimes of various nature. However, crime is a multifaceted problem. Researchers from different disciplines view it from their own unique way. For example, sociologists view it as an antisocial act, lawyers consider it an illegal act, for religious representatives crime is equivalent to committing a sin, whereas, psychologists seem to be more concerned with the personal and behavioural dynamics. Crime as defined in criminology is violation of legal norms. Human conduct may be divided into two broad categories. Those which conform to the norms of society and those which deviate from those.

Crime has always been a part of society. Since the beginning of history evidence of crime can be traced. The more complex or advanced a society becomes, the more difficult it is for the individual and the more frequent the human failures. Multiplication of laws and of sanctions for their observances merely increases the evil. According to Tannenbaum (1943), criminology, more specifically, is the scientific study of crime and criminals. It includes the analysis o
1. The nature and extent of crime.
2. Causes of crime and criminality.
3. The development of the criminal law and the administration of criminal justice.
5. The treatment of the criminal.
6. Patterns of criminality.
7. The impact of crime on social change.

Ideally behavior would not be called criminal unless the following seven conditions were present. Sutherland & Cressey (1969). These conditions are:

1. There must be certain consequence or ‘Harm’.  
2. The harm must be legally forbidden and have been proscribed in penal-law.
3. There must be ‘Conduct’ i.e., there must be an intentional or reckless action or inaction which brings the harmful consequence about.
4. Menace or ‘Criminal intent’ must be present.
5. There must be a fusion or concurrence of menace and conduct.
6. There must be causal relation between the legally forbidden harm and voluntary misconduct.
7. There must be legally proscribed punishment.
Indian researchers have classified crime into two broad categories according to the gravity of crimes committed i.e., major crimes (murder, theft, etc.) and minor crimes (potty stealing, minor thefts, etc). Crime reports show that assaultive violent crimes are committed mostly by young adults, whereas minor crimes are committed by older criminals.

The study of crime can be psychological, sociological, anthropological or even economic in emphasis. Psychological criminology researchers focus on the factors that play a significant role in determining individual behaviour. Study of crime requires examining both the individual personality and situation. According to Bartol (1980), a viable psychological study of criminal behaviour demands attention to personality factors and how they interact with situational variables.

The psychological approach from the perspective of personality is based on a belief that personality and other genetic factors play a very decisive role in the commission of a crime.

**Theories of Crime:**

There are many factors which affect the incidence of crime and these factors are covered by various theoretical viewpoints. These different
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Theories attempt to explain the nature and cause of crime from various angles. Some of these are:

**Biological Theory of Crime:**

Those cover various biological basis of crime, such as, hereditary, constitutional, hormonal and chromosomal factors. Sometimes brain disorders, such as epilepsy, were also considered important causal factors. Biological viewpoint as such does not hold a solid ground these days. Lombrosd's contention of presence of an extra Y chromosome in criminal males, long been discarded, has found fascination among some researchers in the present times too. However, as such, more attention is being paid to other theories.

**Sociological Theory:**

Crime is thought to be a learned behaviour in the course of an individual's development. The fault is attributed to society (Rocklase, 1969).

**Psychological Theory:**

This theory has been based, partly, on the notion that crime may be the result of psychological illnesses. Eyscneck, (1970) and Cattell (1950) have attempted to explain crime in terms of individual differences in personality.
Many psychologists have studied the characteristics of delinquents and criminals for identifying the causes of antisocial behaviour. Psychological theories can be grouped under personality theories, such as, Freud's a psychoanalytic, Eysenck's and Cattell's personality theories.

(a) Psychoanalytic Theory:

Classical psychologists view antisocial proclivities as innate, but constrained by ego and superego. Psychologists with psychoanalytic orientation have attempted to relate crime with psychoanalytic concepts such as unconscious conflict and sense of guilt. Another explanation given is that during the formative years parents consciously or unconsciously induce some destructive, immoral and antisocial tendencies (Wulman, 1978).

(b) Eysenck's theory of Personality and Crime:

In the personality theory of crime most notable and extensive work has been done by Eysenck (1985). He pioneered the three dimensional theory of personality and attempted to explain its relationship to crime. Eysenck (1970) tried to relate sociological, psychological and biological factors to a general interactionist theory related to crime.
Mo speculated the theory that antisocial conduct was in evidence of lack of proper socialization, that socialization was itself due to the formation in childhood and youth of appropriate conditioned responses. As these form less easily in extroverts, it was predicted that extroverts, particularly those with high neuroticism (N) scores, would be more likely than introverts to commit criminal acts. (Eysenck, 1964). In 1970 Eysenck put forward another factor psychoticism (P) which may in addition to extraversion (E) and neuroticism (N) be implicated in the formation of crime. In India a good amount of research has been done on the basis of Eysenck's model. (Jawahar, 1964).

