CHAPTER - VI

DISCUSSION
The present research was carried out in order to study the personality and adjustment of murderers in comparison to a non-criminal population. The murderers and non-criminals were further ramified into other categories pertaining to rural-urban background, two levels of education and sex. The discussion of results of the present investigation would therefore highlight the observed differences between murderers and non-criminals on the variables of personality and adjustment as well as analysing the effects of variables like sex, education and habitat.

Personality of Murderers

Personality was the first major variable on which a comparative analysis between murderers and non-criminals was made. It was measured in terms of Eysenckian Personality model of Extraversion (Sociability, impulsivity); Neuroticism and Psychoticism. In our earlier review of literature on crime and personality, we had suggested that there is a greater need to study personality ingredients assumed to accompany some specific pattern of criminality. Eysenck's (1970) theory of crime had suggested such a hypothesis and
an attempt had therefore been made in the present study to investigate these specific personality factors of P, E/I and N as related to murder. Each dimension will now be dealt with reference to the scores obtained by murderers and non-criminals.

(a) Extraversion and Murder:

According to Eysenck (1970) propensity to crime is universal but is held in check by a person's conscience. This conscience develops through the process of socialization which occurs due to the formation of appropriate conditioned responses in childhood and youth. As these form less easily in extraverts, so they are more likely to commit criminal and antisocial acts than introverts. But many studies have discredited Eysenck's (1964, 1970) hypothesis relating crime with E/I (e.g. Little, 1963; Hoghughi and Forrest, 1968; Jaspal, 1977; Mohan and Singh, in press, a). Later, Eysenck modified his theory and suggested that it is the impulsivity aspect of E/I rather than the sociability which is related to crime (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1971a).

On the basis of these studies we had hypothesized that murderers would not differ significantly from non-criminals on E/I as measured by the scales like EPI and PEN but the murderers would show higher scores on the impulsivity component of E/I. The results of the present
study clearly support this hypothesis. A comparison of the mean scores of murderers and non-criminals on EPI reveals that the murderers have a mean score of 11.07 while the non-criminals have scored 11.10. Similarly, on PEN scale, the murderers have obtained a mean score of 9.92 while the non-criminals have scored 9.88. The mean scores suggest that there are practically no differences between the two groups and this finding has been aptly substantiated by the two insignificant F-ratios (See Table-XIV).

Eysenck and Eysenck (1971) had said that criminal behaviour may be accounted for in terms of a failure to elaborate those conditioned responses, which underlie what in popular parlance is frequently called 'conscience'. Mowrer (1950) has shown how the disciplinary activities of parents, school teachers and the child's peers may act as unconditioned stimuli to produce sympathetic autonomic reactions to the undesirable, asocial type of behaviour which society requires to be stamped out. On Eysenck's original theory (1964) "extraverts who condition poorly would therefore be predisposed towards criminal behaviour reflecting asocial viewpoints." Gough (1948) and Cleckley (1964) had aptly described criminals as "poorly socialized." But several studies by Berry (1966), Forrest and Hoghugi (1968), Singh, A. (1976), Jaspal (1977), Mohan and
Singh, A. (in press, a) failed to find any relation between extraversion and crime.

According to Jaspal (1977) "it would be reasonable to conclude that those studies which could not confirm Eysenck's theory regarding E/I had methodological errors in that the tools used for personality measurement were not clearly differentiated into relative proportions of sociability and impulsivity items." The MPI and PEN for example, have a large number of sociability items in Extraversion scale which could account for the failure of studies using MPI and PEN to obtain significantly higher E/I scores in criminals. Many studies have tried to isolate the contributions of the first order factors of sociability and impulsivity to the scores obtained from offenders. Field (1959) found four hundred recidivists to score lower than 100 apprentices on social E and higher on behavioural E (impulsivity). Sanocki (1969) found that the prison sample differed from matched controls on 5 of the 12 items on the short form of the MPI. Of the three E/I items, almost all referred to 'liveliness'. Schalling and Holmberg (1970) found prisoners higher than controls in impulsivity and lower on sociability thus not altogether differing on the second order factor of E/I. Eysenck and Eysenck (1971a) in a study where item analysis of questionnaire responses was done, tested the
hypothesis that items relating to sociability would discriminate less well than items relating to impulsivity. They found that 'in toto' the items referring to sociability failed to discriminate on the whole between criminals and controls. According to Schalling and Holmberg (1970) "since the impulsivity component of E/I is higher for criminals and the sociability component lower, the studies based on overall means of the higher order factor of E/I may not be giving a true picture." So, in the present study, the subjects' scores on E/I were split into its two components viz. sociability and impulsivity so that a clear picture could be obtained regarding the relationship between sociability, impulsivity and murder.

(i) Sociability and Murder:

According to Eysenck and Eysenck (1963), Sociability and Impulsivity are the primary traits contributing to the higher order factor of E/I. It was also suggested that the two extraversion factors may differ with regard to relative importance of environmental vs. genetic influences, sociability being more easily subject to environmental influences and impulsivity having deeper roots in heredity (Schalling and Holmberg, 1970).

it was expected that in the present study the
murderers would not differ much from the non-criminals on sociability component of E/I. Contrary to this they have scored lower on sociability items, the respective means being 6.60 and 7.10. The F-ratio computed for sociability is 3.314 which just missed reaching the level of significance (See Table-XV). So t-test was applied which gave a significant t-ratio of 2.00 (p < .05). These findings have earlier corroboration in the work of Sanocki (1969), Schalling and Holmberg (1970), Schalling (1975) who found criminals to score lower on sociability than the non-criminals.

These results may be due to a long imprisonment of murderers in the present sample. According to Eysenck and Eysenck (1970) "it is evident that prisoners who live in an institution with few possibilities of seeing friends and going to parties, sociability items may have other implication than for individuals leading a normal life." Heskin et al. (1973) in a study on the long-term effects of imprisonment found that extraversion scores as measured by EPI declined with the increase of imprisonment period. According to Jaspal (1977) the conditions of prison life may influence the responses of prisoners, although instructions emphasize that the questions refer to habitual behaviour.
(ii) **Impulsivity and Murder**

According to Eysenck and Eysenck (1971), the correlation between eyeblink conditioning and Extraversion is mediated by the impulsivity items in the scale rather than the sociability ones. This suggests that individuals high on impulsivity would condition poorly and also thereby socialize less well than individuals low on impulsivity. Deficiencies in the socialization process leading to socially deviant behaviour have frequently been accounted for in terms of learning theory. They have been ascribed either to a special constellation of early learning experiences or to an inability on the part of the individual to learn the rules of society. Thus it is the impulsivity component of E/I rather than sociability which may considered to be associated with criminal behaviour.

