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The present chapter deals with the discussion of the results derived from the analysis of the data given in the last chapter. In the discussion main emphasis has been given to the different variables studied in the present investigation. Various tools and techniques were used to measure the relationship among different variables and conclusions were drawn in verification of the hypotheses stated earlier. The results already arrived at by various studies directly or indirectly have also been compared with the results of the present study. This has been done in order to make the study more comprehensive and reliable.

Hypothesis I

The first hypothesis states that "Juvenile and adult female offenders will be Psychotic, Neurotic as well as Extrovert. They will be low in Intelligence, Achievement-Motivation, Socio-Economic Status and poor in Adjustment".

The perusal of Tables 5.1 to 5.3 reveals that Juvenile delinquents and adult offenders (Rural and Urban Both) have the traits of Psychoticism and Neuroticism but they are
not Extroverts. They have Low Intelligence and Achievement-Motivation. They have very unsatisfactory home, Health, Emotional and Total Adjustment. They have very retiring Social Adjustment. Adult offenders (Rural and Urban Both) and juvenile delinquents from the rural background belong to the lower class of Socio-Economic status. While urban juvenile delinquents belong to the average class of Socio-Economic Status.

The above mentioned hypothesis in the case of Psychoticism, Neuroticism, Intelligence, Achievement-Motivation, Adjustment is accepted here, but in the case of Extraversion and Socio-Economic Status of urban juvenile delinquents is not accepted.

So, the first hypothesis is partially accepted.

Hypothesis II

The second hypothesis in the present investigation is that "Variables of Personality Characteristics, Intelligence, Achievement-Motivation, Adjustment and Socio-Economic Status will be significantly correlated with each other in respect of rural and urban juvenile delinquents".

The trait of Psychoticism is significantly correlated with Neuroticism, Extraversion, Home, Social and Total adjustment and negatively correlated with Achievement-Motivation. The trait of Extraversion is significantly
correlated with Neuroticism, Social and Total Adjustment. The correlation between Neuroticism and Intelligence is negative and significant, but the relationship of Neuroticism with Home and Social Adjustment is positively significant. Socio-Economic Status is significantly correlated with Achievement Motivation and Intelligence. The different variables of Adjustment are significantly correlated with each other except Emotional Adjustment (vide Table 5.4).

In the case of urban juvenile delinquents the different traits of Personality viz., Psychoticism, Extraversion and Neuroticism are inter-correlated significantly. The trait of Psychoticism is significantly correlated with all the variables of Adjustment except Health Adjustment. Home Adjustment is significantly correlated with the trait of Neuroticism and the others different variables of Adjustment are no.

The correlation between Socio-Economic Status and Health Adjustment is negative and significant, but Socio-Economic Status is significantly correlated with Intelligence and Achievement Motivation. There is a significant relationship between Total Adjustment and Intelligence. Different variables of Adjustment are significantly correlated with each other except Emotional Adjustment (vide Table 5.8).

In the case of rural juvenile delinquents there is no significant relationship among the different traits of Personality except Psychoticism with Extraversion. Achievement Motivation is negatively and significantly correlated
with Psychoticism, Neuroticism and Extraversion, but positively and significantly correlated with Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status. Neuroticism is negatively and significantly correlated with Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status and positively with Health Adjustment. The variables of Home, Health and Social Adjustment are inter-correlated significantly each other however, Emotional and Total Adjustment are not correlated significantly. The correlation of Socio-Economic Status with Intelligence and Total Adjustment is significant. There is a significant relationship of Social Adjustment with Intelligence and Neuroticism (vide Table 5.9).

Thus, we see some of the variables are significantly correlated and others are not, so the second hypothesis is partially accepted.

**Hypothesis-III**

The third hypothesis outlined in the first chapter is that "Personality Characteristics, Intelligence, Achievement-Motivation, Adjustment and Socio-Economic Status will be correlated significantly with each other in the case of Adult Female offenders of both the rural and the urban ecological backgrounds".