Cattell's Theory of Personality and Crime

Eysenck's model was appropriately designed to study criminal personality. Cattell as such did not give a theory of personality which would directly relate to criminal personality. However, there are some factors which, Cattell noted, had high loadings on criminal behaviour.

Cattell in his theory (1950) explained that the criminals show a decidedly subaverage super ego strength, but also as low an ego strength as in clinical cases and low self, sentiment.
Personality and Criminality

The psychological approach to criminality is based on the belief that personality plays a decisive role in the commission of a crime. This approach takes into consideration genetics and personality as the factors determining criminal behaviour. Criminal behaviour is an expression of one personality and personality variations are largely determined by genetic factors. Behaviour of an individual, at any moment, is the outcome of the circumstances, personality of the individual, and external factors. The environmental processes, emotions, frustrations of motives, all combined decide the action and direct the behaviour normal or criminal. It is very well described by various authors that personality traits do play a significant role in criminal and antisocial behaviour.

Gender Differences and Criminality

In the earlier times it was generally believed that crime was a masculine activity. Lombroso’s chromosomal analysis ruled out crime among women. However, with the passage of time there has been a tremendous change in the earlier belief.
There is no doubt that prevalence and incidence of crime among males outnumber that of females, but at the same time, crime has no more remained a unique activity of males. Most often crime has been associated with aggression and there is scientific evidence that, "from mouse to man, the male of species is more aggressive than the female who is the most frequent target of hostility." Kallek Berkal (1980) also observed that "in every culture men are more aggressive and violent than women."

The difference in the rate and nature of male and female crime can by and large, be attributed to socialization process and the social expectations. (Meyer, 1978). The society, in general, has set a male apart from females and require him to be independent, active, aggressive and willing to take greater risks, whereas the expectations from the females are just opposite.

In the last decade, the proportion of female arrests has gone up, an increase of 9% in the incidence of total, cognizable crime during the five year period from 1966-71. (Crime in India 1971). In spite of the reported increase, the female sex is way behind the male in committing crime in all
motions, all age groups, all periods in history and all type of crimes.

In the present times changes in the women's roles and participation in almost all types of professions have been given here more opportunities of exposure and the implications for such activities also do not lag behind. Women are in the process of becoming more and more autonomous and independent even in India. Number of viewpoints during the 1950s onwards have taken a very mild and benevolent outlook towards female criminality (Sutherland-Crossey et al, 1968; Pollick, 1950).

Socio-demographic Variations and Crime:

Historical evidence and statistical analysis have led Gantil (1971) to conclude that in India, variations in crime rate are largely due to regional, cultural, economic, educational and other socio-demographic factors. Some of these have been subjected to empirical analysis.

Age and Crime:

Age has direct and indirect effect on the type of crime. A number of studies have reported that there is a high incidence of crime among teenagers, (Hickson,

Economic Status and Crime:

Marxists, the early social workers and the humanitarians argue that crime of crime is only poverty. For some of them crime is nothing else than reaction against economic injustice.

Although it may not be right to point out that persons of high socio-economic status do not commit crime but most researchers and sociologists have argued that the cause of crime is poverty (Sinha, 1988; Khan, 1981) Bell-Fekom (1978) was unable to find that socio-economic status or social class values are associated with violent behaviour.

Educational Status and Crime:

Available research evidence has indicated educationally disadvantaged segment to core prone to such activities. It has been reported by several studies (Dutt, 1938; Guten, 1960; Mohen and Singh, 1977) that less educated
persons are more likely to commit crime. The expectation, therefore, could be that the educated are less likely
to commit crime.

Rohen and Singh (1977) in a study on education and crime divided the offenders into 3 educational
groups and found that 60% of the murderers belonged to the middle education group.

Birth Order and Crime:

About the birth order related to crime the largest proportion were neither first nor last born but middle
once among the algae (Anthens and Kundu, 1961).

Rural, Urban Area and Crime:

National level statistics on the crime rate is generally higher in urban areas than in rural areas
(Crime in India, 1976). Lycel and Skipper (1981), reflecting on the higher crime rates in urban areas,
reported that in urban areas the crime is more visible therefore, more able to identification.