In line with these findings, it was predicted that, in the present study, the murderers would score higher on impulsivity items as compared to the non-criminals. This has been borne out by a highly significant F-ratio of 9.98 ($p < .01$). A look at the mean scores of murderers and non-criminals reveals that they have scored 4.65 and 4.01 respectively (See Tables XV & XI).

The present results are in line with most of the earlier findings of Sanocki, 1969; Schalling, 1970; and
Eysenck and Eysenck, 1971. Sanocki (1969) in a study on the personality of criminals, item analysed the subject's responses on the E/I dimension of MPI and found that they scored significantly higher on impulsivity rather than sociability. Eysenck and Eysenck (1971) also confirmed that the impulsivity component of E/I is higher in criminals. Singh, A. (in press, a) compared criminal's scores on EPI with non-criminals and found that the criminals scored very high on impulsivity items on EPI.

As regarding the relationship between sociability and impulsivity, Eysenck and Eysenck (1963) and Sparrow and Ross (1964) have reported that sets of impulsiveness and sets of sociability items show a correlation of about .47 (in the normal population). According to Schalling (1975), the correlation between sociability and impulsivity decreases considerably in criminal group. In the present study, sociability and impulsivity are showing a positive correlation of .400 for non-criminals, but for murderers the correlation is only .286. This clearly corroborates Schalling's (1975) earlier finding. This has further been substantiated by the results of Factor Analysis.

Looking at Table-XII we observe that the significant factor loading on impulsivity is spread over two factors after rotation. On factor I the loading is .55 and on
factor V it is .40 which implies that impulsivity apart from clustering with E and its components is also relating itself positively to P and negatively with Home and Emotional adjustment for murderers. On the other hand for the non-criminal population the impulsivity component is yielding one consistent factor loading of .77 with E and its components.

(b) Neuroticism and Murder:

The second aspect of Eysenck's personality system which has been related to crime is that of Neuroticism. Though it was relegated to secondary importance by Eysenck (1970), yet other investigators have stressed the importance of this dimension in relation to criminality. According to Burgess (1972), Eysenck's dimension of N is perhaps more important and relevant to the theoretical model of criminal personality proposed by him.

According to Eysenck (1964) psychopaths were assumed to have high scores on N with consequently high autonomic lability. Empirical studies have mostly confirmed this assumption. The marked disregard for future consequences of acts, which is observed in psychopaths, has been conceptualized as a learning deficit. This implies the failure of cues associated with punishment to arouse sufficient anxiety to motivate avoidance behaviour. It has
been asserted by Eysenck that a highly labile autonomic system interferes with efficient learning of avoidance cues. On these grounds, and those relating N to socialization, we had framed a hypothesis that murderers would score higher on N as compared to the non-criminals. The present study confirms this hypothesis. A look at the mean-scores of murderers and non-criminals reveals that they have scored 9.11 and 7.61 on PEN respectively. The comparative figures on EPI for murderers and non-criminals are 11.44 and 9.13. The two respective F-ratios are 11.44 and 23.74 both significant beyond .001 level (See Table-XVII).

The present finding on murderers supports most of the earlier evidence that had accumulated in favour of criminals having higher N scores. Bartholomew (1957, 1959), Field (1960), Fitch (1962), Berry (1966), Millman (1966), Price (1968), Eysenck and Eysenck (1971a), Burgess (1972) all supported Eysenck's theory regarding N and criminality. In some other studies, N was found to be significantly related to aggressive crimes like murder (Sethi et al., 1976; Yadav, 1976; Nirmal, 1977; Singh, A., 1979a and 1979b) and the present study confirms those studies.

The results of factor analysis for murderers show that Factor II has high loadings on N (PEN), N(EPI) and emotional adjustment (See Table XII). This finding has also been reported in an earlier study by Mohan and Singh (in...
Neuroticism has been termed as "emotional lability, physiologically related to quicker arousal of sympathetic autonomic nervous system" (Mohan and Singh, in press, a). As such, there should be a negative relationship between N and emotional adjustment and the present results clearly speak in support of this.

The factors extracted for non-criminals (Table-XIII) show a different trend. P and N on both the inventories i.e. PEN and EPI, Home adjustment and Emotional adjustment form the first factor with P and N having positive and Home and Emotional Adjustment having negative loadings on it.

It shows that the persons high on N have also a tendency to score higher on P. It also reveals that the higher the scores on N the lesser will be the home and emotional adjustment for the non-criminal population. The reason why the murderers have a different factor structure might be due to the fact that they are already scoring very high on N and P than the non-criminals.

(c) Psychoticism and Murder:

Though a number of studies relating E/I and N to crime had been done, the concept of P was only recently considered in light of criminality. It was only in the 1970's that Eysenck and Eysenck suggested that in addition to E/I and N, P too would be implicated in the causation of
crime. The results on this personality dimension are quite in accordance with Eysenck and Eysenck's (1970) prediction relating crime to P and to the hypothesis framed in Chapter III. The mean scores of murderers and non-criminals (Table-IX) show these differences on P. The mean score of non-criminals and murderers is 5.06 and 7.65 respectively and the F-ratio is 92.60 (p < .001).

Another interesting finding of the present study is that P is showing a high positive correlation (+.411) with N and negative correlations with Marital, Home and Emotional adjustment for murderers as well as non-criminals (See Tables X and XI). In factor analysis for murderers (Table XII) P has high positive loadings on Factor V while home and emotional adjustment have high negative loadings implying a lower level of adjustment. For non-criminals (Table XIII), P, N (both PEN and SPI), home adjustment and emotional adjustment form one factor (Factor I). This implies that high P effects other behavioural responses. Considering the most important characteristics of high P scorers, as given by Eysenck (1970) such as odd, isolated, troublesome, lacking human feelings for fellow human beings, aggressive and hostile to near and dear ones we may safely say that such a person would have difficulty in home and emotional adjustment.

