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Reviewing the literature in retrospect we find that various attempts have been made by the biologists, anthropologists, sociologists, psychiatrists and the psychologists 'to know' what makes an individual break the law. The biologists held that a large number of criminals are biologically defective (Lombroso, 1911; Hootan, 1939; Ferri, 1917), the psychiatrists stress the emotional frustrations and hatreds that have led man into open opposition of conduct norms (Healy & Bronner, 1936; Grossbard, 1962), while the sociologists maintain that most crimes are learned forms of behaviour and have their roots in deteriorated, depressed and poverty stricken areas where anti-social and criminalistic behaviour patterns are established and passed on from generation to generation (Thomas, 1923; Farris, 1955; Merton, 1957; Lemmert, 1967). The psychological theories of criminal behaviour lean heavily at present towards personality factors (Elliott, 1952). Though other factors are contributing to the final product of the criminal, it is the personality factor which plays a major role (Jaspal, 1977).

Lombroso (1897) indicated that the signs of degeneracy were frequent among criminals.

Burr (1926) defined the criminal as one who was born and not made.
Shaw & Mckay (1931, 1942) provided data indicating that there was a relationship between urban delinquency rates and distance from the centre of the city.

Gokhle (1954) suggested that juvenile delinquency was supposed to be outcome of not only one factor but of various social and environmental factors. Mass communication media was also felt to be an important factor in shaping the child.

Mehendale (1955) concluded that physical environment acted as an indirect factor determining nature, extent and time of committing crime.

Glueck (1956) found delinquents to be more impulsive and vivacious as compared to non-delinquents.

Perlman (1959) concluded that in less severely deprived areas, or in smaller cities and towns, group pressures toward delinquency were usually less extreme.

Chatterjee (1959) emphasized internal factors in terms of unconscious motives as a cause of delinquency.

McCord (1960) reported that parental rejection combined with socio-pathic factors tended to produce prolonged antisocial behaviour on the part of the child.

Ahuja (1969) explored that crime was predominantly a male behaviour. Women were less criminal because they were inherently moral. Women had great ability to suffer
in silence and they were physically less active and mentally subdued.

Rajguru (1971) reported that apart from all other factors, psychological or emotional factors were mainly responsible for creating the feeling of insecurity and imbalance which gave rise to delinquent behaviour.

Swatanter (1977) emphasized that female crime was found to be far less as compared to the male juvenile crime.

Omodei (1979) found that offending rates were substantially lower for girls than for boys. Female delinquency was not primarily classed as sexual, as often alleged, but consisted predominantly of larceny. The range of opportunities appeared to be narrower for girls than for boys.

Glaser (1979) indicated a direct correlation between unemployment rates and crime rates.

Brown (1979) explored that financial enterprises, the lure of adventure, delinquent associates, contamination of institutionalization, a sense of powerlessness and the stigma of sexual promiscuity were among experiences which may initiate a teenager into prostitution.

Young (1980) exhibited that the explanations for racial differences in female crime and delinquency advanced by Adler (1975) had little value since the empirical
differences they purport to explain were not supported by data.

Shepherd & Judthing (1980) contributed that for females and males alike, youths perceptions of the school and police as attenuated social institution might contribute more to delinquency than family.

Mawby (1980) revealed that despite a narrowing of the sex differences found in record crime data, considerable differences remained. Boys were more likely offenders.

Willis (1981) indicated that sexual equality did not significantly reduce the male female gap in criminal behaviour. Urbanization and income level were more important factors.

Austin (1981) concluded that increase in female crime was an effect of the women's movement.

Hill & Harris (1981) showed that the possibility that charged gender identity patterns provide an equally plausible account of historical trends in female criminality.

Monhoney (1982) concluded that delinquency was less likely among bright youths except for those in extreme family situations.

According to Hartnagel (1982) modernization was predicted to have positive indirect effects through female role participation.
Austin (1983) suggested that increase in female involvement for the serious offences of auto theft and robbery; which might be attributed to women's liberation, were found to be greater than increase in larceny, theft and fraud/embezzlement, which might be attributed to the same cause.

2.1 SEX & CRIME

Statistical studies indicated that delinquency and crime were very closely associated with the male sex.