Psychoticism, Extraversion and Neuroticism are inter-correlated with each other significantly. Intelligence is
significantly correlated with Psychoticism, Achievement-Motivation, Socio-Economic Status, Home, Social and Total Adjustment. There is a significant relationship of Socio-Economic Status with Achievement Motivation and Home Adjustment. The correlation of Total Adjustment with Neuroticism and Intelligence is significant. The different variables of Adjustment are significantly correlated with each other except Social Adjustment (vide Table 5.5).

In the case of Adult Urban offenders the traits of Personality viz., Psychoticism, Extraversion and Neuroticism are inter-correlated significantly. Intelligence is significantly correlated with Achievement-Motivation, Psychoticism and Emotional Adjustment. There is a significant relationship of Psychoticism and extraversion with Home Adjustment, but Neuroticism is significantly correlated with emotional and Total Adjustment. Achievement-Motivation and Socio-Economic Status are correlated significantly. Different variables of Adjustment are inter-correlated with each other significantly (vide Table 5.10).

As far as Adult Rural offenders are concerned, the trait of Psychoticism is significantly correlated with Extraversion and Neuroticism. Intelligence has the significant relationship with Achievement-Motivation, Socio-Economic Status, Home, Social and Total Adjustment. Achievement-Motivation is significantly correlated with Socio-Economic Status, Home and
Total Adjustment. Total Adjustment has significant relationship with Socio-Economic Status, Home, Social and Emotional Adjustment. The correlation between Home and Social Adjustment is significant (vide Table 5.11).

In the case of Adult offenders (Rural and Urban Both) the variables are significantly correlated in some of the cases as mentioned above, but in some of the cases, these are not correlated significantly.

In the light of the above findings, the third hypothesis of the present investigation is partially accepted.

Hypothesis IV

The fourth hypothesis states that "there will be no differences in the variables of Personality characteristics, Intelligence, Achievement-Motivation, Adjustment, and Socio-Economic Status of the offenders coming from the rural and urban ecological backgrounds".

From the obtained results, it is clear that there are no significant differences in Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, Intelligence, Achievement-Motivation, and different variables of Adjustment viz., Home, Health, Social, Emotional and Total Adjustment (F-ratios 0.04655, 0.54473, 1.18466, 0.23463, 0.916, 0.12564, 0.31631, 0.09281, 3.45081 and 0.15201, respectively (vide Table 5.28).

But in the same table, it is evident that there is a
significant difference in the variable of Socio-Economic Status (F-ratio, 8.429).

The above mentioned hypothesis in the case of rural and urban offenders is accepted for all the variables except that of the Socio-Economic Status.

So the fourth hypothesis is partially accepted here.

Hypothesis V

The fifth hypothesis outlined in the first chapter is that "no significant differences will be found on the variables of Personality characteristics, Intelligence, Achievement Motivation, Adjustment and Socio-Economic Status of the juvenile and adult female offenders".

In order to find out the difference among different groups of offenders on different variables under study, F-values were calculated. The results obtained are in accordance with the contention of the above hypothesis except for Health Adjustment. Looking in the tables 5.28, it is found that there are no significant differences of juvenile and adult female offenders for different variables, but it is also seen in the same table that there is a significant difference for the variable of Health Adjustment (F= 7.2349, vide table 5.28).

In the light of these research findings, the fifth hypothesis is partially accepted.
Hypothesis VI

The sixth hypothesis in the present investigation is that "The interaction between the variables of ecological backgrounds and age level will not yield significant results for any of the variables under study (Personality Characteristics, Intelligence, Achievement-Motivation, Adjustment and Socio-Economic Status)."

It is clear from the table 5.28 that there are no significant differences on the different variables under study except the variable of Socio-Economic Status (F = 8.48727, vide table 5.28).

So the sixth hypothesis is partially accepted here. Having discussed the findings of the present investigation in the light of the hypotheses formulated, it is considered necessary to integrate the results with those of earlier investigations. There are so many studies which reported a close relationship between Psychoticism and Criminal behaviour. Segraves (1969) found that the drug taking students had scores significantly on Psychoticism.