The present finding on murderers supports most of
the earlier evidence that had accumulated in favour of criminals being high on P. Medor (1914), Rudin (1916), Essen-Moller (1946), Odegard (1963) and Planansky (1966) all obtained evidence to give support to one of Eysenck and Eysenck's (1970) reason for implicating P in the causation of crime, i.e. that psychosis and criminality have a particularly close connection. Other studies by Segraves (1969), Wilson and Maclean (1974), Singh, A. (1976), Jaspal (1977), Nirmal (1977), Eysenck et al. (1977), Singh, A. (1979a, 1979b), Mohan and Singh, A. (in press, a) all obtained evidence to show that criminals tend to be more psychotic than normals.

Eysenck and Eysenck (1971) had said that some of the P items are not endorsed by prisoners in the appropriate direction because of their similarity to lie scale items. They had suggested that since prisoners are characterised by elevated lie scale scores, it would be likely that the scores on P would be raised by something like 15 to 20 per cent at least. In the present case too, the murderers have higher lie scores in comparison to the non-criminals. Most of the items on P are saturated with processes closely inter-linked with socialization. A criminal is lacking the necessary socialization and formation of "conscience" (Eysenck, 1970) and hence it is quite natural that the murderers should be scoring higher on P.
(d) **Lie Scores of Murderers**:

It is known from unpublished work (cf. Eysenck and Eysenck, 1971a) with a lie scale that prisoners tend to have higher lie scores. The present findings bear this out. The murderers as a whole have much higher lie scores than the non-criminals. On PEN scale, the murderers have obtained a mean score of 6.65 while the mean for non-criminals is 4.75. The F-ratio obtained on the scores of murderers and non-criminals is 35.86 which is highly significant ($p < .001$).

Similarly on EPI the respective means for the murderers and non-criminals are 4.51 and 3.31; the F-ratio is 35.39 which is again significant at .001 level.

Lie scale has emerged as one single unitary factor for both murderers as well as non-criminals (See Tables XII and XIII); though for murderers, L(EPI) has a negative correlation of .329 with P, .348 with N and .266 with impulsivity and positive correlations with all the three adjustments and L (PEN). For non-criminals, L(EPI) has positive correlations with P, N (EPI) and L (PEN) while negative correlations with impulsivity and Marital adjustment.

The results of the present study are clearly in line with the earlier studies of Singh, A. (1976), Jaspal (1977), Mohan and Singh, A. (in press, a), who reported criminals to be scoring high on lie. Jaspal (1977) reasons that this
tendency may be due to two reasons - namely the prisoners may be reluctant to admit something frowned upon by society or they may have a general tendency to tell lies even when they are not called for; a sort of compulsive lying pattern may be a feature of their personality. In the former case, they may be over conscious of giving socially desirable responses because of the fact that society has ostracised them by putting them in prisons, and in the second case it may be a manifestation of their psychotic tendencies (Mohan and Singh, A., in press, a).

Adjustment of Murderers

The second area of study for the present research was adjustment. Adjustment was studied in terms of home, marital and emotional adjustment. The following discussion deals with the differences in adjustment between murderers and non-criminals.

(a) Home Adjustment and Murder:

The earlier review of literature in Chapter II showed that there is a close relation between home maladjustment and murder. This relation becomes clearly evident when we study the victim-offender relationship. Most of the studies have shown that a large number of victims are either family members or close relatives (Ahuja, 1970; Gupta and Sethi,
In light of these studies, it was hypothesized that murderers would show a low home adjustment as compared to the non-criminals. The results of the present study support this expectation. Looking at Table IX we find that the mean home adjustment score of murderers and non-criminals is 20.23 and 21.20 respectively. Since the F-ratio computed for home adjustment failed to reach the level of significance, the t-test was applied. The t-ratio obtained was 1.96 which is significant at .10 level. Though not a very high level of significance, it supports the expected trend that murderers would have a low home adjustment.

Home adjustment is showing high negative correlations with $P$, $E$ (both PEN and EPI), $N$ (both PEN and EPI) and impulsivity, while it is showing a positive correlation with $L$ (EPI), Marital and Emotional adjustment for murderers (Table X). For non-criminals, it has high negative correlations with $P$, and $N$ (both EPI and PEN) while positive correlations with $E$ (PEN), $E$ (EPI), Sociability, Impulsivity, Marital and Emotional adjustment. As already discussed, it is known fact that prisoners tend to have higher lie scores (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1971a). The finding that lie scale and home adjustment are positively correlated for murderers but not for non-criminals suggests that had they not been
telling lies, their scores on the Home adjustment would have been lower than what they have scored in the present case. It implies that they are overly conscious of giving socially desirable responses as adjustment to home is a socially desirable goal. This might be the reason of obtaining very little differences in the home adjustment of murderers and non-criminals.

In factor analysis, Home adjustment is forming one unitary factor with P and Emotional adjustment for murderers (Table XII) while for non-criminals (Table XIII) it is showing high positive loading on Factor IV along with Marital adjustment.

(b) Marital Adjustment and Murder:

The second area of adjustment studied was marital adjustment. The importance of marriage in an individual's life is fairly obvious; it meets a person's need for affection and sexual expression; it provides the ideal situation for procreation and rearing of children. At the same time, marriage may also give rise to various frustrations, resulting in a complete breakdown of marital harmony. In our review of literature, it was found that marital disharmony is a very important factor in the genesis of violent crimes. Ferracuti and Newman (1976) asserted that "a considerable proportion of assaultive crime occurs between
members of family or intimate primary groups." Many studies
(Gibson and Klein, 1961; McClintock, 1963; Pokorny, 1965a,
1965b; Somasundram, 1965; Voss and Hepburn, 1968; Ahuja, 1970;
Sharma, S., 1976) have revealed that a large number of murder
victims are either family members or close relatives. Out of
these family members, husbands and wives form a considerable
proportion. All these studies pointed towards a poor marital
adjustment of the murderers.

The present results are in line with these studies.
We had hypothesized that the murderers would score lower on
Marital adjustment scale than the non-criminals. The present
results strongly support the hypothesis and prove that
murderers have a poorer marital adjustment than the non-
criminals. The mean score of murderers is 67.08 while that
of the non-criminals is 85.99. The F-ratio obtained for the
scores of the two groups is 11.71* which is significant at
.001 level (See Table XXV).

According to Goode (1969) "criminal homicide is the
most intimate of all violent crimes." Boudouris (1971) in
a analysis of 6,839 homicides in the city of Detroit during
1926-1968 found that the proportion of homicides involving
family members was well over 30% and that these homicides
represent problems in family inter-action and maladjustment.
Ahuja (1970) asserted that many murders takes place after a
long period of interpersonal difficulties for which murder
presented a possible solution. He viewed murder as an outcome of long standing personal frictions between husbands and wives or between daughter-in-law and father/mother/sister-in-law.

