Current researches in the area of criminality seem to stress personality factors. The vacuum left by physiologists, sociologists, economists and psychiatrists in advancing a meaningful theory of crime may be filled in by the personality factors. Eysenck (1964, 1970) had put forward a theory of crime wherein he suggested that criminal groups would come from high P, high N and high E/I quadrants. A number of studies have been done in this area and supportive evidence has accrued over the years relating P with crime. Regarding N, most of the studies have found a close relationship between N and crime but the studies somehow could not obtain any conclusive evidence regarding the relationship between E/I and crime.

The evidence accumulated on the basis of research done in the area of crime and personality suggests that prisoners as a whole differ in their personality make up from non-criminals. It has further been suggested that "even more differentiating results could be obtained if typology of crime could be taken into account" (Jaspal, 1977). According to Eysenck and Eysenck (1970) "it would seem to follow that by paying attention to the differences
within the criminal group with respect to personality, i.e. by constructing a typology of people, much greater differences between controls and homogenous groups of criminals would be obtained than from a total group of criminals." According to Blackburn (1971) personality characteristics may be of some importance in distinguishing different subgroups among criminals. Eysenck and Eysenck (1970) suggest that gang crimes are likely to involve high extraverted personalities while aggressive crimes and crimes involving excessive cruelty seem to carry implications of high psychoticism.

Besides personality, adjustment has also been found to be related to crime. Adjustment is the process whereby an organism, organ or individual entity enters into a relationship of harmony or equilibrium with its environment. Human beings make constant efforts to adjust themselves in relation to others so that they may lead a life acceptable to society. Society makes it obligatory on the part of its members to conform to certain modes of conduct. The state, tribe, village, family and other nucleus groups impose various controls on an individual in order to keep him within accepted norms. The adjustment of an individual lies in self direction through the development of a favourable self image; learning of socially approved goals, a realistic aspiration level and
frustration tolerance (Mohan and Singh, A., in press, a). He has also to accept, commit and identify with the values, norms, laws and customs of his society (Reckless, 1971). Deviations or moving away from these may lead one towards crime. As such, one may suggest that criminals who have already drifted away from the societal norms should have lesser adjustment in the areas of social, emotional, home and vocational front. A number of studies have confirmed this assertion (Singh, A., 1976; Nirmal, 1977; Singh, A., 1979a, 1979b; Mohan and Singh, A., in press, a).

A number of factors have been found to affect the personality and adjustment of criminals. One of these is the residential background of the criminals. Singh, A. (1976) studied an equal number of rural and urban criminals convicted of major and minor crimes and found that the rural criminals scored very high on the P scale of PSE. Mohan and Singh, A. (in press, b) observed that the rural criminals were significantly mal-adjusted in social and emotional areas as compared to the urban criminals. Nirmal (1977) also reported a similar finding regarding the adjustment of rural criminals.

Besides residential background, education has also been found to be related to the personality and adjustment of criminals. Mohan and Singh, A. (in press, b) found that the criminals with a low education were significantly
more extraverted; more neurotic (though not significantly)
and they committed more petty crimes than the criminals with
middle or high education. In the same study it was found
that the less educated criminals had a poor occupational,
social and emotional adjustment than the better educated
criminals.

The present research work envisaged to study the
personality and adjustment of a group of murderers.
Eysenck (1970) has suggested that different types of crime
would correlate with different personality types. So, by
paying attention to the differences within the criminal
population with respect to P, E and N, we may be able to
increase our knowledge and understanding of the causes of
crime in so far as they are related to personality. This
may help us in obtaining clues as to the optimal methods
of treatment of different types of criminals (Eysenck and
procedures have failed sadly" and deplores the fact that,
"law enforcement is still largely punitive and revengeful",
while a little attention is paid to the rehabilitation of
the criminal. Rehabilitation can only be achieved if we
have a proper understanding of the personality patterns
and the various maladjustments of the criminal which have
resulted in crime; coupled with the intelligent handling
of the individual in helping him to get over these
mal-adjustments and thus modifying criminal behaviour into a law abiding one. As most prisoners eventually return to society, it is crucially important to study the personality and adjustment problems of criminals so that we are able to prepare the released prisoners for a useful role in society.