Marital Status and Crime:

It has been suggested by several researchers that married men and women are less likely to engage in
crime than the unmarried because the married ones become aware of their responsibilities and learn to care for
others (Panl, 1993; Ramachandran, 1970).
Present study:

In the recent years more and more researchers are paying attention to the varying issues involved in crime. Since 1982, United Nations have started taking interest in crime prevention and criminal justice issues at an alarming increased crime rate. However, the problem of crime is multifaceted and needs to be studied from various angles.

The total area has attained so much of importance that besides the disciplines directly related to it, re law, police criminology etc., other disciplines, such as sociology and psychology, etc., are making active contributions in understanding the various issues involved in the commission of crime.

Psychologists have been trying to understand crime as a product of human behaviour and personality traits in the belief that certain traits must differentiate the criminals from the non-criminals. However, despite the ample research literature the relationship between personality and crime does not clearly emerge. Eysenck (1970) argues that criminals vary among themselves.
A large amount of research has been based upon Eysenck's three-dimensional theory of personality and crime (Eysenck and Eysenck 1976; Allport and Feldman, 1970; Eysenck, 1985). The theory has been the outcome of very extensive factor analytic research. However, there are other personality theories, such as Cattell's (1960), in which he arrived at sixteen composite factors of personality. Any of the factors in Cattell's theory appear similar to Eysenck's framework. Cattell has developed personality tests based on these sixteen personality factors which are believed to assess the total personality of an individual. Some of these factors may have special implications for anti-social behaviour. In a recent study Shamos and Deng (1987) highlighted some of these factors as related to crime.

A number of studies regarding differential relation of personality and crime have appeared (e.g., Agnew and McDougall, 1981; McGurk and McGurk, 1983; Rahman and Hussain, 1981; etc.). The evidence is insufficient to give any definite conclusions (Eysenck, 1985). The present work has been planned keeping in view the fact that various personality factors may have differential relationship with different types of crime. The need for such work has been pointed out by Eysenck (1985).
An attempt could also be made to study gender differences. Different types of criminal activity may show differential relationships to personality, but too little has been done in that field to be very definite to one's conclusions. Males and females seem to have similar personality patterns as far as criminality is concerned, but little seems to have been done in asking deliberate comparisons. Studying gender comparison have more relevance in the present time as there is a marked increase in the number of female arrests for various criminal offences, since the past few decades.

In most of the earlier similar studies criminals have been compared with the non-criminal group of subjects on various parameters of personality. Very few studies could report clear differences. So far no clear-cut personality pattern has emerged. This practice has been criticized on the basis that crime is not an all-or-none activity. All those who are incarcerated may not be absolutely criminal and those who are taken from general population may not be absolutely innocent or non-criminals. Taking criminal group just on the basis of legal conviction may not be a fool-proof method of sampling. Secondly, the testing conditions for the two groups of criminals and non-criminals, may be very different, rendering ambiguity to the comparison. Therefore, it may be more desirable
to make comparison between and within the criminals of different categories of crime. Finding out relationship between personality and type of crime may lead to more conclusive findings rather than confusing the results by simply taking criminal and non-criminal group.

Socio-demographic factors are all pervasive factors. It may not be possible to point out, with conviction, the kind of demographic background which could be more conducive to such activity. With the available knowledge, which is based upon empirical evidence, it occurs that all types of people and all types of backgrounds may be equally prone to such social malaise. However, some types and some socio-demographic factors may be more vulnerable. Importance of these factors has been pointed out by a number of researchers, who believe that socio-demographic factors play a very crucial role. The importance of these factors has also been pointed out in a number of Indian studies (Nair, 1983; Sinha, 1985). Therefore, scope of the relevant socio-demographic factors would also be studied.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Psychological researches on criminality have been focused mainly on studying the relationship between personality and crime. A large proportion of these were based on Eysenck's model. The present work centers around Cottell's theoretical formulation of personality. Scanning the available literature revealed very few relevant studies. Cottell (1950) pointed out the relevance of some of the factors from 16 PF for anti-social behaviour, such as factors G (Ego strength) G (Super ego strength) A (Alert) H (Forthright) A₂ (Dependency) and A₄ (Tranquility).

In the absence of directly related research literature, studies on personality in the area of crime have been reviewed in the following pages. The first part of review deals with research work on personality and crime and second part focuses on the socio-demographic correlates.

Personality and Crime

It is a heterogeneous combination of personality traits which have been receiving wide attention of researchers with different orientations. Ahuja (1973) speculated that certain personality characteristics might differentiate criminals from non-criminals.