The present results when viewed in light of these studies show similar findings. The literature regarding marital happiness and divorce suggests that divorce is not common amongst the Indians for "the bond of marriage has remained indissoluble throughout our long history" (Somasundram, 1970a). But during the past few decades urbanization, industrialization and rapid technological innovations have resulted in a large scale migration from rural to urban areas. The joint family system is cracking, the influence of religion waning. Moreover, the freedom of women from the strenuous work at home and "the growing education among women coupled with economic dearth has led them to seek employment" (Mohan and Singh, A., in press, c). All this may lead to manifold stresses, strains, and jealousies within the marital relationship resulting in various frictions between the family members which may ultimately end up in murder.

The results of correlational analysis for marital adjustment show that for murderers, marital adjustment has high positive, significant correlation with Home and Emotional adjustment and Lie (EPI) while it has negatively significant correlation with P, E (EPI) and N(EPI) (See Table X). For
non-criminals, marital adjustment has positively significant correlation with Home and Emotional adjustment and negatively significant correlation with P, N (FEN), N(EPI) and Lie(EPI) (Table XI).

In factor analysis, marital adjustment is forming a separate, independent factor (Factor IV, Table XII) for murderers. For non-criminals, Marital adjustment has high loadings of +.89 on Factor IV along with Home adjustment (See Table XIII).

This finding suggests that adjustment in non-criminal sample is a global overall phenomenon but in case of murderers, it yields an individualized factor structure in relation to the deviancy. Thus marital adjustment has emerged as an independent factor which may have implications on human behaviour leading to murder. The present results fall in line with the earlier studies where the importance of marital adjustment and hormony has been stressed in the causation of murder (Ahuja, 1970; Somasundram, 1970; Shanna, S., 1976; Singh, A., 1979b).

(c) Emotional Adjustment and Murder:

The third area of adjustment studied is emotional adjustment. According to Coleman (1970) "Our emotions are important resources in our adjustive arsenal." Crow (1974) asserts that "many human responses are influenced quite as
much, if not more, by emotional urges and compulsions, as by objective reasoning and judgment." Each individual needs to work out appropriate and effective patterns of emotional response and a failure to control emotions may give rise to a variety of pathological behaviour patterns like emotional disturbances, alcoholism, drug addiction and other antisocial and criminal activities (Coleman, 1970).

This relationship between crime and emotional disturbances has been upheld by many studies (Burt, 1938; Healy and Bronner, 1936; Glueck and Glueck, 1956; Rajangam, 1957; Shanmugam and Sundari, 1960; Majumder and Roy, 1962; Pati, 1966; Sin$i, A., 1976). On the basis of these studies we had hypothesized that the murderers would show a poorer emotional adjustment than the non-criminals. The present results clearly support this hypothesis. The respective mean scores of murderers and non-criminals on emotional adjustment are 17.87 and 22.13 and the F-ratio is 39.54 which is significant at .001 level (See Table XXV).

These results can best be explained by taking into view the nature of the crime committed i.e. murder. According to Johnson (1966) "Crimes like murder are crimes of emotionality." Wolfgang (1969) asserts that "murder is most often an impulsive, violent, and explosive act" and according to Cormier (1962) "murder occurs at a point of intense emotion
and a feeling that to continue (the relationship) is inconceivable and to give up impossible."

Many other studies used questionnaire measures of emotional adjustment and came out with the results that the criminals committing major crimes like murder, physical assault and rape had a poorer emotional adjustment (Singh, A., 1976; Nirmal, 1977; Singh, A., 1979a, 1979b). The present study confirms the findings of the earlier studies.

Another interesting finding of the present study is that emotional adjustment is showing nearness to N, the later being emotional lability physiologically related to quicker arousal of the sympathetic nervous system. This has been substantiated by the fact that emotional adjustment shows negative correlation with N for both murderers as well as non-criminals. This relationship between N and emotional adjustment has clearly come out in the factor analysis also (Tables XII and XIII). Singh, A. (1976) and Mohan and Singh (in press, a) also found similar results with criminals. This clearly indicates to a negative relationship between emotional adjustment and N, so that a person high on Neuroticism i.e. more anxiety prone, will have a poor emotional adjustment.

So far the discussion has revolved around the differences between murderers and non-criminals with regards to their personality and adjustment. It has been pointed out in some earlier studies that some other psychosocial factors
effect the personality and adjustment of criminals as well non-criminals (Singh, A., 1976; Jaspal, 1977; Mohan and Singh, A., in press, a). We have already reviewed in Chapter II that the psychosocial factors like sex, rural-urban habitat and educational attainment appear to be important in giving explanation of the variations in nature and type of crime committed as well as personality and adjustment differences among criminals. The ensuing discourse would mainly revolve around bringing out the differences obtained on these factors on the variables of personality and adjustment.

(I) Personality, Adjustment and Rural-Urban Background

The first such factor studied in the present research was rural-urban differences. Equal number of subjects were selected out of both rural and urban population so that a comparative analysis of their personality and adjustment could be made. The following discussion would highlight the differences obtained in the personality and adjustment of these groups.

(a) Rural-Urban Background and Personality:

The personality of rural and urban subjects was studied in terms of E/I, N and P. Looking at Table XIV we find that there are no significant differences in extraversion
between the rural and urban subjects in the overall sample. Same is the case with sociability and impulsivity - the two components of E/I. There are no significant differences between the two groups on both sociability and impulsivity (See Table XV). Similarly, when we see the further break up of subjects into murderers and non-criminals, we find that no significant differences emerge between the rural and urban subjects. The t-ratios for E/I, sociability and impulsivity are all insignificant (See Table XXVIII). These results are in line with the findings of Singh, A. (1976) and Mohan and Singh, A. (in press, b). In both these studies, no significant difference were found on extraversion between rural and urban subjects. Nirwal (1977) also reported that rural delinquents did not differ from urban delinquents on extraversion.

As regarding Neuroticism, we find that as compared to urban subjects, the rural subjects have a significantly higher neuroticism score, as shown by the significant F-ratios (See Table XVII) for both PEN and EPI scales. These results are in line with some earlier findings. Verma (1975) in a study on occupation and Neuroticism reported that farmers amongst male and housewives amongst female population obtained a higher N score. In a subsequent study Verma (1976) reported significant differences between rural and urban people on N with the rural people obtaining higher scores.
An interesting finding regarding rural-urban differences and N is that these differences are significant only in the non-criminal population, the t-ratios being 3.41 and 3.11 on PEN and EPI respectively. The comparative t-ratios for murderers are 0.96 and 0.15 on PEN and EPI respectively (See Table XXVIII) which are both insignificant.