Bishop (1931) concluded that more women were becoming "criminally minded" and "better class women" were turning criminal more often.

Poliak (1950) argued that even if corrections could be made for statistical bias in favour of females, the male crime rate probably would still greatly exceed that of females as supported by Reckless (1977).

According to Poliak (1950) criminality of women is "largely masked", criminality masked in the sense of being hidden by or incidental to ordinary female roles in society, namely the role of housewife, mother, shaper, nurse, domestic servant, paramour.

Wettengel (1955) concluded that the delinquent girls who were the offenders more than once, were more likely to report hostility to the mother and to have had mothers who
spent less time with their daughters.

Barnes & Teeters (1960) concluded that public women were not generally, as was supposed, the victims of deception and wronged by men.

Mannheim (1965) observed that psychiatric hospitals had an over-representation of women, even though he saw this as predisposing them to some greater extent to be deprived of the opportunity to commit crimes. Rates for admission to English psychiatric hospitals were 307 for men and 425 for women out of the 100,000 of the total population in 1974.

According to Sutherland & Cressey (1966) the male sex has a great excess of crimes in all nations, all communities, all age groups and all periods of history for which organized statistics were available.

According to Johnson (1966), sex ratios of crime suggested that there were sex differences among the patterns and types of crimes committed by males and females. It has been found that offences like burglary, automobile theft, armed robbery, weapons and driving while intoxicated were dominated by males whereas, there was a relatively high proportion of women among persons arrested for embezzlement and fraud. Forgery, counterfeiting, larceny, theft, prostitution and commercialized vice were primarily female offences, although men were behind the scenes as panders and managers.

Among the felonies, Johnson (1966) reported that
in the year 1950, of all the total female commitments in the U.S. State prisons 59.6% accounted for larceny, forgery, manslaughter, aggravated assault and murder as compared to 39% of similar male commitments.

National Crime Commission (1966) commented that perhaps 90% of all young people had committed at least one act for which they could have been brought to the juvenile court.

Wolfgang (1967) noted that every study of homicide had found a low rate of female homicide as compared to the male rate.

Cowle et al. (1968) argued that girls were less often delinquent than boys because they were better able to tolerate stress.

According to Paripurnan & Varma (1972), if right type of education is not provided in the early stages of life, no body should blame the criminal and delinquents.

Patel (1974) mentioned that the international statistical data for 1973 revealed a three fold rise in the frequency of female crimes in developing countries as compared to 1972.

According to German Tribune (10th Oct., 1976), during the last two decades there had been a great upsurge in the crimes committed by women all over the world. In U.S.A.,
since 1960 the rate of arrested women had risen three times as fast as that of men; in Great Britain, this increase was two fold over a period of mere seven years; in Canada, the female criminality doubled in the past sixteen years and in Japan there had been a 22% rise in female criminality in the past five years.

According to Hoib (1976), of all the cases of robbery and armed attacks on motorists in 1975, one out of every 15 such attacks was perpetrated by a female while, in 1960 this figure was one in 26. The same coldly calculating criminal energy was applied to grand larceny where the number of women involved increased by 175% since 1960. The number of women committed for forgery has risen by 55%, assault and battery by 45% and murder by 87% since 1960.

Bowker (1978) showed that female property crimes were generally on the rise. Female violence comprise about the same proportion of total human violence that it did 10 years ago. Female delinquency had been rising much more steeply than adult females.

Wandesteene (1978) analyzed the principal views on the extent and nature of female crime. Women were naturally less criminal than man. A woman's social position gave her better protection from criminal behaviour. Female crime was more likely to remain undiscovered and unpunished.
It was generally accepted in the literature that female crime was of a less serious nature than male crime. Women were most apt to commit property offences. Women were believed to have recently shown increased participation in murders, kidnapping and acts of terrorism.

According to Wardsworth (1979) like the greater part of the research literature on crime in males, the work on women and crime has generally been based on studies of populations already arrested and in institutions.

Andrew (1980) revealed that the most violent females came from small intact homes within the family subtype. Females were as violent as males.

Rafferty (1981) revealed that the rate of delinquency was the same between girls and boys, rich and poor, country and city, black and white.