Thus in the present study an attempt has been made to study the personality and adjustment of murderers in comparison to the personality and adjustment of non-criminals. Since some factors like rural-urban background and education have been found to affect the personality and adjustment, the differences among murderers on these variables were also studied by comparing broad categories of rural/urban, low/high education and male/female murderers.

HYPOTHESES

The ensuing portion of this chapter will be devoted to the deriving of some framework of hypotheses in light of the earlier studies. Broadly speaking, the areas covered will be personality and murder, adjustment and murder and psychosocial factors related to the personality and adjustment.

A. Personality and Murder

Most of the studies in the field of crime and personality have indicated some relationship of personality with crime (Jaspal, 1977). For the present study one of the
major personality concepts i.e. of Eysenck has been studied. Eysenck (1970) has related his three personality dimensions (i.e. Psychoticism, Extraversion and Neuroticism) to crime and the bulk of the literature in this area has been reviewed earlier in Chapter II. These three factors i.e. F, E and N are now given briefly in order to deduce a hypothesis linking each with murder.

(i) **Extraversion - Introversion and Murder**

Eysenck (1964, 1970) had put forward the view that antisocial conduct was evidence of lack of socialization, that socialization itself is due to the formation in childhood and youth of appropriate conditioned responses. Introverts are characterized by strong excitatory and weak inhibitory potentials whereas extraverts are characterized by weak excitatory and strong inhibitory potentials (Eysenck, 1957). Thus it may be predicted that introverts should form conditioned responses better than extraverts. Since extraverts condition poorly due to their tendency to build up cortical fatigue quickly, they do not get properly socialized (Eindelang, 1971). Further, because time passes more slowly for extraverts, they become easily bored and seek stimulation (excitement) which may bring them in conflict with law (Eysenck, 1964, 1970). Applying this argument to the aggressive behaviour, it is asserted that extraverts will have a low inhibition against aggression.
because of poor socialization and therefore, they would tend to respond to frustration or provocation with aggression. Thus, according to Eysenck (1970) extraverts are more likely to commit antisocial, criminal and violent acts.

Eysenck and Eysenck (1963) put forward a theory about the dual nature of extraversion wherein they said that sociability and impulsiveness are primary traits contributing to the higher order Extraversion - Introversion factor. The failure of many studies to find any relationship between E/I and crime (Bartholomew, 1957; Fitch, 1962; Little, 1963; Burgess, 1972; Singh, A., 1976; Jaspal, 1977) was attributed to the fact that it is the impulsivity items that clearly differentiate between criminals and controls rather than the sociability ones (Schalling, 1970).

Eysenck and Eysenck (1970, 1971) had suggested that in the field of criminality especially when dealing with incarcerated subjects, the sociability component is difficult to measure, and that this consideration may account for the failure of some researchers (e.g. Little, 1963; Fitch, 1962; Hogtushi et al., 1970) to confirm his criminological theory. According to Eysenck and Eysenck (1970), it is evident that for prisoners, who live in an institution with few possibilities of seeing friends and going to parties, sociability items may have other implications than for individuals leading a normal life. The
temporary conditions may influence their way of responding, although instructions emphasize that the questions refer to habitual behaviour (Jaspal, 1977). Banister et al. (1973) found that extraversion score as measured by EPI declined with the increase of imprisonment period. Further, as has been pointed out by Eysenck (1964), it may be difficult to separate low sociability (e.g. reporting having few friends, being reserved) due to a lack of interest in people (true introversion), and low sociability due to disturbances in interpersonal relationship (neurotic introversion). Thus criminals may be expected to have lower scores on the sociability component of Extraversion.

According to Schalling (1970), the relations postulated by Eysenck (1957) to exist between cortical arousal, conditionability and extraversion are valid only for the impulsiveness component of E. In accordance with this reasoning, it was hypothesized that criminals are higher than non-criminals in impulsiveness, whereas they may be assumed to be lower in sociability. Eysenck and Eysenck (1971) presented evidence in support of this proposition. Sanocki (1969) when found criminals to be significantly more extraverted on the short form of MPI (Eysenck, 1959) item analysed the subjects' responses and found that it was the impulsivity aspect which differentiates criminals from controls. Schalling (1970) also found
criminals to be higher in impulsivity than non-criminals. Burgess (1972) concluded on the basis of a study that E is not a unitary factor among groups of criminals.