This might be due to the reason that criminals on the whole score much higher on neuroticism as has been reported in many earlier studies (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1970, 1973; Singh, A., 1976; Jaspal, 1977; Barack and Widom, 1978). So they do not show any rural-urban differences. This is clearly evident from the interaction of crime and rural-urban factor which has emerged significant (Table XVII). Figs I and II show that on both PEN and EPI scales, the murderers have scored higher than the non-criminals, irrespective of rural-urban background. But whereas the urban non-criminals have scored much lower than the rural non-criminals, there is hardly any difference between the scores of rural and urban murderers.

The next personality variable was P. A look at Table-IX reveals that the mean P score of rural subjects is 6.95 while that of the urban subjects is 5.76 in the overall sample. The difference between the two means is highly significant as shown by the F-ratio of 19.508 (p < .001).
These differences have consistently come up in the further murderer-noncriminal break-up of subjects. Looking at Table-XXVIII, we find that the rural murderers have scored significantly higher on P as compared to the urban murderers, the t-ratio being 2.13 (p < .05). This finding supports the hypothesis framed earlier that the rural murderers would score higher on P as compared to the urban murderers, and at the same time, corroborates the earlier studies. Singh, A. (1976) and Nirmal (1977) reported similar findings with criminals and juvenile delinquents respectively. Similarly, the t-ratio for non-criminals is 4.14 (p < .01) suggesting that rural non-criminals are significantly more psychotic than urban non-criminals. Thus, we find that rural subjects of both murderer and non-criminal groups have scored significantly higher on psychoticism than the urban subjects.

The fact that the rural sample is scoring higher on P irrespective of whether they are murderers or non-criminals has its further support in the clustering together of psychoticism with adjustment. The factor analysis shows that in non-criminal sample, P is showing a negative factor loading with home and emotional adjustment and positive with N (See Table XIII). The rural sample is otherwise too scoring higher on N and lower on the two adjustments. This supporting evidence is further strengthened by the fact that in the
criminal group, P is showing a negative factor loading only with home and emotional adjustment and not with N (See Table XII). This implies that higher P would lead to poorer adjustment. In the rural murderers P is higher and adjustment is poorer.

As regarding the lie scores of rural and urban subjects, Table IX shows that on both PEN and EPI scales there are very little differences between the mean lie scores of rural and urban subjects. Table XXII reveals that the two F-ratios obtained for PEN and EPI respectively are both insignificant suggesting that there are no rural-urban differences in telling lies as far as the overall sample is concerned. But when we look at the break-up of the sample into murderers and non-criminal groups, we find that significant differences emerge. The urban murderers have scored significantly higher on lie scales of both PEN and EPI as compared to the rural murderers (See Table XXVIII). On the other hand, among non-criminal group, the rural subjects have scored significantly higher as compared to the urban subjects on EPI but on PEN, the differences have failed to reach significance (See Table XXVIII). These results suggest that among murderers, the urban subjects are telling more lies, but among non-criminals, the rural subjects tell more lies.
FIG. 1.
INTERACTIONS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE PERFORMED ON N (PEN)

CRIME X RURAL-URBAN
- MURDERERS
- NON-CRIMINALS

MEAN SCORES

RURAL

EDUCATION X RURAL-URBAN
- LOW EDUCATION
- HIGH EDUCATION

MEAN SCORES

RURAL

URBAN
FIG. II.
INTERACTION OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE PERFORMED ON N (EPI)

CRIME X RURAL-URBAN
- - MURDERERS
- - NONCRIMINALS

MEAN SCORES

RURAL     URBAN

8.0
7.5
7.0
8.0
8.5
9.0
9.5
10.0
10.5
11.0
11.5
12.0
FIG III.
INTERACTION OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE PERFORMED ON P

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIME X EDUCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>●● LOW EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○○ HIGH EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MURDERERS Non-CRIMINALS

MEAN SCORES

8.0
7.5
7.0
6.5
6.0
5.5
5.0
4.5
4.0
FIG. IV.
INTERACTIONS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE PERFORMED ON EMOTIONAL ADJUSTMENT
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Adjustment was studied in terms of home, marital and emotional adjustment in the present investigation. So the first adjustment variable was home adjustment. Looking at Table IX, we find that in the overall sample, the urban subjects have scored significantly higher on home adjustment as compared to the rural subjects. The respective means are 22.31 and 19.12 and the F-ratio is 20.642 (p < .001). These differences have consistently come up in the further rural-urban breakup for murderers and non-criminals. For both murderers and non-criminals, the urban subjects are scoring significantly (p < .05) higher than the rural subjects, the respective t-ratios being 3.67 and 2.69 for murderers and non-criminals (See Table XXVIII). These results are quite in line with the hypothesis framed earlier. Some earlier studies have also reported rural criminals to be less adjusted to home as compared to the urban criminals (Singh, A., 1976; Nirmal, 1977; Mohan and Singh, A., in press b) and the present study supports these earlier studies.

The second area of adjustment was marital adjustment. Looking at Table IX we find that the mean marital adjustment score of rural subjects is 464.39 while that of the urban subjects is 488.62 implying thereby that the rurals have a lower marital adjustment than the urbans. This difference
has emerged significant as is evident from a highly significant F-ratio of 19.343 (p < .001). These differences have further emerged in the break up for murderers and non-criminals also.

It was hypothesized earlier that the rural murderers would show poorer marital adjustment as compared to the urban murderers and the results obtained in the present study clearly support this hypothesis. Looking at Table-XXVIII we find that the urban murderers as well as non-criminals have a significantly (p < .05) better marital adjustment as compared to the rural murderers and non-criminals. This might be due to the reason that in rural areas there is a preponderance of joint family system which when combined with a low level of education may result in a lower marital adjustment.