Murrell & Lester (1981) exhibited that females did not report the same degree of involvement in delinquency. Females (especially lower-status females) were more likely to become official delinquent as a result of status and sex offence.

A Special Report in U.S. News & World Report (Dec. 14, 1981) noted that one-third of all major crimes are committed by people under 20 years of age. No ethnic,
religious, racial groups or socio-economic levels were free from the apparently rapidly rising tide of juvenile problems.

Fiore (1982) explored that only a weak cause, if any, could be made for females being treated less favourably.

West (1982) concluded that it was the adverse point of any rating that was associated with future delinquency. Children from broken homes rather than those from intact homes, those from poor homes rather than affluent homes, those with unhealthy mothers rather than those with healthy mothers, and those born illegitimate rather than those born to married parents who were more likely to become delinquents.

PTI (1985) reported that a sub-committee of the Education Commission of the States in Washington had cautioned that at least 15% of Americans between the ages of 16 and 19 were unlikely to become productive adults. They were 'alienated and disconnected from society' as a result of drug abuse; delinquency, pregnancy, unemployment and dropping out of school, the subcommittee said. It showed that one and a quarter million white teenagers, three quarter million black teenagers and 375,000 Hispanic (native American origin) teenagers were unlikely to become productive adults.

Joshi (1985) reported that with rapid social changes, migration of rural masses to cities and consequent urbanisation
and social disorganisation the incidence of juvenile delinquency has been rising in all the developing countries. The loosening of the joint family system has contributed in no small measure to juvenile delinquency problem in India. Academic backwardness is also responsible for deviant behaviour in the majority of young persons. In social atmosphere where morality is not valued, the child falls a prey to evil influence very easily. The craze for movies has a highly unhealthy influence on children who are susceptible to delinquency. It is also true that the number of children irrespective of their birth order, does affect the child’s development and behaviour. To put it briefly, the aberrant behaviour in the adolescent is due to social and psychological deprivation.

2.2 PERSONALITY AND DEVIANT BEHAVIOUR

The physical conditions of the home have a vital role to play in the development of a child’s personality and character. Bickerings, nagging, alcoholism, irritation, indiscipline and overcrowding make the child feel suffocated.

Rapid industrialisation, slum-culture, unhealthy companionship, hereditary factors, physical hardships and exploitation of minors by adults, specially in larger cities also contribute to defective personality aspects.
Schuessler & Cressey (1950) reviewed 113 studies of criminals and concluded that a criminal personality did not exist. However, later studies had confirmed that there was a definite link between personality and criminal behaviour (Hathaway & Monachesi, 1956; Gottfredson & Kelley, 1963; Pasewark et al., 1971).

Various studies have been conducted to study the personality of criminals by taking different personality models, e.g., Cattell (1957) and Eysenck (1964).

McCord (1960) said that no consensus had been reached about the personality of deviants nor on the matter of defining deviance.

Pasewark et al. (1971) compared institutionalized male and female adolescent offenders with non-offenders on the Edward's Personality Preference Schedule (1959) and found a greater similarity between the male and female non-offenders, implying personality features common to offenders which override sex differences.

Jaspal (1977) said that interesting though these findings might be it was unreasonable to suppose that criminals were a homogeneous group. The scientific effort to study the relationship between the crime and personality has proved to be extra-ordinarily difficult.
2.2.1 EXTRAVERSION TRAITS AND CRIME

According to Mowrer (1950) socialization was mediated by learning in two stages:

1. fear responses were conditioned to cues associated with punishment or withdrawal of love;

2. in the second stage, responses that were instrumental in removing the individual from the fear of producing cues, e.g. inhibition of the forbidden behaviour, were reinforced by fear reduction. Crime might be regarded as a failure to condition the fear responses to earlier punished or disapproved acts. Highly extraverted individuals were considered to condition less efficiently due to a more rapid growth of cortical inhibition (Eysenck, 1957, 1967). Under identical conditions, therefore, cortical arousal would be more marked in introverts than cortical inhibition in extraverts. Extraversion was deemed to be related to the general level of cortical arousal. With extraverts having a lower level than introverts, they were also quicker to develop inhibition due to repeated responding and disipate it more slowly (Eysenck, 1964, 1970).