The studies discrediting Eysenck's original theory therefore could not be explained in terms of the fact that they were heavily dependent on the relative preponderance of sociability items over impulsivity items and gave only a global picture where the two factors could be serving to cancel each other out (Jaspal, 1977).

From the above discussion one may conclude that it is the impulsivity items which differentiate criminals from non-criminals. If this is the case, we may hypothesize that:

On a scale like EPI, which contains an almost equal number of sociability and impulsivity items, the overall extraversion score of murderers would not differ significantly from non-criminals but the murderers would score higher on Impulsivity Component of E/I. If this be so, then on PEN scale also which contains mainly sociability items, the Extraversion score will not discriminate between murderers and non-criminals significantly.

(ii) Neuroticism and Murder

Eysenck (1970) while stating his theory of crime had
said that "high degrees of anxiety or neuroticism tended to act as a drive strongly reinforcing the extraverted or introverted tendencies favouring or disfavouring antisocial conduct." From this it was deduced that criminals would have high neuroticism scores. The prediction relating N to crime has been tested by various studies. A majority of the studies have put forth evidence supporting the relationship between neuroticism and crime (Bartholomew, 1957, 1959; Field, 1960; Fitch, 1962; Syed, 1964; Berry, 1966; Millman, 1966; Forrest and Hoghughi, 1968; Price, 1968; Schelling and Holmberg, 1968; Eysenck and Eysenck, 1970, 1971, 1973; Shanmugam, 1975; Wilson and Maclean, 1974). On the other hand, a few of the studies have found no differences between the neuroticism scores of criminals and non-criminals (Bartholomew, 1963; Little, 1963; Hoghughi and Forrest, 1965). While Jaspal (1977) found criminals scoring significantly lower than the non-criminals.

According to Burgess (1972), Eysenck's (1970) dimension of N is perhaps more important and relevant to the theoretical model proposed by him. Burgess (1972) argues that "neurotics with habitual antisocial response tend to engage in those responses more strongly than non-neurotics." According to Blackburn (1968) the frequency and intensity of aggressive responses are both indications of habit strength. Thus there should be a close link
Many studies have supported this deduction. Mayo and Bell (1971) using EPI (Eysenck, 1964) found that total hostility correlated positively with N. Yadav (1976) in a study on female murderers used EPI (Eysenck, 1964) and NSQ (Scheier and Cattell, 1961) and concluded that neurotic trend was highly associated with their personality. Singh, A. (1979a) found male criminals committing major crimes to score very high on N as compared to the other petty crime offenders. In a subsequent study Singh, A. (1979b) reported murderers to be scoring higher on N than the other criminals.

From the above discussion, one may conclude that in most of the earlier studies criminals have been found to score higher on N.

If this be the case, we may hypothesize that in the present study the murderers would score higher on Neuroticism as compared to the non-criminals.

(iii) Psychoticism and Murder

In 1970, Eysenck had suggested that besides the factors of Extraversion and Neuroticism, another affective factor of personality, i.e., of Psychoticism, may also be implicated in the causation of criminality. He had suggested that there may be two reasons for believing this (i) the
traits describing a psychotic resemble those exhibited by criminals and (ii) that psychosis and criminality have a particularly close connection (Odegard, 1963; Heston, 1966; Eysenck, 1972). All the studies done so far have found criminals scoring higher on psychoticism than the non-criminals. Unlike E and N, no negative or insignificant results have been obtained so far.

In a few recent studies, a close relationship between Psychoticism and violent offences has been found. Eysenck and Eysenck (1971) asserted that aggressive crimes and crimes involving unnecessary cruelty seem to carry implications of high P. Marriage (1975) found that violent offences are high P offences. Eysenck et al. (1977) found violent offenders scoring very high on P. Singh, A. (1976) found criminals committing major crimes like murder scoring significantly higher than those committing minor crimes. Jaspal (1977) and Singh, A. (1979a) confirmed these results in later studies on major and minor crime offenders. In yet another study, Singh, A. (1979b) found that murderers scored very high on P as compared to other offenders.