According to Ahuja (1970) "marital unhappiness is far more pervasive than statistics pertaining to joint residence of husband, wife and in-laws." Moreover, the lower marriage age among rural people may also prove a hindrance in the path of understanding the spouse and contribute towards marital disharmony as low education and early marriage have been found to effect adversely on marriage (Ruch, 1970). The present results also show a positive relationship between education and marital adjustment (See Table XXV) and thereby lend support to the earlier findings.
The third area of adjustment under present investigation was emotional adjustment. Looking at Table IX we find that the urban subjects have scored higher on emotional adjustment as compared to the rural subjects, but the difference between the two is not significant. This might be due to the effect of significant interaction between sex and rural-urban factor. Fig. IV shows that among males the urbans have higher adjustment but among females, the rurals have higher adjustment. Thus these sex differences might have subdued the overall results.

As regarding the further break up of overall sample into murderers and non-criminals, we had hypothesized that rural murderers would show poorer emotional adjustment as compared to the urban murderers. The present results fail to support this hypothesis, but there is a trend in the anticipated direction. Both urban murderers as well as non-criminals have scored higher on emotional adjustment as compared to the rural subjects. Similar findings have been reported in some earlier studies (Singh, A., 1976; Nirmal, 1977; Mohan and Singh, A., in press b).

(II) Personality, Adjustment and Educational Background

The second psychosocial factor studied in the present research was educational differences. The subjects of the present study were divided into two educational groups viz.
high education - low education so that a comparative analysis of the personality and adjustment of low and high educated subjects could be made. The following discourse would therefore highlight the obtained differences if any on the various personality and adjustment variables in the different educational sub-groups.

(a) Education and Personality:

The first variable of study was the E/I dimension of personality. Looking at Table IX we find that on both PEN and EPI, the high educated subjects have obtained higher scores on E/I than the low educated subjects. The F-ratio for PEN is 3.901 which is significant at .05 level but the F-ratio for EPI is 2.742 which just failed to reach significance. This finding suggests that high educated subjects are more extraverted as compared to the low educated subjects and finds support in the earlier work of Savage (1966), Entwistle and Welsh (1969) and Elliott (1972).

When we look at the break up of E/I into its two components viz. sociability and impulsivity, we find that the higher educated subjects have scored significantly (p < .05) higher on sociability as compared to the low educated group (See Tables IX and XV). But on impulsivity the differences are too meagre to be significant. This suggests that the high educated subjects are more sociable. Earlier, we had
obtained significant differences between the two education groups on E/I scale of PEN but not on EPI. This may be explained in light of the results obtained as regards to sociability. The E/I scale of PEN comprises of mainly sociability items and thus shows significant differences, but when combined with impulsivity, as in the case of EPI, the results were subdued as shown by the failure of F-ratic to reach significance. This implies that it is the sociability component of E/I which is related to education. Eysenck and Cookson (1969), Entwistle and Walsh (1969), and Finlayson (1970) all suggested that the differences in educational performance as shown by different personality groups may be explained in terms of social behaviour patterns (i.e. sociability).

The results of the overall sample are further magnified in the non-criminal sample. Table XXVIII shows that the high educated subjects have scored significantly higher on PEN (p < .05) as well as EPI (p < .10) as compared to the low educated subjects. But on sociability and impulsivity, the differences are not significant. On the other hand, no significant differences emerge between the low and high educated murderers on E/I, sociability and impulsivity (See Table XXVIII). This might be due to the effects of long imprisonment suffered by the murderers. The E/I scores have been found to decline with the increase in imprisonment period...
According to Eysenck and Eysenck (1970), "the items regarding seeing friends, going to parties and like in E/I scale may have other implication for prisoners than for individuals leading a normal life." These studies suggest that the prisoner's responses to sociability items might change due to the imprisonment and this might be the reason of our obtaining significant differences on E/I among non-criminals, but not among murderers.

The second personality variable studied was N. Looking at Table IX, we find that the high educated subjects in the total sample have scored lower on N as compared to the low educated subjects, but the difference is not significant. This might be due to the fact that education is showing a significant interaction with rural-urban background (See Table XVII) on PEN scale. A look at Fig. I shows that while the rural-high education group has scored highest, the urban high education group has scored lowest. This is also revealed in the Duncan's Analysis (Table XVII). This suggests that rural-urban factor is playing an important role in the personality of the subjects. As discussed earlier, we had found rural subjects scoring significantly higher on N as compared to the urban subjects. Same is the case here as far as the high education group is concerned. But for low education, there is very little difference between rural and urban subjects.
When we look at the break up of N scores for murderers and non-criminals, we find that the low educated murderers have scored significantly higher on PEN, but on EPI the differences have failed to reach significance (See Table - XXVIII). As regarding non-criminals, we find that low educated subjects have scored significantly higher on both PEN and EPI scales. This suggests that both murderers as well as non-criminals who are less educated are more neurotic than the high educated ones. Some earlier studies have also reported similar findings regarding N and education. Savage (1962) and Kline (1966) observed N to be negatively related to academic achievement. Child (1964, 1966) and Mohan (1976) have demonstrated that N has detrimental effects on educational attainment. Verma and Wig (1978) used PGI N_2 Questionnaire and obtained an inversely significant correlation between N and education. The present results are in line with all these studies. The subjects who have succeeded in examination for higher classes (i.e., high education group) obviously reveal this trend of significant relationship between N and academic achievement.

As regarding Psychoticism - the third personality variable studied, we find that the low educated subjects in the overall sample have scored significantly higher (p < .001) as compared to the high educated subjects. These results are further magnified in the non-criminal sample. Looking
at Table XXVIII we find that the low educated non-criminals are scoring significantly higher ($p \leq .001$) as compared to the high educated subjects, the t-ratio being 4.85. This suggests that there is an inverse relationship between education and P as far as non-criminals are concerned. But for murderers, no such relationship emerges as shown by an insignificant t-ratio of 0.04. Furthermore, when we look at the interaction of crime with education which has emerged significant, we find a similar pattern. Fig. III amply proves that there is hardly any difference between the two education groups of murderers on P. It has further been highlighted in the Duncan's Analysis where we find that the murderers have scored higher on P irrespective of education while among the non-criminals the high educated groups have scored significantly lower than the low education groups (See Table XXI).

This finding may be explained by keeping in view the fact that criminals as a whole score higher on P as reported in many earlier studies (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1970, 1973, 1977a; Singh, A., 1976; Jaspal, 1977; Mohan and Singh, A., 1979) and therefore education is not showing any relationship with P in their case.