Eysenck (1964, 1970) had put forward the view that propensity to crime was universal but is held in check in most of the cases by a person's "Conscience". This "Conscience" was essentially a generalized set of conditional responses
built up during the childhood and adolescence, in the process of socialization, according to the rules of Pavlovian conditioning. Since extraverted people tend to condition less well than introverted ones, they are more likely to have an underdeveloped "conscience" and a much greater likelihood to behave in an anti-social fashion.

Blackburn (1972) studied personality correlates of officially recorded aggression and asserted that behavioural aggression was predictable from standard self-report measures of personality. He found aggression, hostility, extraversion and anxiety. The first two factors indicated the readiness to engage in overt aggression and the remaining two factors were reminiscent of the two personality dimensions consistently isolated by Eysenck (1967) namely extraversion-introversion and neuroticism-stability.

Passingham (1972) summed up Eysenck's theory of criminality with respect to conditioning in extraverts as follows: (1) Extraverts condition badly (Eysenck, 1964), (2) Socialization was mediated by conditioning, (3) Extraverts would tend to be poorly socialized. Two predictions would follow from this (a) criminals would tend to be extravert, (b) criminals would tend to condition badly. Many studies have tested Eysenck's (1964, 1970) hypothesis concerning the relationship between E/I and criminality. Epps and
Parnell (1952), Seigman (1962), Trasler (1962), Kierson & Kelley (1963), Syed (in Eysenck, 1964) all obtained positive evidence that criminals were markedly extraverted.

Eysenck & Eysenck (1973) found female prisoners to be high on E/I as predicted by Eysenck's theory.

Wilson & Maclean (1974) compared the scores of hundred recidivists and 100 trainee bus drivers on EPI and the results supported Eysenck's findings that criminals tend to be more extraverted than trainee bus driver.

According to Feldman (1976), personality test scores did indeed help to predict aggressive behaviour, and the Eyseckian system of personality appears promising.

There have been a few studies on E/I and criminality in India.

Singh & Akhtar (1973) found that students suspected of cheating in examinations showed higher scores on EPI as compared to non-cheaters.

Shanmugam (1975) obtained higher E/I scores of criminals in a study as compared to non-criminals.

Singh (1980) obtained similar results on female students. Some other studies have reported no significant difference on E/I between normals and criminals (Bartholomew, 1957, 1959, 1963; Field, 1960; Fitch, 1962; Little, 1963; Hoghughi & Forrest, 1965; Mckerracher and Watson, 1968; Schalling and Holmberg, 1968; and Mohan & Singh, 1980).
On the other hand, a few studies have found criminals to be scoring lower on E/I as compared to the non-criminals. Millman (1966), Berry (1966), Forrest & Hoghughi (1968) & Jaspal (1977) obtained data which showed criminals to be lower on E/I scores than the normal subjects.

Various reasons may be accounted for the lack of consistency in the studies comparing E/I scores in criminals and control subjects. One reason may be that the studies might have used different testing devices so that a correct picture is not painted.

Gibson (1964), Schalling (1970), Martin & Warde (1971) and Ruch (1970) found that delinquents were more impulsive than non-delinquents.

According to Schalling & Holmberg (1970), the inconsistent results might be related to the fact that E/I was "higher order" factor resulting from intercorrelation of primary factors. The impulsivity component of this higher order factor of extraversion was higher for criminals and the sociability component lower, so that studies where the results were based on overall means might not be given a true picture.

2.2.2 NEUROTICISM AND CRIME

Eysenck (1964, 1970) had postulated that antisocial behaviour was a consequence of poor conditionability. Since
behaviour was learnt through socialization techniques during childhood, neurotics because of higher autonomic drive level tend to fare poorly as compared to stables with a more optional drive level for learning performance.

Gibson (1967) and Hoghughi & Forrest (1970) found that prisoners scored higher on N as compared to the non-prisoners. Some other studies by Gibson (1967b), Allsopp (1968) and Saxby et al. (1970) (Both the studies unpublished and quoted in Feldman, 1976) showed that self reported offending was positively related to N. Studies done on female criminals by Bartholomew (1963), Eysenck and Eysenck (1973) and Saxby et al. (1970) reported that criminals tend to score much higher on N.