In light of this positive evidence, it may be hypothesized that murderers would have higher Psychoticism scores than the non-criminals.

B. Adjustment and Murder

The second area of study for the present research
work is adjustment. Adjustment is nothing but learning of behavioural patterns approved by the society. Eysenck (1970) has also maintained that propensity to crime is universal but is held in check by the "conscience". This conscience is developed as a result of socialization and makes an individual conform to society's norms, laws, and customs. It also helps him in development of a favourable self concept, learning of socially approved goals, realistic aspiration level and frustration tolerance. But many conditions like personality imbalance, unsatisfactory parent-child relationship, broken homes, distasteful occupation and like may obstruct his attempts to self expression and adjustment. As such, one may suggest that criminals who have already drifted away from societal norms should have lesser adjustment in the areas of home, social, emotional and vocational front. This has been confirmed by many studies (Singh, A. 1976; Nirmal, 1977; Singh, A., 1979a and 1979b; Mohan and Singh, A., in press, a). A few studies have shown a close connection between a low home, emotional, marital adjustment and murder. Johnson (1966) views murder as a crime of passion and Singh, A. (1979b) has shown that it is often a family affair. It has been found that a majority of murder victims are either family member or near relatives or close friends/immediate neighbours (Gupta and Sethi, 1974; Singh, G. and Verma, 1976;
Sharma, S. 1976; Singh, A., 1979b). The ensuing portion of this chapter is devoted to the framing of hypothesis for the present study with regard to home, emotional and marital adjustment.

(i) Home adjustment and Murder

There have been some studies relating home maladjustment to the propensity to crime. Glueck and Glueck (1951) reported that 49.3% of the delinquents but only 28.8% of the non-offenders were from broken homes. Wilkins (1960) reported a positive correlation between low home adjustments and delinquency. Raychaudhry et al. (1968) found crowding in home, uncomfortable home condition, poor family discipline and parental discord predominant in the early life of indisciplined subjects. Singh, A. and Sharma, S. (1977, 1978) found uncongenial home atmosphere predominant in the homes of delinquents. These studies suggest that home adjustment not only as viewed by the researchers, but also perceived by the criminal would be poorer.

Regarding the relationship between home adjustment and murder, studies done on the victims of homicidal attempts have shown that a large number of them are either family members or close relatives (Ahuja, 1970; Gupta and Sethi, 1974; Sharma, S. 1976; Gillies, 1976; Singh, G. and Verma, 1976; Singh, A., 1979b). This shows clearly a lack of home adjustment. Singh, A. (1979a) found that male
criminals committing major crimes showed a very poor home adjustment as compared to the criminals committing minor crimes. Singh, A. (1979b) found murderers to be very poorly adjusted to home.

In light of these studies, it may be hypothesized that the murderers would show a low home adjustment as compared to the non-criminals.

(ii) Marital Adjustment and Murder

Marital adjustment is another aspect which may be of salience in the study of murderers. Johnson (1966) views murder "as a crime of passion" and Singh, A. (1979b) has shown that it is often a family affair. A large number of studies have shown that criminals and particularly murderers have a very low home adjustment (Toby, 1957; McCord and McCord, 1959; Gibbens, 1961; Barker and Adams, 1962; Ganguly and Maitra, 1966; Singh, A., 1976; Singh, A. and Sharma, S., 1977, 1978; Singh, A., 1979a, 1979b; Mohan and Singh, A., in press, a). Adjustment to home is very closely related to marital adjustment and the fact that a large number of murderers murder either their family members or close relatives/friends is an ample proof of their poor home as well as marital adjustment.