As regarding the Lie scores of high and low educated subjects, Table IX shows that on both PEN and EPI scales there are very little differences between the mean lie scores of
high and low educated subjects. Table XXII reveals that the two obtained F-ratios for PEN and EPI respectively are both insignificant suggesting that there are no educational differences as far as telling lies is concerned. These differences have failed to emerge significant even when a separate analysis was performed on the scores of high and low educated murderers as well as non-criminals (See Table XXVIII). All the t-ratios obtained failed to reach the level of significance. In some earlier studies also no significant correlation has been found between education and lie scores (Gynther and Shinkumas, 1966; Verma, 1975) and the present results are in line with these studies.

(b) Education and Adjustment:

The second area of present research was adjustment and the first adjustment variable was home adjustment. Looking at Table IX we find that for the overall sample, the high educated subjects have scored significantly higher as compared to the low educated subjects as is evident from a highly significant (p < .001), F-ratio of 11.339. These differences have further come up in the non-criminal subgroup as is shown by Table XXVIII. The high educated non-criminals have scored significantly higher (t-ratio 3.54, p < .01) as compared to the low educated subjects. But for murderers, we find that the differences have failed to reach significance.
These results can be explained by keeping in view the earlier findings regarding a negative relationship between P and adjustment. As already discussed, home adjustment has formed one factor with P (Table XII). Since murderers are higher on P their home adjustment is bound to be affected because while P has positive factor loadings on factor V, home adjustment has negative factor loadings. This may be the reason why they do not show any educational differences. Their adjustment is already so poor that the education factor has no part to play.

The second variable of adjustment studied was marital adjustment. Looking at Table IX we find that marital adjustment score of low educated subjects is 464.87 while that of the high educated subjects is 488.20 implying thereby that the high educated subjects have a better marital adjustment than the low educated subjects. This difference has emerged significant as is evident from a F-ratio of 17.842 (p < .001). These differences have come as significant in the further murderer-non-criminal break up of subjects. As is evident from Table XXVIII, the high educated murderers have a better marital adjustment than the low educated murderers. Same is the case with non-criminals. The two t-ratios for murderers and non-criminal are 3.23 and 2.52 (p ≤ .01 and .01 respectively). These results support fairly the hypothesis framed
earlier that the low educated murderers would show poorer marital adjustment as compared to the high educated murderers. Some earlier studies have also reported educational differences in marital adjustment. Singh, N. P. (1972) and Mohan and Singh, A. (in press, c) reported an inverse relationship between education and marital adjustment. Roth and Peck (1951) and Singh, A. K. and Sharma (1979) reported that marital adjustment and happiness increased with the social class which is invariably related to the educational status of an individual.

The third variable of adjustment studied in the present investigation was emotional adjustment. Looking at Table IX we find that the high educated subjects have scored higher as compared to the low educated subjects on Emotional adjustment, but the difference between their scores is not significant. This might be due to the fact that rural-urban background is significantly interacting with education factor (See Table XXV). Figure IV shows that the urban high educated subjects have scored the highest (21.97) while the scores of all other groups do not differ much from each other. This is further substantiated in the Duncan’s Analysis. Table XXVII shows that the urban high education group has the highest and the rural high education group has the lowest emotional adjustment score. The mean range between the two is 15.05
which is significant at .01 level.

When we look at the further break up of scores for murderers and non-criminals, we find that significant differences emerge between the non-criminals - with high educated scoring significantly higher as compared to the low educated subjects. Most of the earlier studies indicate in general that high emotionality (i.e., low emotional adjustment) has an inverse relationship with educational attainment (Malhotra, 1974) and the present results also show similar findings.

As regarding the murderers, we find that there are no significant differences between the two educational groups. This might be due to the fact that the murderers on the whole show poorer emotional adjustment as is evident from the very nature of murder which has been defined by Johnson (1966), and Wolfgang (1969) as an act of emotionality. Furthermore, Table XXV shows that there is a significant (p < .05) interaction between crime and education factor. Fig. IV shows that the high educated non-criminals have scored highest while the high educated murderers have scored the lowest on emotional adjustment. Duncan's analysis further clarifies this (See Table XXVII) where the mean range for the differences between high educated murderers and non-criminals is 15.05 (p < .01).
(III) Sex Differences in Personality and Adjustment

The last psychosocial factor studied in the present study was sex differences. Both the sexes viz., male and female were included in the present study so that a comparative analysis of their personality and adjustment could be made. The following discussion would highlight the differences obtained in the personality and adjustment of male and female subjects.

(a) Sex and Personality:

The first variable of study for the present research was personality, which was studied in terms of Extraversion, Neuroticism and Psychoticism. The mean scores of male and female subjects on these variables are presented in Table-IX. Looking at Table-IX, we find that there are very little differences between the males and females on E/I. On E/I dimension of PEN, males have scored 9.89 and the females 9.91. On EPI, the respective means are 11.21 and 10.95. The two respective F-ratios for PEN and EPI are both insignificant suggesting that male and female subjects do not differ from each other on E/I.

Similarly, when the E/I scores of males and females were analysed separately for murderers and non-criminals, no significant differences could emerge. The means of the male
and female subjects of the two groups viz. murderers and non-criminals are listed in Table-XXVIII which shows that the t-ratios between male and female murderers as well as non-criminals are insignificant for both EPI and PEN. This suggests that there are no sex differences between murderers as well as non-criminals on E/I.

Eysenck and Eysenck (1969) and Verma and Wig (1972) however reported that females tend to score lower on E/I as compared to males. Eysenck (1965) had reported that with increase in age, extraversion declines in girls. On the other hand, Mohan et al. (1968) did not obtain any differences for sex variable on E/I dimension. Suvarcha (1976) also reported that there were no differences between the two sexes on E/I.

In the present study, the E/I scale was split into its two components - sociability and impulsivity. Table IX shows that the females have scored a little higher than males on sociability, but the difference is not significant, as the F-ratio obtained is only 1.275. This suggests that the males and females do not differ on sociability component of E/I. Similarly, when we look at the scores of male and female murderers as well as male and female non-criminals separately, we find that there are no significant sex differences between murderers as well as non-criminals. The t-ratios obtained
for murderers and non-criminals are 1.46 and 0.35 respectively (See Table XXVIII).

As regarding impulsivity, looking at Table IX, we find that males have scored higher than the females. This difference has emerged significant as is evident from Table XV which shows that the F-ratio for sex differences on impulsivity is 3.88 (p < .05). When we look at the break up of impulsivity scores for murderers and non-criminals separately, we find that no significant sex differences emerge (See Table XXVIII).