Some Indian studies have confirmed neuroticism among delinquents. Aggarwal (1961), Shanmugam (1973) and Singh (1973) found criminals to score a higher on N as compared to non-criminals. Some other studies have also reported high N scores in female criminals (Yadav, 1977; Singh, 1982).

There have been a few studies on N and type of offence (Hindelang and Weis, 1972; Eysenck et al., 1977). N has been found to be significantly related to aggressive crimes like murder and aggravated assault (Sethi et al., 1976; Yadav, 1977; Singh, 1979a and 1979b).

On the other hand there were a few studies which
reported no differences in N score between criminals and non-criminals such as those of Little (1963); Hoghughi and Forrest (1965); Sanocki (1960). Jaspal (1977), however, found criminals to be scoring significantly low on N as compared to the non-criminals.

On the basis of the evidence accumulated so far with regard to the relationship between N and crime, it may be safely predicted that criminals tend to score higher on Neuroticism.

Passingham (1970) and Burgess (1973) reviewed Eysenck's theory of criminality as regards N and said that it might be summed up as such.

1. Neurotics were high on anxiety or emotionality.
2. Neuroticism acted as a drive reinforcing extra-verted or introverted tendencies favouring or disfavouring antisocial conduct.
3. Neurotics with habitual antisocial response would tend to engage in those responses more strongly than non-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); Price (1968); Eysenck & Eysenck (1971) and Burgess (1972)
all reported that N scores were consistently higher in prisoners as compared to non-criminals.

According to Feldman (1976), there was a tend for N to increase from non-criminals through first offenders to recidivists.

According to Feldman (1976) when N was high it interfered with the efficient learning of responses, particularly to unpleasant stimuli because of the irrelevant anxiety evoked. The clear prediction was that socialization which was considered by Eysenck (1964, 1970) to be achieved by fear arousing stimuli would be interfered with a high level of N and therefore, antisocial conduct would be more evident among neurotics.

2.2.3 PSYCHOTICISM AND CRIME

Apart from E and N being related to criminality Eysenck has maintained that the third affective dimension of personality i.e. Psychoticism (P) is perhaps the most consistently linked with crime.
The nature of this factor may be conveyed briefly by the traits characterizing it i.e. having high loadings on this factor. These are:

1. not caring for other people;
2. troublesome; not fitting in;
3. cruel; inhuman;
4. lack of feeling; insensitive;
5. sensation seeking "oransal jag";
6. hostile to others, aggressive;
7. liking for odd; unusual things;
8. disregard for danger, fool, hardy;
9. making fool of others, upsetting them.

Many studies have reported a close relationship between psychoticism and criminal behaviour, and earlier reports of such an association have been reviewed by Essen Moller (1946) and Planansky (1966).

Medor (1914) and Rudin (1916) were already impressed by the number of criminals and alcoholic among the relatives of the Schizophrenics, but these studies could always be criticized by pointing out the possibility of parental psychotic behaviour being casually implicated in the psychopathic and criminal conduct of their offspring. This possibility had been ruled out by Heston (1966). All these studies lend support to the assumption that psychoticism
in general might share certain important features with criminality without implying, of course, that all of criminals were in fact psychotic in the strict psychiatric sense.

In empirical terms, Eysenck and Eysenck (1970) proposed that the scores of a questionnaire measure of psychoticism would be raised in a sample of criminals as compared with a sample of non-criminals and many studies had confirmed this proposition.

Segraves (1969) found that when he compared a group of drug taking students with non-drug takers, the drug taking students had scores significantly higher on P.

Eysenck & Eysenck (1971) found criminals to be significantly higher on P & N.

Wilson & Maclean (1974) supported Eysenck's three factor theory that criminals tend to be psychotic than normals.

Hostility was an important aspect of P and it was interesting to note that Caine, Foulds & Hope (1967) found both psychotics and criminals to have elevated scores on their hostility scales.