The finding of the present study mentioned above have been supported by those of Medor (1914) and Rudin(1916) which held that all the criminals were in fact psychotic in the strict psychiatric sense supported by Heston (1966).

Segraves (1969), Eysenck and Eysenck (1971), Wilson and Mclean (1974) found criminals to be significantly
higher on Psychoticism, many other earlier reports of such an association had been reviewed by Essen Moller (1946) and Planansky (1966).

The results of the present study are in agreement with the findings reported by Eysenck and Eysenck (1970) who proposed that the score of a questionnaire measure of Psychoticism would be raised in a sample of criminals, as compared with a sample of non-criminals and many other studies had confirmed this proposition.

The conclusions of the present investigation are in line with the results of the studies conducted by Shanmugam (1975), and Nirmal (1977) who found that delinquents had high P scores as compared to non-delinquents. These were supported by the results of the studies conducted by Singh (1976) and Jaspal (1977).

The findings of the present investigation that the offenders have the trait of Neuroticism have been supported by the work of Eysenck (1964, 1970) and Feldman (1976). They found that anti-social conduct would be more evident among neurotics.

The prediction relating N to crime had been tested by various studies (Bartholomew (1957, 1959), Field (1960), Fitch (1962), Syed (1964), Berry (1966), Millman (1966), Eysenck and Eysenck (1971), and Burgess (1972) all reported that N scores were consistently higher in prisoners as compared to non-criminals.
Gibson (1967a) and Hoghughi and Forrest (1970) found that prisoners scored higher on N as compared to the non-prisoners.

The results of the present study are in agreement with the results of the study conducted by Saxby et al. (1970) which reported that criminals tend to score much higher on N than normals.

There have been a few studies which reported no difference in N score between criminals and non-criminals, such as those of Little (1963), Sanocki (1960) and Jaspal (1977), however found criminals to be scoring significantly low on N as compared to the non-criminals.

Blackburn (1972), Passingham (1972) and Eysenck (1964, 1970) found that extraverted people are more likely to behave in anti-social fashion. These results are not in line with the findings of the present investigation.

Some other studies have reported no significant difference on Extraversion between normals and criminals. These are the studies conducted by Bartholomew (1957, 1959, 1963), Field (1960), Fitch (1962), Little (1963), Hoghughi and Forrest (1965), McKerracher & Watson (1968), Schalling and Holmberg (1968), Mohan and Singh (1980).

On the other hand, a few studies have found criminals to be scoring lower on Extraversion as compared to the non-criminals. This finding is in consonance with the findings
of the studies conducted by Millman (1966), Berry (1966), Forrest and Hoghughi (1968) and Jaspal (1977) which showed criminals to be lower on Extraversion than the normal subjects.

Shanmugam (1975) obtained higher E/I scores of criminals in a study as compared to non-criminals. Shanmugam and Sundari (1962) indicated that delinquent group manifested more traits of introversion and neuroticism. They had less extraversion traits.

The finding of the study conducted by Feldman (1976) is also in tune with the findings of the present investigation. He found that there was a trend for N to increase from non-criminals through first offender to recidivists. Gibson (1967), Hoghughi and Forrest (1970) found that prisoners scored higher on N.

There have been a few studies which reported no difference in N score between Criminals and non-criminals, such as those of Little (1963), Sanocki (1960) and Jaspal (1977), however found criminals to be scoring significantly low on N as compared to the non-criminals. The results of the present research work that the offenders have the low Intelligence is in line with conclusions of the studies conducted by Arnold (1981), Olejar (1981), Gluecks (1940), Sushma (1983), Sharma & Sushma (1985). They found that offenders had low Intelligence.

The findings of the present study are in consonance with the conclusions on Carl (1926) who held that feeble
mindedness came near to being the sole cause of crime.

