INTRODUCTION
amelioration of dismal and highly disturbing situation in this regard.

The world of crime is a difficult world. It is intriguing and mysterious – symbolizing as it does, forces of darkness and destruction. And the human agents, who inhabit and participate in this world – those shadowy and strangely distant characters who look to wear disturbingly primitive or stigmatising features, as Lombroso (1972, originally published in 1911) describes them, or who look embodiments of animalistic forms as enshrined in phrenology, are called criminals. There are, indeed, many expressions that are used to describe them: offenders, convicts, psychopaths, socio-paths, antisocial personalities, recidivists, etc. The last term, used in the present study, refers to a group of hardened criminals who are predisposed to repeat crimes over time despite repeated punishments to which they are subject.
Efforts to understand criminals and their behaviour date back to ancient times (Bartol and Bartol, 1986). Many social and political philosophers, religious thinkers, and social reformers have commented upon the psyche, personality, and the behaviour of criminals and the motivational forces which impel them to indulge in non-conformist or antisocial acts. The views of these earlier thinkers, however, were global and speculative, revolving largely around their assumptions about basic human nature. They debated whether human nature is innately good, rational, and endowed with power of freedom; or is it the other way round. Criminals were conceived to be morally depraved, deeply irrational, and controlled by blind, instinctual impulses that are unethical and destructive. Punishment, aimed either at retribution or deterrence, was prescribed as the sole method to deal with the criminals. It is only later in the history of mankind, when the disease model of deviant behaviour and a humanitarian approach in the field of psychiatry emerged, and criminals were viewed as individuals who were essentially sick and deserved social sympathy, care, and support; that
rehabilitation came to be incorporated as one of the major aims of management of criminals thereafter.

In earlier understanding of criminal behaviour, as briefly mentioned above, the basic causative forces were imagined to be located in the individual — his psyche or mind or self. New advances in the field of sociology and cultural anthropology brought about a radical shift in the focus of attention in this regard. The intricate complexities of the social system and the contradictions inherent therein, including problems of injustice, discrimination, oppression etc. — became the basic factors responsible for the development of behavioural deviations of which antisocial or criminal behaviours were only specific instances. Eminent writers like Marx and Engels (1847) and Durkheim (1893) contributed ingenious and radical insights into the deeply involved and tenuous relation of human psyche with the social system or state and upheld adverse social forces to be the basic cause of ‘alienation’ that led to different forms of deviant behaviour. In the modern times, critical theorists have
been upholding the socio-cultural model of the causation of
criminal behaviour and pleading for the human rights approach
to the treatment of the criminals or prisoners.

The modern science of psychology, which is the youngest of
social sciences, has tried to imbibe these different streams of
thought, relating to an explanation of human behaviour. It has
fruitfully endeavoured to integrate them into an eclectic or
interactionist model for explaining complex social-psychological
phenomena including criminal behaviour. Within psychology
there have been divergent orientations – some emphasizing the
individual psyche and the others the environmental or
situational forces as determinants of human behaviour. Freud
(1953), the founder of psychoanalysis, for instance, considered
criminal behaviour as a direct derivative of death instinct, which
is inherent in human nature. Eysenck (1964) explained crime in
terms of the personality dimensions of extraversion and
neuroticism. The extroverted neurotics who are predisposed to
be under-socialized are prone to manifest criminality or
antisocial behaviour. Skinner (1964), the radical behaviourist, and Bandura (1977), the social learning theorist, on the other hand, stress the role of environmental contingencies and the social models in the learning of the criminal behaviour. These one-sided orientations leaning either on personal or situational determinants are now giving way to an interactionist viewpoint that postulates the complex interaction of two sets of variables as the determining force in behaviour. The interactionist model gives due weight to both psychological as well as social factors in the determination of human behaviour.

The present investigation, drawing upon different psychological theories of crime and making use of psychosocial approaches as given in modern psychology, modestly endeavours to verify some important conjectures relating to the determinants of criminal behaviour. It is hoped that apart from throwing light on some important aspects of criminal behaviour in general, the present study will also help to distinguish the professional
criminals (recidivists) who repeatedly indulge in criminal acts and those who do not show this kind of proneness.

A brief review of related literature reveals that very limited information is available on different aspects of criminal behaviour (Ahuja, 2000). In the Indian setting, in particular, virtually no significant work has been undertaken in this area.

The present study strives to explore the role of some important psychosocial variables in the determination of criminal behaviour. These variables have been selected as they touch on some important psychological perspectives on crime, namely, personality and crime, psychiatry and crime, and social learning view of criminal behaviour, etc. These variables specifically are: personality, locus of control, attitude towards law, home atmosphere, and socio-economic status.

Personality is perhaps the most crucial variable in psychological research, which has significant validity in predicting a fair
amount of variance in human behaviour. Allport (1937), the pioneering trait theorist, described it as a dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical traits that determine his unique adjustment to the environment. The most eminent researcher who has tried to link up personality with crime, Eysenck (1960), predicted that criminals will be high on extraversion and neuroticism dimensions of personality as factor-analytically discovered by him. Owing to the peculiar interplay of the processes of excitation and inhibition these individuals are predisposed to be deficient in social learning and consequently manifest antisocial or criminal behaviour. There are empirical studies that have provided support to Eysenck’s views (Bartol and Bartol, 1986). However, there are also observations that are not fully consonant with his theory (Barlow, 1978). In the Indian setting very little work is reported which follows from Eysenck’s theorizing about criminal behaviour. The present study, making use of standardized psychological tests and appropriate statistical procedures,
endeavours to verify the relationship between personality and crime.