Eysenck and Eysenck (1973) found a close relationship between P and masculinity. Men on the average score much more highly than women on this factor but in their
study on the personality of female prisoners, they found that although male controls had higher P scores than female controls, yet female prisoners scored higher ($P \leq 0.01$) than male prisoners.

In the Indian context, similar results reporting high P in prisoners were found in many studies.

Shanmugam (1975) and Nirmal (1977) found delinquents to have high P scores as compared to non-delinquents.

Singh (1976) in a study of personality of criminals found them to score higher on P than the scores reported by Eysenck & Eysenck (1971). In the same study it was found that the criminals committing major crimes scores significantly higher on P as compared to criminals committing minor crimes. This was also supported by Jaspal (1977).

All the studies reviewed above suggested that criminals would be higher on P than non-criminal subjects. So far these results have been consistently obtained by nearly all the researchers.

Healy & Bronner (1936) found the manifestation of neurotic tendencies in the delinquents.

Panten (1960) explored that the female delinquents have greater difficulty in their interpersonal relationships with family and peers and presented a greater instance of marital incompatibility.
Shanmugam & Sundari (1962) indicated that delinquent group manifested more traits of introversion and neuroticism. They had less extraversion traits.

Kapoor (1963) explored that the large number of cases were of delinquency followed by habit disorders.

Hathway & Monachesi (1969) found that girls displayed more feelings of inferiority than boys, were more sensitive, more easily hurt and more resentful.

Beckman (1980) showed that alcoholic women were lower on self esteem and higher on alienation, neuroticism and anxiety than 'Normal' women.

Chong (1981) found the low esteem among the delinquents in relation to the perceived degree of their parent's child-rearing practices.

Gibbs (1982) revealed that personality patterns differed significantly among ethnic and socio-economic status groups.

Further, a number of studies suggested that the temperament traits such as extraversion and introversion (Eysenck, 1964) dominance, assertion, activity and neuroticism (Vandenberge, 1960), depression and psychopathic deviation (Gottesman, 1963) and certain cognitive styles (Witkin et al., 1954; Witkin et al., 1962) demonstrated a hesitable component.
2.3 INTELLIGENCE AND DEVIANT BEHAVIOUR

Michel (1925) reported that criminals had both high and low intelligence.

Healy and Bronner (1936) located that internal mental conflict or a sense of guilt gave rise to delinquency.

Gluecks (1940) found that mental illness and mental defects were the factors responsible for the delinquent behaviour.

Gopal (1956) found that the delinquents were less intelligent.

Rajangam (1957) found that prostitutes had low intelligence.

Shanker (1958) concluded that there was no casual relationship between the low intelligence and delinquency. Low intelligence may lead to delinquency in the one environment and may be a barrier to it in another situation. High intelligence was no guarantee for good behaviour.

According to Bhattacharya (1958), poor intelligence and poverty were the two major factors, influencing vagrancy.

Gang (1959) revealed that delinquents had low intelligence.
Barnes and Teeters (1960) maintained that prostitutes were an extremely diverse lot like other women. Some were very intelligent, others were feeble minded.

Carl (1962) indicated that feeble mindedness came near to being the sole coarse of crime.

Friedlander (1964) located that general intelligence in majority of the deviant women was normal, a few were classified as genius and very few as mentally subnormal.

Shukla (1969) concluded that only 25% had an average intelligence.

De (1970) found that in the case of murderers, larcenists and sex offenders, least intelligence was required. Sex offenders had below normal intelligence or it might be that mostly the mentally deficient offenders got caught.

There is a lot of controversy with regard to the intelligence of offenders.

Drillen (1970) indicated that low birth weight & low I.Q. tend to be linked only in the case of environmentally disadvantaged groups. Children growing up in more favourable circumstances seem able to make up for a poor start in life.

Jaspal (1977) found that criminals had lower intelligence than normals.
Olejar (1981) suggested that the intellectual level of the delinquents was below average.

Arnold (1981) showed that intelligence of gang members was below average.

Sharma and Sushma (1985) and Sushma (1983) found that the delinquents were on the border line of the intelligence.