Many studies have reported a very close relationship between marital maladjustment and homicide, though most of
these have primarily been sociological interview type surveys. By studying the relationship between the murderer and his victims, Goode (1969) concluded that "criminal homicide is the most intimate of violent crimes." Gibson and Klein (1961) and McClintock (1963) studied the pattern of English murders and found that 1/3 of the total murders were committed on wives, girl friends or children and amongst the family members wives or mistresses were involved in 2/3 of the family tragedies. The Presidents' Commission (1966) on crime in the District of Columbia (U.S.A.) found that 27 per cent of the homicides occurred between spouses. Voss and Hepburn (1968) reported that only one per cent of criminal homicides occurred between strangers while 50 per cent were between very close relatives and friends.

Similar findings have been reported from India also. Somasundram (1965) found that 4 out of 12 murderers studied had killed their wives. In a subsequent study Somasundram (1970) studied 41 murderers who had killed their wives and reported a complete marital breakdown and disharmony leading to the crime. Akuja (1970) studied female murderers and found that 81.5% of the murder victims were close relatives of the accused while over 50% of them were husbands. Sharma, S. (1976) in a similar study found that a majority of the female murderers had murdered their husbands.

According to Akuja (1970) 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 long standing personal frictions between husbands and wives or between daughter-in-law and mother/father/sister-in-law. Sharma, S. (1976) relates murder with marital maladjustment. She found that a majority of female murderers reported a problem of adjustment with husband, in-laws as well as their parental family.

All these studies suggest that the murderers have a disharmonious marital relationship. In light of these studies it may be hypothesized that:

the murderers in the present study would also show a poor marital adjustment as compared to non-criminals.

(iii) Emotional Adjustment and Murder

Various investigators have found criminals to have lower emotional adjustment. Healey and Bronner (1936) reported 91% of the delinquents giving evidence of emotional impairment. Shanmugam (1953) found delinquents to react aggressively to stress situations as compared to non-delinquents. Gluecks (1956) found delinquents to be more impulsive and vivacious as compared to non-delinquents. McCord and McCord (1959) believe that there is a strong emotional factor in criminality. Majumdar and Roy (1962)
studied four groups of delinquents in terms of their offences: theft, sex, liquor consumption and petty offences and found that all the four groups differed in emotional stability.

Many studies have also found murderers to be emotionally maladjusted. According to Johnson (1966) "Crimes like murder are basically the crimes of emotionality." Singh, A. (1979b) reported murderers to be less emotionally adjusted as compared to the other criminals. Singh, A. (1979a) reported that the criminals committing major crimes like murder showed a low emotional adjustment than the criminals committing minor crimes like theft, pickpocketing.

In light of the above given studies, it may be predicted that the murderers would have poorer emotional adjustment as studied through Bell's adjustment inventory.

C. Psychosocial Factors and Murder

A number of factors have been found to be affecting the personality and adjustment of criminals as well as non-criminals. Personality differentiations of criminals will have to be studied in the light of some of the psychosocial factors like rural-urban background and...
educational attainment. The ensuing discourse would mainly revolve around these factors and the hypothesis framed for each of these for the present study are given below.

(i) **Sex and Murder**

In our earlier review of literature (Chapter II), we had noticed that female criminality has been a neglected field of research till now though a few studies on women criminals have been reported during the past two decades. These studies (Dalton, 1961; Ahuja, 1970; Sharma, S., 1976) have primarily been sociological ones. Though there are a few psychiatric studies also (Cole, 1968; Somasundram, 1973; Climent et al., 1973; d' Orban, 1979; Singh, S. and Singh, A., 1979), yet there is not much material in psychology except for a few studies like Eysenck and Eysenck (1973), Yadav (1976), Barack and Widom (1978). So in the present study an attempt was made to study a group of female murderers in comparison with male murderers as well as male and female non-criminals.