In contrast to Eysenck's biologically oriented personality theory, is the social learning perspective. Rotter (1966) postulates two types of orientations – internal, and external – based on generalized expectancies regarding the outcome of one's efforts or the causes and control of the same psychological events. These expectancies are built up due to the unique history of contingencies of reinforcement to which the individual has been exposed. Those who have an internal locus of control, attribute the outcomes of the efforts or events to internal factors like perseverance, diligence, self-control, etc. Externals, contrarily, attribute the outcomes to factors external to them, namely, fate, destiny, chance etc. General expectation would be that those who indulge in criminal acts again and again probably suffer from this hopelessness that events happen in spite of themselves. Relatively few studies are available on the relationship between internal – external orientations and
criminal behaviour (Reckless, 1967). The present study, therefore, hopes to throw light on the relationship between locus of control and criminal behaviour.

One significant hypothesis regarding the dynamics of criminal behaviour has been that the criminals suffer from some kind of psychopathology that is responsible for their antisocial behaviour (Meier, 1989). They might be suffering from some kind of psychopathy or sociopathy, which refers to a peculiar moral deficiency and an inability to learn from experiences. Or they have some psychotic predisposition to schizophrenia or paranoia, which may cause a state of disorientation or persecutory delusions, eventually resulting in criminal or antisocial behaviour. Empirical observations in this area again reveal mixed results. Some proportion of the criminal population definitely suffers from some kind of psychopathology (Wilson and Richard, 1985), but all criminals are not necessarily psychopathic or psychotic. The present investigation strives to explore this association between crime and psychopathology in
a more systematic manner – taking cognisance of different dimensions of psychopathology.

Regarding socio-cultural determinants of criminal behaviour, three sets of variables have been incorporated in the present study: parental attitudes, behaviour relating to child rearing, and family atmosphere. These are covered by the eleven variables of father positivity, mother positivity, father democracy, mother democracy, rule enforcement, family protectiveness, sex role enforcement, male family harmony, male achievement standards, mother vs. father identification, and degree of parental agreement about child rearing.

Following from a very realistic and constructive social psychological and sociological thinking regarding the origins of criminal behaviour, it is a pervasive generalization that individuals who are subject to different kinds of socio-economic or socio-cultural deprivations, whether at home, family, or broad societal levels, are likely to develop strongly negative, defiant,
and destructive attitudes towards state authority and society at large. This ultimately results in breaking the law or anti-social behaviour (Ahuja, 2000). Though there can be exceptions to this generalization due to the operation of uncontrolled psychological factors, there can also be more than an iota of scientific truth in these social-psychological assertions. Not much empirical work is available in this area, however. The present study giving due consideration to the role of attitudinal and socio-economic factors in criminal behaviour seeks to have a more systematic and precise statement on their role using standardized psychological testing procedures.

It is clear from the brief discussion above that the study is essentially devoted to the assessment of various personal and socio-cultural factors that underlie repeated criminal behaviour. It also intends to discover clusters of variables that can help in distinguishing recidivists from non-recidivists and the normal population. Discriminant analysis is used to achieve this objective.
OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The exact title of the study is:

A STUDY OF PSYCHOSOCIAL FACTORS IN RECIDIVISM

The main objectives of the study are:

1. To assess the scores of the recidivists on measures of personality, locus of control, psychopathology, attitude towards law, parental attitudes, and socio-economic background.

2. To see the performance of the non-recidivists on indices of personality, locus of control, psychopathology, attitude towards law, parental attitudes, and socioeconomic background.

3. To compare the scores of recidivists and non-recidivists with that of the normal sample on all the variables included in the study.
4. To compare the recidivists and non-recidivists on all the measures included in the study.

5. To use discriminant analysis in order to precisely discover the cluster of variables which most reliably and significantly distinguish the three groups.

HYPOTHESES

The specific hypotheses are:

1a. Recidivists as compared to normals will score higher on extraversion.

1b. Non-recidivists as compared to normals will score higher on extraversion.

1c. Recidivists as compared to non-recidivists will score higher on extraversion.

2a. Recidivists as compared to normals will score higher on neuroticism.
2b. Non-recidivists as compared to normals will score higher on neuroticism.

2c. Recidivists as compared to non-recidivists will score higher on neuroticism.

3a. Recidivists as compared to normals will score higher on psychoticism.

3b. Non-recidivists as compared to normals will score higher on psychoticism.

3c. Recidivists as compared to non-recidivists will score higher on psychoticism.

4a. Recidivists as compared to normals will have a greater belief in external locus of control.

4b. Non-recidivists as compared to normals will have a greater belief in external locus of control.

4c. Recidivists as compared to non-recidivists will have a greater belief in external locus of control.
5a. Recidivists as compared to normals will score higher on all indices of psychopathology.
5b. Non-recidivists as compared to normals will score higher on all indices of psychopathology.
5c. Recidivists as compared to non-recidivists will score higher on all indices of psychopathology.
6a. Recidivists as compared to normals will have a more negative attitude towards law.
6b. Non-recidivists as compared to normals will have a more negative attitude towards law.
6c. Recidivists as compared to non-recidivists will have a more negative attitude towards law.
7a. Recidivists as compared to normals will come from lower strata of society.
7b. Non-recidivists as compared to normals will come from lower socio-economic strata of society.
7c. Recidivists as compared to non-recidivists will come from lower socio-economic strata of society.

8a. The home atmosphere of recidivists as compared to normals will be more negative.

8b. The home atmosphere of non-recidivists as compared to normals will be more negative.

8c. The home atmosphere of recidivists as compared to non-recidivists will be more negative.