2.4 ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION AND DEVIANT BEHAVIOUR

Shanmugam & Govindarajan (1967) explored that the success and failure significantly affected the choice of distance of non-delinquents, but not of the delinquents which was interpreted as supporting the hypothesis. Non-delinquents had also significantly higher level of aspiration and achievement than delinquents.

Tamhankar (1968) reported that children from middle class families had higher achievement motivational level than those of upper and lower classes reported.

Chaudhary (1971) indicated that the correlation coefficients between achievement motivation and intelligence were significantly at .01 level of girls.

Farely (1975) reported the notion that the delinquents might be lower in achievement motivation than non-delinquents received no support.

Anoliks (1979) traced that delinquents were under achievers in schools.
Gupta & Arora (1977) interpreted that the delinquents expected more and achieved less in their mission because they worked less and expected more. They had high level of aspiration.

Sharma & Sushma (1985) and Sushma (1983) found that delinquents had low achievement motivation. They scored high on unrelated achievement motivation but less on task related and achievement related tasks.

2.5 ADJUSTMENT OF THE OFFENDERS

Lombroso & Ferrero (1897) indicated that signs of degeneracy were frequent among criminals and a correlation of degeneracy and of criminality existed which might be directly physical, but which was likely to be, to a great extent, social.

Burt (1938) concluded that 85% of the delinquents studied by him were emotionally impaired.

Rajangam (1957) studied various problems of prostitutes and reported maladjustment in the areas of home, emotion, society and health to influence delinquency and prostitution.

McCord & McCord (1960) reported that parental rejection combined with sociopathic factors tended to produce prolonged anti-social behaviour on the part of the child.
Molcolmidi (1962) explored that there was a definite relationship between type of crimes and degree of psycho-pathology. Individuals who committed sexual crimes appeared to be the most seriously emotionally disturbed.

According to Eysenck (1964, 1970) "antisocial conduct was evidence of a lack of proper socialization" and the socialization was nothing but learning of behaviour patterns approved by the society.

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

Pati (1966) explored delinquents to be aggressive and in pathological emotional condition.

Sutherland & Cressey (1966) explored that no child was so constituted at birth that it must inevitably be law-abiding and the family was the first agency to affect the direction which a particular child would take.

Barnes & Teeters (1966) concluded that a disorganized family was one of the casual factors behind most child-neglect and delinquency. A disorganized family life set in motion processes harmful to children.
Cowie et al. (1968) noted the predominantly unstable and emotionally cold homes of the series of girl delinquents and the large number of girls of very good intelligence, in contrast with their frequent educational deprivation.

Mirchandani (1970) concluded that delinquent girls were emotionally disturbed.

Ahuja (1970) found that 81.5% of the murder victims were close relatives and over 50% of them were husbands.

Matto (1972) revealed that the adolescents at the lower intelligence level were the worst adjusted and needed the greatest attention. The emotional, home, health and social adjustment in the lower socio-economic stratum was significantly inferior to that in upper and the middle strata.

Shah and Loren (1974) showed that the human infant was not merely a passive recipient of environmental stimuli and provisions. Rather the child organized experiences in way that were peculiar to it as a function of the continuous interaction between nature and nurture.

Adjustment is multi-dimensional and hence it involves home adjustment, health adjustment, marital adjustment, social adjustment, emotional adjustment and occupational adjustment. Jaspal (1977) and Singh (1976) found criminals have poorer adjustment in all these areas as compared to the non-criminals.
Singh & Verma (1976) found that 84% of the victims of male murderers' attacks were relatives or neighbours.

Sharma (1976) maintained that a majority of the female murderers had murdered their some close relatives.

Singh (1977) showed that murder was often a family affair. It was found that a large number of murderers murdered either family members or close relatives, friends, neighbours (supported by Gupta & Sethi, 1974; Singh and Verma, 1976; Sharma, 1976).

Singh (1979) studied adjustment of criminals in relation to the type of crime committed and reported that criminals committing crimes like theft and pickpocketing had a poorer occupational and social adjustment.

Middendroff (1979) explored that in modern times female crimes of violence had increased & especially female participation in terrorist acts.

Anoliks (1979) traced that delinquents were maladjusted in the family. They were reported to be mildly psychologically disturbed.