Many studies have tested Eysenck's (1964, 1970) hypothesis concerning the relationship between E/I and criminality, Epps & Farnell (1952), Seigman (1962), Trasler (1962), Syed (in Eysenck, 1964) all obtained positive evidence that criminals were markedly extraverted.

The finding of the present investigation that the criminals have low Intelligence is in consonance with the studies conducted by those of Arnold (1981), Olejar (1981), Gluecks (1940), and Carl (1926). But Michel (1925), reported that criminals had both high and low intelligence.

The result of the present study that the offenders are less intelligent is supported by those of Sharma and Sushma (1985), Sushma (1983), Gopal (1956), Healy and Bronner (1930), Rajangam (1957).

Shanker (1958) concluded that high intelligence was no guarantee for good behaviour.

Barness and Teeters (1960) located that deviant women were extremely diverse lot like other women. Some were very intelligent, others were feeble minded as supported by the results of Friedlander (1964).

The above mentioned findings that the offenders have low achievement-motivation is in line with the conclusions of Shanmugam and Govindrajan (1967), Anoliks (1979), Sushma
Farely (1975) reported that the delinquents might be lower in achievement-motivation than non-delinquents received no support.

Gupta and Arora (1977) interpreted that the delinquents expected more and achieved less in their mission because they worked less and expected more.

The findings of the present study that offenders are mal-adjusted is in line with the results of the studies conducted by those of Singh (1976), Jaspal (1977), Singh (1977), Sutherland and Cressey (1966), Barness and Teeters (1966).

Johnson (1966) viewed "as a crime of passion" or emotionality.

The findings that the home adjustment of both juvenile & adult female offenders is poor, borne out by the studies of Ahuja (1970), Gupta and Sethi (1974), Singh (1977), Singh and Verma (1976) and Sharma (1976), who found out that the most of the victims of murderers' attacks were close relatives or husbands.

The offenders are maladjusted in all the areas of adjustment falls in line with the findings of the different investigations conducted by Jaspal (1977), Singh (1976), Rajangam (1957), Singh (1982), Matte (1972) and Sushma (1983).
Emotional instability among the delinquents is found by Pati (1966), Gupta (1959), Misra (1979) and Mirchandani (1970).

Juvenile delinquents are superior to adult offenders as far as health adjustment is concerned is not in agreement with the findings of the studies conducted by Singh (1932), Sushma (1983), Sharma and Sushma (1985), Jaspal (1977) and Singh (1976).

The results related to health adjustment differ from the results of other investigations because in all the studies deviant behaviour has been compared with the normal behaviour of man. But in this case deviant behaviour has been compared within two age groups viz., juvenile and adult female offenders.

The conclusions of the study conducted by Shah and Loren (1974) are not in tune with the results of the present investigation. He showed that human infant was not merely a passive recipient of environmental stimuli and provisions. It is a combined product of nature and nurture.

The result of the present investigation that the delinquents come from poor families is supported by the conclusions of Anne (1923), Badami (1965), Mehendale (1955, 60), Pathak (1963), Singh (1973) and Joshi (1985).

That lower class of socio-economic status gives birth to anti-social behaviour, is supported by Radzinowicz and Joanking (1977).

Healy and Bronner (1936) and Burt (1938) give no support
to the findings that delinquents come from poor families. They said that poverty was not a very significant factor in the development of crime. Otherwise how can we account for white collar crimes committed by well-to-do persons such as businessmen, politicians, doctors and lawyers.

Juvenile urban offenders are superior to the other offenders. This finding is not in consonance with the results of the previous studies.

However, cadets (1962) and Sushma (1983) found that most of the offenders belong to the rural areas.

The results of the present study are not in line with the conclusions of Doraiswami (1940), Conifer (1983). They reported that poverty was not a major factor in delinquency.

After the discussion of the results of the present study in the contextual framework of the earlier studies conducted in this area, an attempt has been made in the subsequent chapter to present in brief the summary and conclusions of the study.