As regarding Neuroticism, we find that females have scored significantly higher as compared to the males, the mean scores being 7.75 and 8.96 (on PBN) respectively for males and females. Similarly on EPI, the mean scores are 9.30 and 11.37 respectively. The two F-ratios for PBN and EPI are 7.62 and 17.55 respectively which are both significant beyond .01 level. These results are in line with earlier finding that females have elevated N scores as compared to the males. Eysenck and Eysenck (1969, 1973), Verma and Wig (1972), Abraham et al. (1977) all found women to score higher on N as compared to men. Mohan (1976), Suvarcha (1976) and Nirmal (1977) reported adolescent and preadolescent girls scoring significantly higher on N as compared to the boys of same age.

An interesting finding regarding sex differences and
N is that these differences are significant only in the criminal population - the t-ratios being 2.83 and 3.98 on EPI and PEN respectively for murderers which are both significant at .01 level. But in non-criminals the differences are too meagre to be significant (the comparative t-ratios for non-criminals are 0.24 and 0.69 respectively on PEN and EPI (See Table XXVIII). In some earlier studies also female murderers have been reported to be scoring higher on N (Yadav, 1976; Singh, A., in press, b). Eysenck and Eysenck (1973) also found female prisoners scoring significantly higher on N as compared to the male prisoners.

As regards P, Eysenck and Eysenck (1973) have asserted that "there appears to be a close relation between P and masculinity; men on the average score much more highly than women on this factor." This assertion has been upheld in the present study. A look at Table IX reveals that the mean P score of males is 6.63 while that of the females is 6.07. The F-ratio obtained is 4.38 which is significant at .05 level. Singh, A. (in press, b) also found males scoring significantly higher on P as compared to the females.

As seen in case of N, the sex differences on P are also significant for the murderers only. Looking at Table XXVIII we find that the male murderers have scored significantly higher (t-ratio being 2.37 p < .05) on P as compared to the female murderers. But for non-criminals, the
differences between males and females are too small. Thus suggesting that the observation of Eysenck and Eysenck (1973) regarding a close link between P and masculinity is valid for the criminal population only.

Concerning lie scale, we find that on both PEN and EPI males have scored a little higher than females, but the differences have failed to yield significant F-ratios. But when we see the further break up of sex differences among murderers and non-criminals, we find that male murderers have scored significantly higher on lie scale than female murderers the mean scores being 7.42 and 5.87 respectively on PEN and 4.94 and 4.09 on EPI. The two t-ratios are 3.36 and 2.83 (p < .05) respectively for PEN and EPI. But for non-criminals, these differences are not significant thus suggesting that while the male murderers have scored higher on lie scale as compared to the female murderers, there are no significant sex differences for non-criminals though the males have scored a little higher. These results are in line with the earlier studies. Kapoor (1968) reported that males score higher on lie scale than the females. Similar results were reported by Verma (1976). Singh, A. (in press, b) found female criminals scoring significantly lower on lie than the male criminals.

(b) Sex and Adjustment :

The second variable of study for the present research
work was adjustment, which was studied in terms of home, marital and emotional adjustment. The mean scores of males and females on these three areas of adjustment are presented in Table IX along with the subjects’ scores on personality which shows that males have scored a little higher on home adjustment as compared to the females, the mean scores being 21.01 and 20.42 respectively. The difference between these two means has not emerged as significant as is evident from Table XXV. The F-ratio obtained is only 0.70.

Similarly, when we look at the mean home adjustment scores of males and females separately, as given in Table XXVIII, no significant differences come into view. The t-ratio for sex differences between murderers is 1.14 and for non-criminals is 0.00 suggesting that there are no sex differences as far as home adjustment is concerned.

The second area of adjustment studied was marital adjustment. Looking at Table IX we find that the mean marital adjustment score of males is 484.58 while that of the females is 468.49 implying thereby that the males have a higher marital adjustment as compared to the females. This difference has emerged as significant in the analysis of variance applied to the scores of males and females which yielded a F-ratio of 8.49 (p < .01). These results when viewed in light of some earlier studies show similar findings. Bhatt and Gauba (1978) and Mohan and Singh (in press, c) also
found that females scored lower on marital adjustment as compared to the males. According to Ojha and Singh, R.I.P. (1972) much of the adjustment in marriage depends on the attitude towards marital roles. The traditionally valued role in patriarchal societies is that of the dominance of husband and submissiveness of wife. But, "as a result of the educational growth, and industrial and technological advancement many a wives are unwilling to adapt themselves to the dominating role of their husbands" (Ojha and Singh, R.I.P., 1972) and this may be a possible reason of females scoring lower on marital adjustment.

As regarding the sex differences on marital adjustment between murderers and non-criminals, the present results show that the female murderers have a significantly lower marital adjustment as compared to the male murderers, the respective mean scores being 4.56 and 4.77. The t-ratio obtained for these scores is 2.58 which is significant at .05 level. But for non-criminals, the difference between the mean scores obtained by the two sexes is not significant, the t-ratio bring 1.32 only. This suggests that marital adjustment plays an important role in leading women to murder. This finding has been reported in many earlier studies (Ahuja, 1970; Sharma, 1976; Singh, A., 1979). Ahuja (1970) in a study on female murderers concluded that "many murders take place after a long period of interpersonal difficulties,
for which murder represented a possible solution." He views murder as the outcome of a long standing personal friction between daughter-in-law and mother/sister/father-in-law. Sharma, S. (1976) related murder with marital maladjustment and reported that female murderers reported a problem of adjustment with husband and in-laws.

Emotional adjustment was the third area of adjustment studied in the present research work. Looking at Table IX we find that males have a better emotional adjustment as compared to the females, the mean scores being 21.16 and 18.84 respectively. The F-ratio for sex differences in emotional adjustment is 11.76 which is significant at .01 level. These differences have emerged in the similar dimensions as reported in some earlier studies. Suvarcha (1976) and Nirwul (1977) found similar results with younger age groups.

When we look at the differences between male and female murderers as well as non-criminals, we find that the female murderers have a very poor emotional adjustment as compared to the male murderers. The two respective means are 16.07 and 19.67, the t-ratio is 3.60, significant at .01 level. But for non-criminals, these differences have not emerged as significant, though males are scoring a little higher than the females (Sec Table XXVIII). When we view these results in light of earlier studies we find that the
present findings are in line with most of the earlier work
also reported that female delinquents scored significantly
lower on emotional adjustment as compared to the male
delinquents.