Thus, in the present study both the sexes i.e. male and female were studied by taking an equal number of male and female murderers and non-criminals. As this study was relatively new research taking the sex variable into account, no definite hypothesis could be framed. It was thought that the results would themselves be indicative of any trends for further research.
(ii) Rural-Urban Differences and Murder

Many studies have shown that there are ecological differences in crime and criminal patterns and in general, crime and delinquency rates are found to be higher in urban communities than in rural areas (Johnson, 1966). Useem and Waldner (1942) reported that urban crimes mostly comprised of offenses against property (including theft, fraud, forgery and embezzlement) and they also include abortion, vice and political corruption while rural crimes mostly involve property but they tend to be naive and discreet. According to Sutherland and Cressey (1966), "The rural rates are higher than the urban rates for homicide and about one half as high as assaults, one fourth as high for robbery, burglary, larceny and auto theft. Sharma, S. (1976) has shown that the rates of major crimes against person are very high in rural areas as compared to urban areas.

Peckless (1971) taking note of the fact that the rates of crime against person are high in rural areas seeks to explain this by saying that under conditions of relatively isolated living where primary group relationship predominate, the spirit of independence burns fiercely; reactions to interference and friction are strong and violent. Butterfield as early as 1907 concluded that rural people and especially farmers were characterized by individualism, conservatism, deep-seated prejudices, a
tendency to brood over more or less imaginary injuries and to be moody, pessimistic and fatalistic. McMohan (1951) found that rural people in comparison with their urban counterparts had less of independence, dominance, resourcefulness, self-reliance and rationality, but more of feeling of personal worth, of the sense of belongingness and of practical mindedness. Similarly, personality differences have been found in rural and urban criminals. Singh, A. (1976) studied an equal number of rural and urban criminals and found that the rural criminals scored very high on the P scale of PSK. Mohan and Singh, A. (in press, b) observed that the rural criminals were significantly more maladjusted in the areas of home emotional adjustment. Singh, A. (1976) found that rural criminals committing major crimes to be showing a low home adjustment than the rural criminals committing minor crimes. Nirmal (1977) also found adjustment differences in rural and urban criminals.

Keeping in view the above given studies, we may hypothesize that:

(i) the rural murderers would have higher P, scores than the urban murderers; and
(ii) the rural murderers would show a lower home, emotional and marital adjustment than the urban murderers.

(iii) Education and Murder:

Formal education is a mean of social control through
internalization by the individuals of the mores of the culture of his society. Education accounts for the structuring of character to a great extent (Glueck and Glueck, 1957) and many studies have shown that delinquents and criminals have poor school records and little formal education. Burt (1927) reported that nine out of every ten of the delinquents studied fell below the middle line of average educational attainment. Glueck and Glueck (1957) reported that a large number of delinquents showed a dislike for school. Frum (1952) found that 23% of the total cases of adult recidivism studied, started with juvenile truancy or incorrigibility. Wooten (1960) reported that "there is a fairly good agreement on both sides of the Atlantic that those who are found guilty of offences tend to have poor school records. Palmer (1960) found that murderers tended to be the persons with low educational attainment. Mohan and Singh, A, (1977) in a study on education and crime, found that as compared to the other offenders, most of the murderers belonged to the middle education group (middle to high school level education).

A few of the recent studies have found a correlation between education and the personality dimensions. Verma and Wig (1978) used P. G. I. Health Questionnaire and found an inverse and low but significant correlation between neuroticism and education. Sharma, S. K. (1978) also found
similar results on college students. Many studies have reported education to be affecting the adjustment also. Sharma, S. K. (1975) reported a significant correlation between Mittal's adjustment inventory and education of adolescents. Sharma, S. K. and Malhotra (1976) also reported a similar finding. Kaur (1976) reported a greater difficulty in the adjustment of home and occupation areas in the less educated subjects. Roth and Peck (1951) reported that "marital adjustment and happiness increases with the social class" which is invariably related to the educational status of an individual.

Regarding the relationship between education, crime and personality, Mohan and Singh, A. (in press, b) have found differences in the personality scores among various groups of criminals. They divided criminals into three educational status levels and found that the criminals with less education were significantly more Extraverted and had higher Neuroticism scores than the criminals with high education. It was also found that they showed a very poor occupation and emotional adjustment.

In view of the studies showing a relationship between education, crime, personality and adjustment, it may be hypothesized that:

(i) the murderers with low education would score higher on P, E and N as compared to the
murderers with high education; and
(ii) the murderers with high education would show a
better home, emotional and marital adjustment in
comparison to the less educated murderers.