Singh (1982) reported that the delinquents scored poorly in all the areas of adjustment.

Sharma & Sushma (1985) and Sushma (1983) found that delinquents had poor adjustment in all the areas of adjustment.
2.6 SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND THE OFFENDERS

Anne (1923) explored that the delinquent girls had the very unfavourable home background. The most of the girls come from poor families and the family would put tremendous pressure on the girl to start earning early, but showed no interest in how she passed her leisure time. The discipline and ethical standards were nil or very low.

Healy & Bronner (1926) and Burt (1938) showed that poverty was not a very significant factor in the development of crime. Otherwise how can we account for white collar crime committed by well to-do persons such as businessmen, politicians, doctors and lawyers.

Doraiswami (1940) found that the poverty was not the major factor in delinquency. Maximum literacy rate of parents was 8th standard. Inconsistent discipline was found. Stealing was major act.

Mukerji (1955) showed that adolescents coming from middle class homes, unemployed and possessing inadequate standard of education, were the offenders.

Menendale (1955,1960) traced that the dominant factors responsible for delinquency were, poverty, aggravated home
conditions, companionship, jealousy and revenge, intoxication, adolescent disturbances and social heritage.

Gluecks (1960) and Kvaraceus (1960) support the idea that family was a potent source of delinquency.

Cadets (1962) gave in the report that most of the offenders came from rural areas.

Pathak (1963) revealed that poor economic and physical conditions and bad neighbour-hood conditions were responsible for delinquency. Zones of physical and social deterioration contributed about half of the delinquent children. The average monthly income of families of about half of the delinquents ranged from Rs. 70/- to Rs.150/-.

Badami (1965) explained that the delinquents were illegitimate had doubts as to their legitimacy, physically weak parents, poorly educated, and addicted to drugs. Their parents were illiterate or poorly educated, unhealthy and worked under poor conditions. Delinquents came from broken homes or did not live with parents.

According to Singh (1973), criminals are normally characterized as aggressive, hostile, antisocial, unstable, antiauthority, immature, mentally defective, poor in perseverance, less dependable, low in goal striving, inconsistent, possessing neurotic and psychotic disposition, having feelings of guilt, insecurity, inferiority and rejection.

According to Radzinowicz & Joanking (1977), the poor and the oppressed are more likely to find themselves victims of assault or murder, robbery or rape than the rich and powerful.
Every individual is the product of the environment in which he is born and reared as well as of the constitution he has inherited through his parents.

The dispute about the proportionate roles of nature and nurture is very old. The idea of the born criminal, or at least the inheritance of a predisposition to crime, was once extremely popular. Now, with our democratic desire to believe that everybody starts equal, we have swung towards the other extreme, attributing the lion's share of responsibility to family and social environment. But the stubborn fact remains that, from the beginning, individuals react differently to very similar circumstances.

Wodarski & Gordon (1983) indicated no significant effect for the following variables, parental status, school attendance, sex, religious affiliation, age and race.

Joshi (1985) said that although there were several causes leading to juvenile delinquency, more important of them were maladjustment resulting from disharmonious child-parent relationship, mother-deprivation, broken, neglected or overcrowded homes, poverty, lack of moral education, lack of recreational facilities, visual and auditory defects, speech retardation, poor I.Q., problems of adolescence, superiority or inferiority complex, defects in the nervous system etc.

Conifer (1983) explored that as a general statement it
might be said that economic conditions and poverty had not been found to be the critical factors in the cause of criminal and deviant behaviour, with possible exception of suicide. Some studies had shown that crime increased during the periods of economic prosperity. Studies in England had shown that homosexuality was more common in higher or professional classes. Some crimes such as embezzlement and art fraud, required certain levels of educational and social status in order for them to be committed. It was revealed that most of the crimes certainly occurred more frequently in the slum areas. Poverty has often been related to crime. But the investigations regarding the relationships between poverty and crime have yielded different results.

Before the interpretation of the results it becomes necessary to explain the method of proceeding further. The succeeding chapter will contain the tools which were used to get scores on different variables and the statistical techniques to find out the relationship between personality characteristics, intelligence, achievement motivation, adjustment and socio-economic status of juvenile and adult female offenders.